



UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA PARTICULAR DE LOJA
La Universidad Católica de Loja

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

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

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

Trabajo de titulación previo a la obtención del título de:

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

Autor: Ontaneda Pardo, Juan Líder

Director: González Torres, Paúl Fernando

CENTRO UNIVERSITARIO CARIAMANGA

2022



Esta versión digital, ha sido acreditada bajo la licencia Creative Commons 4.0, CC BY-NY-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, 11 de febrero de 2022

Magíster
Alba Vargas
DIRECTORA DE LA CARRERA DE INGLÉS
Ciudad.

De mi consideración:

Por medio del presente, en mi calidad de director del trabajo de titulación desarrollado por Juan Líder Ontaneda Pardo, me permito informar que una vez realizada la revisión de todo el documento se aprueba la presentación del mismo para revisión por parte del tribunal. Así mismo, doy fe que dicho trabajo de titulación ha sido revisado por la herramienta antiplagio institucional, se adjunta el informe Urkund

Atentamente,

Paúl Fernando González Torres, Ph.D.
DIRECTOR DEL TRABAJO DE TITULACIÓN
CI: 1103212351

Declaración de autoría y cesión de derechos

“Yo, Juan Líder Ontaneda Pardo, declaro y acepto en forma expresa lo siguiente:

- Ser autor del Trabajo de Titulación denominado: *The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students*, del Programa de grado, específicamente de los contenidos comprendidos en: Introducción, Capítulo 1. Escribir en el contexto de la Lengua Inglesa, Capítulo 2. Metodología de la investigación, Capítulo 3. La descripción, el análisis y la interpretación de los resultados, Conclusiones y Recomendaciones, Gonzáles Torres, Paúl Fernando, Ph D. director (a) 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 UTPL, 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: Juan Líder Ontaneda Pardo

C.I.:1709499550

Dedication

With all my affection I dedicated my thesis to my dear mother. She is the best person who helped me during my studies, she always gives me her blessings and unconditional support that has motivated me to reach my goal and get my dreams. I dedicate this work to you dear mother because you are a special person in my life.

Juan Líder Ontaneda

Acknowledgement

With my all humility, first of all I thank God for giving me health and life to achieve my goals. I also thank my parents who always give me their support to achieve my objectives. With all my heart, I thank the University UTPL, to its personnel who explained to me the study program that university has in the area of the English Language, as well as the teachers who have a great human quality, who spared no effort, imparted their knowledge to me with professionalism, so that I could continue with my preparation. With affection I thank my thesis tutor, also my director for their patience, in their orientations in my work. I thank the Educational Institution and its authorities for having authorized the obtaining of field information. Finally. I thank the English teacher and all participants students from the educational institution for their collaboration in my thesis work and for making a dream come true.

!Thanks a lot!

Contents

Carátula _____	i
Aprobación del director del fin del trabajo de titulación _____	ii
Declaración de autoría y cesión de derechos _____	iii
Dedicación _____	v
Aknowledgement _____	vi
Contents _____	vii
Abstract _____	1
Resumen _____	2
Introduction _____	3
Chapter one _____	6
Literature Review _____	6
Writing in the EFL context _____	6
<i>The importance of writing in the EFL students</i> _____	6
<i>The most common and frequent written errors</i> _____	10
Writing Corrective Feedback (WVF) on EFL learners _____	12
<i>The importance of effective feedback</i> _____	12
<i>Written Peer correction</i> _____	13
<i>Written Teacher feedback</i> _____	14
Previous Studies _____	16
Chapter two _____	18
Method _____	18
Setting and Participants _____	18
Procedure _____	19
Chapter three _____	21
Result Description, Analysis and Interpretation of Results _____	21
Conclusions _____	36
Recommendations _____	37
References _____	38
Appendix _____	42

List of tables

Table 1 Pre and Post test results _____	21
Table 2 Teacher and Peer Feedback Results _____	23
Table 3 Student's perception about teacher and peer feedback _____	31

Abstract

This research is titled “The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in students”, whose purpose was to analyze the effects of peer and teacher corrections and to identify the type of feedback that EFL students prefer. The methodological design is mixed, including qualitative and quantitative data. The participants were students from the second year of high school. The instruments were the pretest, the checklist, the posttest and the survey. In the intervention, students wrote six paragraphs. The pretest and the posttest were used to measure the improvement of writing skills, before and after applying peer correction and teacher feedback. The checklist was used to know the effects of peer correction in paragraphs: 2, 4 and 6. The survey was applied at the end of the intervention. The results obtained were classified, organized and interpreted to answer the research questions. Finally, the research showed that the applications of teacher feedback helped to students to increase the level of the ability to write correctly.

Keywords: feedback, students, skills, writing.

Resumen

Esta investigación se titula “El papel de la corrección entre pares y la retroalimentación del maestro en mejorar las habilidades de escritura en estudiantes de secundaria”, cuyo propósito fue analizar los efectos de correcciones entre pares y maestros e identificar el tipo de retroalimentación que prefieren los estudiantes. El diseño metodológico es mixto, incluye datos cualitativos y cuantitativos. Los participantes fueron estudiantes del segundo año de enseñanza media. Los instrumentos fueron: pretest, lista de cotejo, postest y encuesta. En la intervención los estudiantes escribieron seis párrafos. El pretest y postest se utilizó para medir la mejora de la escritura, después de aplicar la corrección del maestro y compañeros. Se utilizó la lista de cotejo para conocer los efectos de la corrección entre pares en párrafos: 2, 4 y 6. La encuesta al final de la intervención. Los resultados fueron clasificados, organizados e interpretados para dar respuesta a las preguntas de investigación. Finalmente, la investigación mostró que la retroalimentación del maestro ayudó a estudiantes a aumentar la habilidad para escribir correctamente.

Palabras clave: estudiantes, habilidades, escritura, retroalimentación.

Introduction

Writing in a second language is extremely important for students from different high schools, considering that they need to handle different documents that are likely in English in their studies at the university and their future professional activities. For instance, in the university, they must write different types of documents such as notes, paragraphs, essays to pass written exams. Another important fact is that if they do not write well, they are not able to take advantage of the different opportunities and they cannot apply the entrance to different specific studies that require an adequate level of English, especially in the writing part. (Hidayati, 2018).

The most important reason why this research was carried out is in order to improve the level of writing of the students' written paragraphs in English through the application of feedback from teachers and students and consequently the level of proficiency of the English language in secondary school in Ecuador.

The general objective is 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. The research questions are: the first one is which are the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of the morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors? And the second question is which type of feedback: Peer correction and teacher feedback do EFL students prefer for writing?

The previous studies related to the role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students made by some researchers are the following. Bitchener et al. (2005) examined some effects of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. The study found a significant effect of combined written and lecture feedback on levels of accuracy in using the simple past tense and the definite article in new pieces of writing, but no effect on improving accuracy for types of writing that were considered in the different written works.

Khadawardi (2020) investigated the effects of implicit corrective feedback on the English writing of second language learners in the UK. The results indicated that implicit written feedback from the teacher helped correcting particular type of errors and other errors demanded oral feedback from the teacher.

Mehrdad and Abu (2019) analyzed how language learners perceive the usefulness of different types and amounts of written corrective feedback, as well as the reasons they have for their preferences. The results indicated that learners react favorably to direct feedback on their written work, also, they show little tolerance for simply marking the error without explanation. Furthermore, a considerable number of respondents favored indirect corrective feedback.

This investigation contains several sections as follows. Then, Chapter one is the Literature Review, which has three general subtopics. The first one, refers to writing in the EFL context. The second part includes some information about written corrective feedback (WCF) on EFL learners and the last part is the previous studies related to the effects of error feedback in second language students. Chapter two describes the methodology in detail which includes the method, participants, instruments, data sources and the description of the procedure. Data analysis in chapter three displays the description, interpretation and analysis of results that were analyzed, compared, and interpreted. These were represented in tables. Likewise, these data were correlated with the most relevant information that is in the literature review. In the last section states the conclusions, recommendations, bibliography, and annexes.

The results of this research will be useful for students, to increase the level of the ability to write well in English, and for teachers because it encourages others colleagues and educators to use these types of feedback and using them for future investigations. Also, the results of this research contributes to science by giving relevant information to help to increase the level of proficiency of English. Finally, there were some difficulties in relation to the feedback process, which was very slow and most of the students had many problems

with the internet connection and sometimes with the lack of electricity. These inconveniences did not allow them to maintain permanent attention, and sometimes delayed the continuous teaching process.

Chapter one

Literature Review

This part of literature review is going to start by addressing important aspects of writing in English as a Foreign Language for students. Later on, the challenges in EFL writing will show up in different aspects such as the reasons why writing is considered one of the most difficult skills to achieve in different contexts. Next, the most common written errors will be checked in reference to morphological, semantic and syntactic errors. On the other hand, the written correction of the peers and the written feedback of the teacher will be shown in terms of conceptualizing, traits, advantages and disadvantages.

Finally, some important researchers related to the field will be emphasized in order to have a strong bibliographic support to carry out this activity.

Writing in the EFL context

Writing in the EFL context is very important especially for students who are going to graduate from different high schools because these students are going to enter in different universities and they need to be able to manage different documents that probably are in English and hence, they need to have at least basic knowledge of English for their future and professional life.

The importance of writing in the EFL students

The importance of writing in the EFL students is given due to different reasons. One is that writing can be an art, but it is the artist's job to create the masterpiece, so every time we write, we are perfecting the job. There are many sub-skills of writing that learners need to learn in order to be successful in their studies. For example, writing skills requires from students to use their linguistic competence to generate ideas, summarize concepts, knowledge of diction choice, select topics, spelling, punctuation, make good connections between sentences and paragraphs and having accurate references (Suastra & Sebastianus, 2020).

Also, writing is the central factor in the language teaching environment because students must write notes, paragraphs and to pass written exams all the time (Koura et al., 2017). This fact refers to the needs that many young learners have in their student life (Hosseini et al., 2013).

Another important point is that when students are in the university, they should know how to write because it has many advantages for their future. Learners who have developed their skill get excellent grades than those who have no skills (Muslim, 2014). It is well known that writing jobs in universities require sophisticated levels in the argumentative and interpretive dimensions of the English language. Therefore, the ignorance of the rhetorical characteristics of these academic genres that involve argumentation and interpretation are a multidimensional challenge for EFL learners (Marulanda & García, 2017).

Another reason why writing is really important is the communication. With writing, people communicate a great number of messages to different types of readers. Therefore, students need regular opportunities in school to write in all subjects. Following a consistent approach into the writing process in all areas and explicit writing instruction would help students become excellent writers (Koura & Zahran, 2017).

In recent years, some researchers and scientists have been thinking about the immense importance of the ability to write in the EFL students. In this sense, researchers have re-examined at writing and recognize the enormous importance of writing as a vital skill for a foreign language speaker as well as for everyone who uses their first language. Additionally, this reality has changed some perspectives in relation to the use of some strategies and techniques and innovating materials that have been effectively improved in the teaching and learning process, specifically in the development of writing skills on students. Taking into account that writing cannot be acquired naturally like speech, and it must be learned necessarily in an educational center (Koura & Zahran, 2017).

Another perspective about the importance of writing in the EFL students is that students today have very little interest in writing, which is so important to fulfil the education

requirements. This may be due to progress of technology, which has a negative effect on students' writing skills due to the availability of prepared assignments (Muslim, 2014). As teachers, we must encourage students in class to fill this gap in one of the most important skills that every student should have, which is handwriting, hence they could improve their writing skill.

In teaching English as a foreign language, it is very important to develop writing skill in tandem in order to have an effective and deep learning. So, some authors said that writing skill cannot be taught alone, if not, they need to be developed at the same time with other skills, in this case reading. English learners are sometimes uninformed about the benefits of connecting reading and writing and they do not have the opportunity to use strategies that integrate reading and writing. The majority of the time, reading and writing have been taught in isolation. Therefore, learners usually face several difficulties in writing, for example, they cannot integrate new information, they cannot present or write details, and they cannot summarize information from different texts (Manvender, 2015).

Challenges in EFL writing

Definitely, the ability to write is a challenge, especially for those learners who are learning English as a Foreign Language. Mukti (2020) states that writing is challenging because this skill needs a long process. Writing well in a foreign language requires that learners have a considerable basic level of English. This could allow them to write basic paragraphs and short essays with simple themes that do not require to be deepening in their meaning. It is well known that the process of writing is really different from the process of speaking because generally writing require different competences. The writing process usually requires different types of competencies and also is different from the process of speaking. Written tasks are the result of specialized tasks such as thinking, checking, drafting and reviewing (Brown, 2000).

Emphasizing in the same fact, written task are challenges related to the needs for future professionals to be able to have an effective written interaction in different contexts,

about this Common European Framework (2016) states that written interaction through written language includes such activities as; passing and exchanging notes, memos, etc. This is done, when spoken interaction is impossible and inappropriate. Additionally, the use of correspondence by letter, fax, e-mail, etc.; negotiating the text of agreements, contracts, communications; reformulating and exchanging drafts, amendments, proof corrections and participating in on-line or off-line computer conferences are examples of written interaction.

On the other hand, the process of writing is precisely the nature of the process or what elements a great composition must have, and learners should possess these competences. The outcome of the compositional natural writing often focuses on students in relation to how they can generate ideas in their writing, how they can organize these ideas coherently, how they can use speech markers and rhetorical conventions in order to put ideas cohesively, how they can revise text for clearer meaning, how they can edit text with proper grammar, and how they can produce a final product as an assignment (Brown, 2000).

Handwriting is one of the skills that are closely intimate related to the process of writing, so handwriting could be considered as another important challenge especially for children who are learning a second language. Since this skill is unquestionable the foundation for development the others language skills that, definitely learners need to develop in the next years of his student life. Handwriting will continue to be an important topic in the future despite the increasing use of computer keyboards. Beginning students should learn to write the letters on their own (Ur's, 2016).

Another major challenge, especially for teachers, is the time that children employ on writing tasks, which is longer than the time they spend developing tasks related to the others language skill, taking into account that writing task takes much time than the other three skills of listening, reading and speaking. In this sense, the longer writing tasks require careful thought and reflection. This fact does not allow students to have appropriate feedback and help in class (Ur's, 2016).

There are many challenges in EFL writing, and of course there are many reasons to ensure this fact, one of them is that many teachers consider that teaching writing is one of the most difficult tasks in class because they need to consider many elements for teaching, for example. The teaching of writing in English is related to the development of the student's linguistic and communicative competence, which makes it a big challenging task (Hidayati, 2018).

It is important to mention that some factors can contribute to teachers' challenge in teaching writing. About this topic, Maggi and Cajas (2020) stated that the student's expected level of English and their actual level is the main challenge that participants have to confront in their classes. The second challenge, though not as intense as the first, is the Spanish language interference. According to the participants, students have not been able to adapt to the English writing conventions and continue using the Spanish conventions in their English writings.

The lack of student's motivation to write in English is a great challenge faced by teachers, the second result of two aspects. They added that, if students can improve their level of English and understand the English writing conventions, their motivation will increase markedly.

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

To start talking about the most common and frequent written errors, it is important to clarify the concept of error in contrast to mistake because there is a relevant difference between these two words in the process of teaching and learning English as a foreign language. According to Brown (2007) a mistake is a performance error that is either a random guess or a "slip". Everyone makes mistakes, both in native and second language situations. Native are generally able to recognize and correct these "lapses" or mistakes, which are not the result of a deficiency in competence but the result of some kind of temporary glitch or imperfection in the speech production process.

On the other hand, an error, a notable departure from the adult grammar of a native speaker, shows the learner's proficiency. English Learners asking "Does John can sing?" in all probability they reflect level of competence in which all verbs require a pre-posed do auxiliary for question formation. As such, it is an error, most likely not a mistake, and an error reveals a part of the learner's proficiency in the target language. It is clear that we are talking about error, not mistakes in reference of students who are learning English as a Foreign Language.

What are the most common morphological errors in writing?

First of all, it is important to analyze that the morphological errors are formed when the structure of words is misused in an expression and their relationship to each other does not fit. Imam (2016) states that a morphology error implies a failure to comply with the norm in supplying any part of any instance of these word classes.

It is significant to note that there are many types of morphological errors according to the categories. They can be nouns, verbs, adverbs, adjectives, indefinites, demonstrative adjectives, singular and plurals, possessive adjectives, past formation, past tense, present, future, infinitives. Warren (2013) emphasizes with a different classification, which are inflectional and derivational errors.

What are the most common semantic errors in writing?

Semantic errors are those that do not agree with the rules of the semantic system of the English language. Gass and Selinker (2015) state that the study of semantics refers to the study of meaning. Some semantic errors are divided based on some perspectives. In relation to the confusion of sense relation. Jassim (2016) states the most common semantic errors in writing as follow: using a superonym for a hyponym, using a hyponymy for a superonym, using inappropriate co-hyponyms, using an incorrect close synonym, binary terms confusion, and L1 translation.

What are the most common syntax errors in writing?

A syntax error means that an expression does not make sense, and on the contrary an expression has syntax when the formation in sentences make sense. It is important to note that the words can be structured in a sentence in many ways and still they can make sense. Talosa and Maguddayao (2018) state that the discrepancies with the syntax rules are called syntax error. Lee and Vanpatten (2003) emphasize that syntax is related to the rules that govern what is acceptable in a statement and what is not.

The most common syntax errors are verbs tense, the use of pronoun, faulty parallelism, subject – verb – agreement, fragment, merged sentence, and redundancy (Talosa & Maguddayao, 2018).

Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) on EFL learners

Written corrective feedback is one of the most important activities that teachers must carry out in class, especially in EFL learners. This type of correction can be a word or phrase of encouragement, a comment, an advice, or a suggestion that encourage students in order to make changes to their written work. This is the foundation for their success and in the future, they can become good writers.

The importance of effective feedback on EFL learners

Feedback is any information that teacher usually provides to students, so they can reduce the gap between current performance and a desired goal in reference to a particular point on an assignment and this information is essentially for students to adjust their knowledge in a specific area. In reference of an effective feedback, one of the best ways that teachers can help students is by teaching how to use feedback. Teachers should also make opportunities for students to use it after receiving it, so it can be considered as effective feedback for them (Brookhart, 2017).

Feedback is essential for the training of students and if it is done well, it motivates and develops accurate knowledge in them. It also helps students realize their potential. In addition, Hattie and Timperley (2008) said that feedback is one of the most powerful

influences on learning and achievement, but this impact can be either in positive or in negative way.

Many educators and researchers recognize the power and the importance of applying the feedback into the learning process. Jaszczur (2019) emphasize that feedback can be recognized as a tool which helps students to make their learning experience meaningful and giving effective feedback to students has been identified as a key strategy in the learning and teaching process. For doing an effective and meaningful feedback, teachers can apply different techniques and strategies. Klimova (2015) added that teachers can apply different feedback strategies such as assessment of students' works, peer review, students' self-reflection, in-class discussions, course evaluation questionnaires, or focus interviews with students.

Written Peer correction

In general, peer correction is a technique often used in class. It is done when learners can correct each other rather than the teacher doing this. For that, they use different resources such as computers or simply their handwriting in order to write their recommendations. Maximilian (2014) stated that peer correction is a technique to improve students' writing through discussion between students where each student give feedback to their peers.

Peer correction is often done in class to improve students on many interesting factors such as: interactions, autonomy, participation and cooperation. Additionally, peer correction can lead to significant improvement about writing skills in students (Itmeizeh, 2016).

There are many characteristics that written peer correction has. For instance, this correction should be done specifically between students. Teachers do not participate directly in this kind of correction. About the characteristics, Ali et al. (2019) stated that peer review is a collaboration between students to provide constructive comments on the oral and written results of their peers.

Another characteristic would be that this type of correction is not qualified. This is only for academic purposes and means that one of the objectives is that students can identify and clarify some common doubts that they probably have in the learning process. Peer correction is a great way to engage students in the teaching and learning process. This method is informative, because it comes from someone who has the same knowledge. Also, it is less stressful for students because it is not about grading (Ganji, 2009).

The importance of written peer correction stems from the fact the learners need to internalize their knowledge in writing. They need to receive immediately feedback and when the number of students is huge, feedback usually never reaches the students. That is why it could be very motivating for them. Tsuruyya (2020) emphasizes that peer correction has an important role in language teaching and learning as a contribution to motivate the performance of L2 learners in writing classroom. Peer correction encourages the development of autonomous learning due to teachers' review that took over-dependence thus reduced the initiative of the students.

Another important point of using written peer correction is the advantages and disadvantages of this activity. Some teachers recommended the use of peer feedback because its social, cognitive and affective benefits help students understand and improve certain points in learning to write in English, providing them an exact guide in reference of improving their writing ability (Bijami, 2013).

Written Teacher feedback

Written teacher feedback is the comment, recommendation or correction that teachers give students regarding different assignments that are part of the learning process in order to improve their writing skills. It must be well managed by teachers. About this important definition, Brookhart (2008) highlighted that good feedback to students is one of the skills that teachers must master, since it is part of a good formative evaluation.

The importance of written teacher feedback has been discussed for many years and different authors emphasize on it. Zhan (2016) stated that written teacher feedback plays an

important role in improving students' writing skills. Another important idea about the importance of having a written teacher feedback is giving by Holtzman (2016), who said that significant progress in student academic achievement requires that each teacher receives the individualized feedback and support that he or she needs to change practice in ways that improve student learning. Thus, quality observation provides not only that, but also the data that teachers need to assess and improve their system-wide supports for better teaching.

Written teacher feedback may have different characteristics, one of the most important is that they can be direct or indirect. Westmacott (2017) emphasizes that written feedback is direct, with a correct version provided to the student, or indirect, in this case the presence of the error is indicated but not corrected. Also, within the indirect category, there are several possible subcategories depending on how explicitly the type of error type and location are stated. The teacher can indicate the type of error committed through the use of a code, for example: g = grammar; giving the location of the error, for example by underlining or highlighting it; simply noting the number or type of errors in a particular line of the text in the margin.

The importance of written teacher correction is related to one of the most important elements that the teaching and learning process should have and that is the role of teacher in the feedback process. About the importance of this process, Güntherová (2019) added that the objective of the error correction is to find and fill the gaps in what should be learned by students and work to close these gaps and further develop in the correct use of language in class.

In fact, there are many advantages and disadvantages of using teacher correction to improve their writing skill in learners. One of them is precisely that learners can obtain their feedback on time. Balderas and Guillén (2018) added that the revision is crucial because it promotes and guides the improvement of the text by adding self and peer correction as strategies. During this stage, learners not only gain a more appropriate and accurate final version of their text, but also knowledge of the writing as a process. In addition, students can

use error codes and error logs during self and peer correction to provide and follow-up explicit feedback in an attempt to foster self-awareness of the areas that need improvement.

Once we review the most important and appropriate theoretical bases about the most common types of feedback that the teacher uses in class, we are going to check the most relevant studies related to the effects of error feedback in second language students.

There are many previous and excellent studies related to the effects of error feedback in second language students. Wagner et al. (2016) examined that indirect WCF, which is an instructional procedure that mark students' L2 errors with editing symbols that guide their corrections. WCF students assume that this guide will provide greater grammatical proficiency over time. This study found that these assumptions are correct. However, in-depth analyses of L2-English learners' correcting behaviors on four elicitation tasks over a 12-week period demonstrate that WCF is not uniformly effective in increasing the accuracy for all grammatical constructions. This result can be understood through Skill Acquisition Theory (SAT) when the treatability of constructions with WCF is considered.

Liu (2008) studied the effects of error feedback on second language writing. The study used a quasi-experimental design that investigated the abilities of 12 university ESL to self-edit their writing under two feedback conditions. First, direct correction with the correct form provided by the teacher. Second, indirect correction indicating that there is an error but without providing the correction. The conclusions helped the students to self-edit their tests. Although direct feedback reduced students' errors on the immediate draft, it did not improve students' accuracy on a different paper. Indirect feedback helped the students reduce more morphological errors than semantic errors.

Westmacott (2017) contributes to the purpose of this study, which is to report an investigation conducted with learners in a Chilean university. The methodology used is to provide direct to indirect, coded feedback and to explore student responses to the two types of feedback. The results were that the majority of students in this EFL setting stated that indirect feedback was more useful as it drivers deeper cognitive processing and learning, as

well as helping to reinforce grammatical knowledge and encourage autonomous learning behavior in students.

Bitchener et al (2005) examined some effects of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. The methodology is the application of direct and explicit feedback in writing and individual conferences of five minutes, given to 53 adult migrant students about three types of error that are about prepositions, the simple past tense, and the definite article, resulting in greater accuracy in the new writing pieces over 12 weeks. The study found a significant effect of combined written and lecture feedback on levels of accuracy in using the simple past tense and the definite article in new pieces of writing, but no effect on improving accuracy for types of writing that were considered in the different written works.

Khadawardi (2020) investigated the effects of implicit corrective feedback on the English writing of second language learners in the UK. A case study consisting of a small group of students received implicit written feedback through codes representing specific types of writing errors in written assignments. In addition, the participants were interviewed and learned the points of view on the implicit written comments of the teacher and their reactions. The results indicated that implicit written feedback from the teacher helped correcting particular type of errors and other errors demanded oral feedback from the teacher.

Mehrdad and Abu (2019) analyzed how language learners perceive the usefulness of different types and amounts of written corrective feedback, as well as the reasons they have for their preferences. The methodology is qualitative and quantitative data was collected from 103 ESL students through computer-generated written questionnaires. The results indicated that learners react favorably to direct feedback on their written work. In addition, they show little tolerance for simply marking the error without explanation. Furthermore, a considerable number of respondents favored indirect corrective feedback.

Chapter two

Method

After verifying the most important points of view of some researchers about peer and teacher feedback in writing assignment in EFL, in chapter two, in the method part, the setting, participants and procedures are going to be analyzed. We start with a brief overview of the type of method and the variables that were identified in this research.

In the part of setting and participants, the place, the city and the participants are explained such as; the grade, the school, the year and the modality will be explained in detail, and, in the part of procedure, the steps that the investigator follows in the intervention are explained in detail.

Setting and Participants

This research was conducted in a public secondary school in the city of Loja - Ecuador. The participants were students who are 14 and 15 years old, they belong to one of the classes of students who are in the second year of High School, academic year 2021-2022. To conform the study group, the students were chosen for the investigation indistinctly at the beginning of the academic year, ten students are from parallel "A", and eleven students are from parallel "B. All the students come from a middle socioeconomic status.

Students often have four academic hours of 50 minutes per week of English, and they are receiving class in virtual mode, according to the special planning due to the COVID 19 pandemic.

Procedure

The type of methodological design was mixed, and it includes qualitative and quantitative data. This method is used to analyze the effects of peer correction and teacher feedback on the correction of the morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors and to identify the type that EFL students prefer for writing. There were two types of variables: the dependent variable was the level of improvement of writing skills and the independent

variable was the training, which was related to the use of peer correction and teacher feedback in order to improve their writing skills in high school students.

First, the most important theoretical aspects were found in books, articles, magazines, related to the peer and teacher feedback. They were processed and paraphrased in order to have an important theoretical foundation that can be used in the next steps in the research study.

Second, the English classes were planned with the course teacher of second year of high school, and at this time, students took a pretest about "My Future Plans". In the second class, students had to write the paragraph No. 1, about "COVID-19". Later on, the teacher had to correct it, in front of the class, applying the teacher feedback. In the third-class, students had to write the paragraph No. 2, about "Soccer". At this time, they did the peer correction. In the fourth-class, students had to write the paragraph No. 3, about "Habits" and the teacher gave the corresponding feedback. In the fifth-class, students had to write the paragraph No. 4, about "environment" and student had to apply the peer feedback. In the sixth-class, students wrote the paragraph No. 5, about "personality" and the teacher gave the feedback. In the seventh-class, students again wrote the paragraph No. 6, about "emotions" and they did a sort of peer correction. Finally, in the last class, students took the posttest, which was related to writing a paragraph about "My Future Plans", and also students completed the survey.

It is important to mention that all of the paragraphs were reviewed by the researcher based on some items from the rubric that was given to me from UTPL. This rubric contains the following parameters; semantic criteria, syntactic criteria and morphological criteria. All of these aspects were graded with a scale of excellent (10-7,6), good (7.5 – 5.1), fair (5-2.6) and poor (2.5-0).

The instruments used in the investigation were the pretests (Annex 1), the checklist (Annex 2), the posttests (Annex 3), and the survey (Annex 4). As a part of the intervention,

students had to write six paragraphs with different topics. Here, the students must write a 120-150 words narrative paragraph about different topics.

The pretest and the posttest were used to measure the improvement of writing skills in high school students, before and after applying peer correction and teacher feedback. The checklist was used by the teacher after the peer correction for each paragraph in order to know the effects of peer correction, specifically in paragraphs numbers: 2, 4 and 6. The survey was applied at the end of the intervention in order to identify the type that EFL students prefer for writing.

Finally, the results obtained from different paragraphs were classified, organized in tables and interpreted to answer the research questions. And this data showed that the applications of teacher feedback helped to students to increase the level of the ability to write correctly.

Chapter three

Description, interpretation and analysis of results

In this chapter, the results obtained from the pretest, posttest and the six paragraphs were grouped, described, analyzed and interpreted in order to determine the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of morphological, semantic and syntactic errors. First, the research question No. 1, was answered based on the average of the pretest, posttest and variance as follows:

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	Coefficient of variance
8,71	9,00	0,29

Note: Average of Pretest and Posttest.
Source: Pretest and Posttest.

Based on the results presented in table No. 1, It is relevant to emphasize that the participants in the pretest obtained an average of 8,71 points, while the average of the posttest was 9,00 points and the variance was around 0,29 on a scale from 1 to 10 points. It means that there was a considerable improvement as a result of the intervention. Here six paragraphs were written by learners; three paragraphs with the corresponding teacher feedback and three paragraphs with the corresponding peer feedback.

These results are supported by Hattie and Timperley (2008), who stated that feedback is one of the most powerful influences on student learning. In relation to peer correction. Itmeizeh (2016) stated that this type of correction leads to a significant improvement in students' writing skills. Regarding teacher feedback. Zhan (2016) said that written feedback from teachers plays a preponderant role in improving students' writing skills. Taking into account the previous contribution of various researchers, definitely the

teacher and peer feedback has helped learners to improve their writing skills in semantic, syntactic and morphological aspects.

It is necessary to mention that in the intervention, there were few cases in which the paragraphs did not comply with the instructions, with respect to the number of words and in other cases, some students sent their work very late. These inconveniences delayed the process of analyzing and interpreting the general results.

Similarly, it is necessary to mention that in the pretest, the majority of the errors were related to the semantic error and morphological error, with the following subcategories of collocations with 106 and disorder aspect with 40 errors. On the other hand, in the posttest, the collocations errors were 54 errors and, in the disorder aspect there were 8 errors. The following is an excellent example about the pretest.

My plans in the future

My name is Inés Martinez I would to talk about my future ideas. Firts, want to be doctor because I would like to help many sick people, when I finish high school, I am going to university to study to be a doctor and thus help many people, I would also like to travel to many places and children, a pet and I will live happily ever after

Example about posttest

*In my future what I am going to do is first finish my studies, graduate and then follow a driver's course, then look for a job or buy a motorcycle, then give up my job, help my parents or my little brother with their studies or difficulties that they have in the life
I also make a house for my parents so that they can vibrare here in their old age after buying me a house to live with my partner and my children after living there I die and that my children have a place to live and form their own family*

These results confirm that there was a considerable improvement in the posttest compared to the pretest. In the following lines, the teacher and peer feedback results are going to be analyzed in relation to semantic, syntactic and morphological errors.

Table 2

Teacher and Peer feedback results in relation to semantic, syntactic and morphological errors.

	Teacher's feedback	Peer's feedback
Semantic	48,74%	18,18%
Syntactic	15,72%	27,27%
Morphological	35,53%	54,54%

Note: Average of Teacher's and Peer's feedback.

Source: Teacher's and Peer's feedback.

According to the results in table 2, in regards to the teacher's feedback, the semantic aspect obtained 48,74%, the syntactic aspect obtained 15,72% and the morphological aspect obtained 35,53%. These results mean that a large percentage of the participants made semantic errors that correspond to collocations and lexical grammar. It is important to mention that in the sub aspect of semantic errors; 132 errors were detected in collocation, while just 23 errors were detected in lexical grammar.

In the same way, in the sub aspect of syntactic errors; 30 errors were detected in prepositions, 8 errors were detected in word order and 12 errors were detected in conjunction. In reference to the sub aspect of morphological errors, 12 errors were detected in omission, 20 errors were detected in addition, 34 errors were detected in missing information and 4 errors were detected in disordering.

With respect to the results obtained above related to indirect feedback, Westmacott (2017) said that written feedback may be indirect, in which case the presence of the error is indicated but not corrected.

In the following paragraphs, each one of the sub aspects from the semantic, syntactic and morphological errors are going to be described, interpreted and theoretically

substantiated with examples in relation to the teacher feedback. The following is an excellent example about how the teacher feedback was done by the investigator as follows:

Covid-19 is a virus that was called coronavirus, it is said that at the end of 2019 the first case was detected but there were so few cases of contagion that even the alert of a possible pandemic was given. This virus is from China Wuhan. This virus mainly affects the respiratory system causing lung damage and even death. This virus is highly contagious that is why we must always take biosecurity measures. These measures include: using alcohol, washing hands frequently, maintaining social distancing and the mandatory use of a mask. According to the course of the months the virus has mutated and currently some variants have been detected, among them are: delta variant, alpha variant, beta variant and the gamma variant. currently some vaccines were manufactured to combat this virus

Teacher Feedback

You did an excellent paragraph. However there are some mistakes.

Mechanic error:

LINE 2: You need to divide your ideas.

LINE 3: You can write "was" instead of "is".

LINE 8: after a period, you need to start with capital letters.

LINE 9: You need to use a period at the end of the paragraph.

The rest is OK.

The total of words are 131.

Collocation errors

From the 45,54% of percentage obtained in the semantic aspect, in reference to collocation errors, the participants made 132 errors in the six paragraphs that were written in the part of the intervention, that comes to a percentage of 85,16% of the total of 155 semantic errors. One of the errors is, for example, instead of using *on*, some students use *in*.

These results help us to understand that the majority of the errors in the semantic aspect, belong to the sub aspect of collocations and these results could serve as a basis for

replanning of some contents, emphasizing the knowledge of collocations and the correct use of words in the context.

Gass and Selinker (2015) emphasize that the study of semantics refers to the study of meaning, and, in our results, one of the most common semantic errors in writing is the correct use of collocation.

Lexical grammar errors

From the 45,54% of percentage obtained in the semantic aspect in general, with respect to the lexical grammar errors, the participants made 23 errors in the part of the intervention, that is 14,84% of the total of 155 semantic errors. One example is that some students, instead of using *yesterday*, use *today* in a context.

These results show us that few of the errors in the semantic aspect, belong to the sub aspect of lexical grammar errors. Furthermore, we can understand that most of students have a considerable knowledge related to this sub aspect.

Another important aspect to highlight in the Semantic aspect is the lexical grammar error is when the choice of the word in a context is wrong and grammatically is incorrect.

Preposition

From the 15,72% of percentage obtained in the syntactic aspect in general, with respect to the preposition errors, the participants made 30 errors in the part of the intervention, that is 60% of the total of 50 syntactic errors. For example, the most common mistakes are: instead of using *for*, some students use *to*. In the expression *I am looking for*.

These data indicate that students made a considerable number of errors in reference to the sub aspect of prepositions, in contrast with all of the general errors made by students, but as teachers we need to take into account for future investigations.

The correct use of prepositions in a writing assignment is an important part of syntax. Talosa and Maguddayao (2018) state that the disagreements with the syntactic rules are called syntax error.

Word order

With respect to the word order errors, from the 15,72% of percentage obtained in the syntactic aspect, the participants made 8 errors in the part of the intervention, that is 16% of the total of 50 syntactic errors. One of the errors found is that instead of using “*and*” some students use “*because*”.

These results show that learners made a few mistakes in reference to the sub aspect of the word order error. This means that in the structure part of sentences, students do not have relevant problems, but teachers should take in to account for the current planning.

The order of the words is a very important sub aspect of the syntax to take into account in writing. In this respect, syntax is related to the rules that govern what is acceptable in an expression and what is not acceptable (Lee & Vanpatten, 2003).

Conjunction

Regarding the conjunction errors, from the 15,72% of percentage obtained in the syntactic aspect, the participants made 12 errors when they were writing six paragraphs in the part of the intervention, that is about 24% of the total of 50 syntactic errors. One of the errors found is: *instead of using “and” some students use “because”*.

These results lead us to know that learners made some errors in relation to the sub aspect of the conjunction error. It means that in the use of the conjunctions, in general, students do not have considerable problems as part of the syntactic errors considered in this study.

The correct use of the conjunction is really important in writing tasks and it is considered one of the most relevant points in the part of syntactic errors, but in the context or in a structure. The most common syntax errors are tense, pronoun antecedent, faulty parallelism, subject – verb – agreement, fragment, fused sentence, and redundancy (Talosa & Maguddayao, 2018).

Omission

In relation to the omission errors as part of morphological errors with a percentage of 35,35% in general, the researcher only detected 12 errors of omission errors, when the six paragraphs were reviewed in intervention part. From the total of morphological errors, which are 113, the percentage of omission errors is 10,61%. One of the errors found is that some students often omit the “s” or “es” in the third singular person.

These results mean that learners made some errors in relation to the omission sub aspect of the morphological error that refers to omission. It also means that students often make these mistakes in their writing task, and the level of the ability to avoid this type of error is considerable among students.

The omission of any word as a part of a morphological error is really important to consider, because this error could change the meaning of the idea in context. In this regard, Imam (2016) states that morphology error is one which involves a failure to comply with the norm in supplying any part of any instance of these word classes.

Addition

In this sub-aspect, 20 addition errors were detected from 113 errors that are part of morphological errors, whose partial percentage is 17,69% of the total. For example, the most common mistakes are that some students add an article before plural nouns (e.g. “a students”).

These results mean that some students have some difficulties in relation to the addition sub aspect of the morphological error. It also means that students hardly ever make this type of error in their writing assignment.

This type of error could be relevant in a writing task, because an addition could make an idea lose the meaning. In this context, Warren (2013) stated that there are many types of morphological errors according to the categories they can be nouns, verbs, adverbs, adjectives, indefinites, demonstrative adjectives, singular and plurals, possessive adjectives, past formation, past tense, present, future and infinitives.

Missing information

In this missing information sub-aspect, 34 errors were detected by the investigator from 113 errors that correspond to a percentage of 30,08% of the total of errors that were found in the morphological aspect. For example, the most common mistakes are that some students do not use verbs in the past (e.g. *played, painted*) in different narrative sentences in the past.

These results can be interpreted as follows. The participants have considerable difficulties about the missing information sub aspect that corresponds to the morphological error. It also means that students have to improve more in relation to the other sub aspects in their writing assignment.

The missing information is a typical morphological error in writing tasks, when this error occurs the statements are meaningless. In this respect, Imam (2016) state that morphological errors occurs when the relationship of the words in the structure does not fit.

Disordering

In this disordering sub-aspect, the researcher detected 47 errors out of 113 errors, almost a half of them, which correspond a percentage of 41,59% of the total of errors that were found in the morphological aspect. For example, the most common mistakes are that some students instead of using *knowledge*, they use *knoledgew*.

These results mean that the participants have many difficulties about the disordering sub aspect that corresponds to the morphological error. It also means that students need to improve more in relation to the other sub aspects in their writing assignment.

Another typical morphological error is disordering, which happens when words into the structure are not used well. In this sense, Imam (2016) states that morphological errors are formed when the structure of words is misused in an expression.

Description, Interpretation and Analysis of the Result of Peer's Feedback

According to the results in table 2, in reference to the peer feedback, the semantic aspect obtained 18,18%, the syntactic aspect obtained 27,27% and the morphological

aspect obtained 54,55%; these results means that a large percentage of the participants made morphological errors in contrast with the others aspects. In reference to the sub aspect of semantic errors, 2 errors were detected from collocation, and there were not lexical grammar errors.

In the sub aspect of syntactic errors, 3 errors were detected from prepositions, and there were no errors in word order nor conjunction sub aspects. In reference to the sub aspect of morphological errors, 4 errors were detected from disordering and there were no errors in omission, addition, nor disordering errors.

Based on the results mentioned previously, I could say that not many errors were detected by students. This could be because the majority of students do not have the sufficient knowledge to apply peer feedback or teachers do not usually apply in class very often for different reasons. One of the reasons that Ali et al. (2019) mentioned is that teachers do not participate directly in this kind of correction. Other reasons could be that some students do not know much about how the kind of errors should be corrected by them.

Peer Feedback – *The student did it in Spanish* -

Morphological errors.

1 *The word “friendship”, must be spelled correctly*

2 *The comma must be joined to the word*

3 *Instead of writing rom it is “room”*

4 *There is no meaning in the word tothe.*

Total words 55.

The last example was about how the peer feedback was done by students, as you can notice, the majority of these peer correction was done base on common errors that probably they know very well or these errors are important part of contents that teacher need to teach them. In the following paragraphs, each one of the sub aspects from the semantic, syntactic and morphological errors are going to be described, interpreted and theoretically supported with examples in reference to the peer feedback.

Collocation errors

According to the table 2, from the 18.18% of percentage obtained in the semantic aspect, in reference to collocation errors, the participants could identify just two errors in the part of the intervention and one of the errors found is that, for example, instead of using “*the*” some students should use “*a*”.

Taking into account that just two errors were detected by participants, it is relevant to say that students did not have enough information on how to apply the peer’s feedback to their classmates, it could be one of the reasons why they did not participate in this activity effectively.

Following the previous ideas, one of the characteristics of this activity could have influenced in lack of participation of learners, considering that this activity should be done among students and it should not be graded. This activity is less stressful for students, because it is not about scoring (Ganji, 2009).

Prepositions

Based on table 2, from the 27,27% of percentage obtained in the syntactic aspect in general, with respect to the preposition errors, the participants could detect just three errors in the part of the intervention and the most common mistakes is that instead of using *by*, some students use *the*.

As mentioned above, these results indicated that students did not participate effectively for some reasons, and other reasons could be that, the investigator did not have enough time to work, to explain in details the type of work that they need to do in the peer’s feedback. Also, because the modality was totally online.

The application of peer feedback is a process where students after several applications must know how to apply and be aware of the benefits that this activity brings, and one of them in increasing their autonomy. Peer correction encourages the development of autonomy in learning because teachers' review is preponderant and reduce the students' initiative (Tsuroyya, 2020).

Disordering

In this disordering sub-aspect, the participants detected 6 errors out of 6 errors, which correspond a percentage of 54,54% of the total of errors that were found in the morphological aspect. And, the most common mistakes are the incorrect spelling of words such as *bult*, *hose*, *carc* and so on.

These results confirm some facts mentioned before in reference to the fact that learners do not know exactly the types or errors that they must correct in the application of peer's feedback or these terms of corrections are little known for them.

Of course, the peer correction is not an exact guide for students on how learners should write a paragraph but it gives them a general and relevant orientation. Peer's correction help students understand and improve certain points in learning to write in English, giving them a clear guide to improve their writing skill (Bijami, 2013).

Finally, it is important to mention that few errors were detected by participants in the application of peer feedback. Therefore, regarding lexical grammar, word order, conjunction, omission, additions and missing information errors, the participants did not detect any errors. That is the reason why this information related to peer feedback was not analyzed. In the next section, the student's perception is going to be analyzed in detail to know which type of errors EFL students usually prefer for writing.

Table 3

Student's perception about teacher and peer feedback.

Nº	Questions	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Total
1	I consider it is important to receive peer feedback in written assignments	50%	50%		100%
2	I consider it is important to receive teacher's feedback in written assignments.	77%	23%		100%
3	The feedback delivered by my peer helps me to improve my writing skills.	50%	36%	14%	100%
4	The feedback delivered by my teacher helps me to improve my writing skills.	77%	23%		100%
5	My peer provides me with feedback through comments, questions or additional information.	45%	41%	14%	100%

6	The teacher provides feedback through comments, questions or additional information.	59%	36%	5%	100%
7	The feedback delivered by my classmate is clear and easy to understand.	54%	32%	14%	100%
8	The feedback delivered by the teacher is clear and easy to understand.	41%	59%		100%
9	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my peer.	46%	45%	9%	100%
10	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my teacher.	82%	18%		100%
11	The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve in...				
	Grammar use(Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization and Punctuation)	64%	36%		100%
	Word formation (Spelling)	63%	37%		100%
	Vocabulary misuse	5%	74%	21%	100%
12	The feedback provided by the teacher has helped me to improve in.....				
	Grammar use(Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization and Punctuation)	64%	36%		100%
	Word formation (Spelling)	63%	37%		100%
	Vocabulary misuse	5%	74%	21%	100%

Note: Result of student's survey.

The results of statement are: 50% of students considered as a neutral this statement, 50% of students agree that it is important to receive peer feedback in written assignment and 0% of them are disagree. In contrast, in statement 2, about teacher, 77% of students agree that it is important to receive teacher's feedback in written assignments; 23% of students are neutral in their opinion and 0% of them are disagree. These results mean that the majority of students do not think that it is important to receive peer feedback in written assignment. On the contrary, a great percentage of students think that it is important to receive teacher's feedback in written assignment rather than receiving teacher's feedback. According some authors, students think that peer's feedback is very simple. Some learners give superficial feedbacks and comments that do not contribute to the improvement of their peers' writing (Becker, 2016).

The results of statement 3 show us that 14% of students disagree in reference to the statements, 36% of students are neutral in their opinion and 50% are agree with respect to this affirmation. On the other hand, in the result of statement 4, 77% of students agree with the statements, 23% of students are neutral in their opinion and 0% of students disagree

with respect to this affirmation. These results mean that a considerable percentage of students think that the feedback delivered by peers do not help students to improve their writing skills. In contrast, a great percentage of students think that the feedback delivered by teachers help students to improve their writing skills.

With respect to these results, Tsui and NG (2000) emphasize that the majority of students prefer teacher feedback rather than peer feedback because teachers are the correct person to give them a useful and reliable feedback.

The results of statement 5 tell us that 14% of students disagree with the statements; 41% of students are neutral in their opinion and 45% of students agree respect to this statement. In contrast, in item 6, 59% of participants agree with the statements; 36% of students are neutral in their opinion and 5% of students disagree respect to this statement. This information said that the majority of students think that the feedback delivered by peers do not provide them with thorough comments, questions or additional information to improve their writing skills. On the contrary, students think that the feedback delivered by teachers provide them thorough comments, questions or additional information in order to improve their writing skills. Students doubt the ability to provide feedback from classmates, because, therefore there is no improvement and they keep repeating the same mistakes over and over (Tseng & Huh, 2019).

About the statement 7, 14% of participants disagree with the statements, 32% of students are neutral in their opinion and 54% of students agree respect to this statement. In contrast in statement 8, 41% of participants agree with the statement, 59% of students are neutral in their opinion and 0% of students disagree respect to this statement. These results said that a great percentage of students think that the feedback delivered by peers is not clear and easy to understand while a considerable percentage of students think that the feedback delivered by teachers is clear and easy to understand. Definitely, teacher obtained a high grade in these students' surveys. Bruno and Santos (2010) stated that the teacher's

comments should be legible and direct; contain a familiar and simple vocabulary; and avoid giving part of the answer.

About the statement 9,46% of participants agree with the statement; 45% of students are neutral in their opinion and 9% of students disagree respect to this statement. On the other hand, in statement 10, 82% of participants agree with the statement; 18% of students are neutral in their opinion and 0% of students disagree respect to this statement. These results show that a considerable percentage of students feel comfortable when they are receiving feedback from their peer. On the contrary, a considerable percentage of students feel comfortable when they are receiving feedback from their teachers.

About the statement 11, the grammar use option obtained, 64% of participants agree with the statement; 36% of students are neutral in their opinion and 0% of students disagree respect to this statement. The word formation option obtained, 63% of participants who agree, 37% are neutral and 0% of students disagree and the vocabulary option obtained; 5% of students agree with the statements, 74% of them are neutral and 21% of students disagree. On the contrary, in statement 12, the grammar use option obtained, 64% of participants agree with the statement, 36% of students are neutral in their opinion and 0% of students disagree respect to this statement. The word formation option obtained, 63% of participants who agree, 37% are neutral and 0% of students disagree and the vocabulary misuse option obtained, 5% of students who agree with the statements, 74% of them are neutral and 21% of students disagree.

These results point us that students perceived that all of the peer feedback help them in many aspects related to linguistic competence. On the other hand, these results give us some understand that the majority of students perceived that all of the aspect related to grammar use, word formation and vocabulary misuse are corrected by teacher.

Based on the results from the student's survey, the type of feedback that EFL students prefer for writing definitely is teacher feedback for many reasons One of the most relevant reasons is that students do not trust in their classmates. They think that only

teachers are capable to correct their writing mistakes. Finally, they consider that this activity is less formal because these grades are not taken into account in their final grades. With respect to peer feedback, Ganji (2009) states that this type of correction is not qualified and is only for academic purposes.

Conclusions

The applications of teacher feedback on the correction of the morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors have helped to students to increase the ability to write correctly paragraphs. This is due to the fact that students avoided more errors in the posttest with respect to the total of errors that they had committed in the pretest.

The applications of peer feedback on the correction of the morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors did not help students in the development of the level of the ability to write well paragraphs with different topics. One of the most relevant causes was that most of peers had not done before this type of activity and they were not very familiar with the type of errors that were being corrected.

The variance shows that there is a slight different between the result that were obtained in the pretest and the posttest. Additionally, this improvement means that the application of the teacher feedback in the intervention could bring benefits and is very effective for students to improve their writing skills.

The most common errors that students could find were the collocations, prepositions, and disordering errors. This could be because that the other types of errors were already known by them, since these errors are even part of the contents that belong to the curriculum planning of the second year of senior high school.

The type of feedback that students prefer is definitely the teacher's feedback more than the peer feedback, due to many reasons. First, students consider that teachers are capable to review their errors, because they are professionals. They do not trust in their peers and feel that this activity is not common for them.

Students did not carry out adequate peer feedback because they think that they do not have the adequate level of English according to the second senior year of high school. And they do not have the appropriate knowledge of the types of writing errors that they need to correct.

Recommendations

It is necessary to motivate teachers to implement the teacher and peer feedback in the teaching and learning process in order to help students to contribute to improve their students' writing skills.

Teachers should encourage students to apply the peer feedback on the correction of the morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors in the classmates' writing task in order to develop students' confidences when conducting feedback.

Taking into account that the application of peer and teacher feedback brings many benefits, it is necessary to motivate other colleagues to continue conducting research, focusing on knowing others effects that this type of strategy has in the teaching and learning process.

It is fundamental that high school teachers can pay special attention to the errors that are not well known by students, so that they can become familiar and, in the future, they will be able to apply the peer feedback correctly.

It is important to motivate teacher so that they can share different types of techniques and strategies to the students and in this way, they can improve their future feedback to their classmates in the English classes.

Authorities and English teachers should provide the appropriate technological tools to their institutions in order to improve the process of teacher and peer feedback and it can contribute to increase the level of knowledge of English as a Second Language in Ecuador.

References

- Ali et al. (2015). Assessing peer review pattern and the effect of face-to-face and mobile-mediated modes on students' academic writing development. *Language Testing in Asia*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-019-0094-7>.
- Balderas and Guillén. (2018). Self and Peer Correction to Improve College Students' Writing Skills. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*.
- Bijami, M. (2013). Peer Feedback in Learning English Writing: Advantages and Disadvantages. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 91.
- Bitchener et al. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 191 - 205. DOI: 10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001
- Brookhart (2008). *How to give effective feedback*. Virginia United States, United States: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data. ISBN 9781416623069 (pbk.) | ISBN 9781416623090 (EPUB).
- Brookhart (2017). *How to use an effective feedback*. Georgia: acsd.
- Brown (2000). *Teaching by Principles* (Second Edition ed.). San Francisco: Longman.
- Brown (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York, United States: Pearson Education.
- Common European Framework. (2016). *Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:ISBN: HB 0521803136 - PB 0521005310
- Ganji, M. (2009). *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, Teacher Correction, Peer Correction and Self correction 117 - 139.
- Gass and Selinker (2015). *Second Language Acquisition*. An introductory course. New York.
- Güntherová, K. (2019). The Effectiveness, Advantages and Disadvantages of Error Correction methods in writing in EFL classrooms. *Research gate*, 7.
- Hattie and Timperley (2008). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 81. DOI: 10.3102/003465430298487.

- Hidayati, K. (2018). Teaching Writing to EFL Learners: *An Investigation of Challenges*. *Langkawi*, 4(1), 12, 22. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v4i1.772>.
- Holtzman, J. (2016). *Better Feedback for Better Teaching*. United States: Bill Melinda Gates Foundation.
- Hosseini et al (2013). In the Importance of EFL Learners' writing Skill. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 1, 12.
doi:10.18052/www.scipress.com/ILSHS.6.1
- Imam, S. (2016). Morphological Errors in Narrative Writing Of Eleventh. *Edukasi*, 104.
- Itmeizeh, M. (2016). *Impact of Peer Correction on Reducing English Language Students' Mistakes in Their Written Essays in PAUC and Learners'*. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2068 - 2078.
- Jassim, L. (2016). An Analysis of Semantic Errors in Iraqi EFL Learners' . *Journal of Thi-Qar University*, 164, 165.
- Jaszczur, M. (2019). *Effective feedback as a way to improve the quality of teaching.*, (pág. 2).DOI: 10.21125/edulearn.2018.1840
- Khadawardi, H. (2020). The Effect of Implicit Corrective Feedback on English Writing of International Second Language Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 123. :
10.5539/elt.v14n1p123
- Klimova, B. (2015). The Role of FeedBack in EFL classes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 173. Doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.502.
- Koura, A. and Faten (2017). Using Habits of Mind to Develop EFL Writing Skills and Autonomy. *Arab World English Journal*, 184. doi:DOI:
<https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no4.12>
- Lee and Vanpatten (2003). *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. New York: The Mc Graw Hill Education.

- Liu, Y. (2008). The Effects of Errors Feedback in Second Language. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching*, 65 - 79.
- Maggi and Cajas (2020). Identification of Challenges in Teaching Writing to Ecuaoorian EFL Students. *Axioma*, 7.
- Manvender, K. (2015). The effect of reading on improving the writing of EFL students. *Social Science Humanities*.
- Marulanda and García (2017). Improving English Language Learners' Academic Writing. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal.*, 49, 67.
- Maximilian, A. (2014). The Effectiveness of Peer Correction to Grammatical Accuracy in Student Writing. *Lentera*, 2, 1.
- Mckimm, J. (2009). Giving Effective Feedback. *British journal of hospital medicine*, 70(3), 158. DOI: 10.1177/108482239801000215.
- Mehrdad and Abu (2019). Written Corrective Feedback: What Do Malaysian Learners Prefer And Why? *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology (IJEAT)*, 8(5). DOI: 10.35940/ijeat.E1173.0585C19
- Mukti, V. (2020). The process and problems of EFL Learners in English Writing. *Ethical Lingua*, 7(2), 406.
- Muslim, I. (2014). Helping EFL Students Improve their Writing. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(2), 105.
- Seden and Roman (2015). English as a Foreign Language Perception Of Effective Feedback. *Jiste*, 36.
- Suastra and Menggo (2020). Empowering Students' Writing Skill through Performance Assessment. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(3), 432 - 441.
- Talosa, A. and Maguddayao (2018). Evaluation of Second Language Learners' Syntactic Errors in ESL Writing. *TESOL International Journal* 172, 3(4), 1.

- Tseng, C., and Huh, K. (2019). Autonomy in Learning English as a Foreign Language: A Case Study in Writer's Voice. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 6(4), 1432-1439.
- Tsuroyya, C. (2020). Students' Perception on Peer Correction in Academic. *Research and Innovation in Language Learning*, 85. Doi 10.33603/rill.v3i2.3108 A.
- Ur's, P. (2016). *100 Teaching Tips*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Wagner, J. and Douglas J. (2016). Understanding Written Corrective Feedback in Second-Language Grammar Acquisition. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 259.
Doi:10.5539/jel.v5n4p259
- Warren, P. (2013). *Introducing Psycholinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Westmacott, A. (2017). Direct vs. Indirect Written Corrective Feedback: Student Perceptions. *Ikala*, 18, 19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n01a02>
- Zhan, L. (2016). Written Teacher Feedback: Student Perceptions, Teacher Perceptions,. *Center of Science and Education* , 73. Doi: 10.5539/elt.v9n8p73

Appendix

Appendix A: Peer's Feedback Checklist

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 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 B: Rubric

RUBRIC

PARAMETERS	EXCELLENT (10 – 7.6)	GOOD (7.5 - 5.1)	FAIR (5 – 2.6)	POOR (2.5 - 0)
SEMANTIC CRITERIA	All words (more than 75%) were used correctly in the context of the paragraph. Uses grade appropriate language throughout. Each sentence supported the other and there were smooth transitions between thoughts.	Most of the words (75%) were used correctly in the context of the paragraph. Some use of grade appropriate language. All sentences were complete, but very few were underdeveloped.	Some words (50%) were used correctly in the context of the paragraph. Consistently uses language at a level one grade lower. There were several areas (50%) that were hard to understand.	A few words (less than 25%) were used correctly in the context of the paragraph. Consistently uses language at a level two grades lower. Sentences (more than 75%) are not complete, and they have no or little development.
SYNTACTIC CRITERIA	All words, phrases, and sentences were complete (more than 75%). There were no grammar errors in the sentences. All the sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement, depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)	Most of words, phrases, and sentences were complete (75%). There were a few grammar errors (less than 25%) in the sentences. Most of the sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)	Some of the words, phrases, and sentences were complete (50%). There were still several sentences (50%) that were underdeveloped. Some sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)	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. A few sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)
MORPHOLOGICAL CRITERIA	Student correctly identified all the affixes that could be used with the root words. The use of word borrowing is correct and word formation is accurate.	Student correctly identified 7 out of 10 affixes that could be used with the root words. The use of word borrowing is partially correct and word formation is accurate.	Student correctly identified 5 out of 10 affixes that could be used with the root words. The use of word borrowing is partially correct and word formation is inappropriate.	Student correctly identified less than 5 out of 10 affixes that could be used with the root words. The use of word borrowing is not correct and word formation is inappropriate.
MECHANICS	Capitalization, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes are used appropriately.	Capitalization, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes are used somewhat appropriately.	Capitalization, paragraphing, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes were not used very appropriately. These errors make it more difficult to	Capitalization, paragraphing, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes were not used appropriately (or were not

	No errors were made in spelling and part of speech.	Few errors were made in spelling.	understand the message or meaning of the writing. Frequent errors made in spelling.	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 C: Students' Survey

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			