



UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA PARTICULAR DE LOJA
La Universidad Católica de Loja

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

**CARRERA DE CIENCIAS DE LA EDUCACIÓN MENCIÓN
INGLES**

**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:

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

Autora: Cárdenas Almeida, Diana Carolina

Directora: Vargas Saritama, Alba Bitalina

IBARRA
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, 23 de septiembre, 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 Diana Carolina Cárdenas Almeida, 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 anti plagio institucional.

Particular que comunico para los fines pertinentes.

Atentamente,

Firma del Director del Trabajo de Titulación

Mgtr. Alba Bitalina Vargas Saritama

C.I: 1103036313

Declaración de autoría y cesión de derechos

“Yo, Diana Carolina Cárdenas Almeida, declaro y acepto en forma expresa lo siguiente:

- Ser autora del Trabajo de Titulación denominado: The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students, específicamente de los contenidos comprendidos en: se debe colocar los nombres de los capítulos elaborados en el Trabajo de Titulación, por ejemplo. Introducción, Capítulo 1. Literature review, Capítulo 2. Method, Capítulo 3. Description, interpretation and analysis of results, Conclusiones y Recomendaciones, siendo Mgtr., Alba Bitalina Vargas Saritama, 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 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: Diana Carolina Cárdenas Almeida

C.I.: 100317353-9

Dedication

This research paper is dedicated to my creator, my source of wisdom and knowledge. To my beloved father Milton Cárdenas, who constantly encouraged me to study hard and reach my goals. Besides, to my brother Jorge Cárdenas, and to my daughter Daniela Pérez who stand by me in all circumstances.

Diana

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank all professors for their guidance, constant encouragement, and support. Additionally, I would like to express my eternal gratitude to Mgtr. Alba Vargas Saritama for her exceptional assistance during the whole process of my thesis. Besides, I would like to thank to all the staff of the Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja.

Diana

Contents

Cover.....	i
Aprobación del director del trabajo de titulación	ii
Declaración de autoría y cesión de derechos	iii
Dedication	v
Acknowledgement	vi
Contents.....	vii
Abstract.....	1
Resumen	2
Introduction.....	3
Chapter one.....	5
Literature review	5
Writing in the efl context.....	5
The importance of writing in the efl students.....	6
Challenges in efl writing	7
The most common and frequent written errors: morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors.....	8
Written corrective feedback (WCF) on efl learners.....	11
The importance of effective feedback.....	12
Written peer correction.....	13
Written teacher feedback	14
Previous studies	15
Chapter two	18
Method	18
Setting and participants	18
Chapter three.....	20
Description, interpretation and analysis of results.....	20
Conclusions	38
Recommendations	39
References	40
Appendix	48

List of tables

Table 1. Pre-test and Post-test results.....	23
Table 2. Teacher and Peer feedback results.....	24
Table 3. Students' perception about teacher and peer feedback.....	26

Abstract

This study was aimed to analyze the role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students focusing on their efficacy for the improvement of semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors. A group of 30 students enrolled in first year of Bachillerato of a private high school located in the northern part of Ecuador took part of this qualitative and quantitative research. A pre-test and a post-test were used to measure students' knowledge regarding semantic, syntactic and morphologic errors. Furthermore, a checklist was applied to provide feedback to the 6 different paragraphs which were written by the participants. Finally, a survey was applied to know their perception about the efficacy of teachers' feedback and students peer correction. Findings revealed that the most common errors belonged to the syntactics category (inappropriate use of comma and sentence fragments instead of complete sentences), followed by morphological errors (omission of prepositions and omission of inflection). The study concludes that direct teacher feedback is more effective than peer correction due to lack of students' knowledge linguistic knowledge.

Key-words: peer correction, teacher feedback, writing

Resumen

Este estudio tuvo como objetivo analizar el papel de la corrección por parte de compañeros y del profesor en la mejora de habilidades de escritura en estudiantes de secundaria, centrándose en su eficacia para mejorar errores semánticos, sintácticos y morfológicos. En esta investigación cualitativa y cuantitativa participaron 30 estudiantes de primero de Bachillerato de un instituto privado del norte de Ecuador. Se utilizó un pre-test y un post-test para medir conocimientos respecto a errores semánticos, sintácticos y morfológicos. Además, se aplicó una lista de comprobación para dar retroalimentación a los párrafos. Por último, se aplicó una encuesta para conocer su percepción sobre la eficacia de retroalimentación de los profesores y corrección de alumnos por parte de los compañeros. Los resultados revelaron que los errores más comunes pertenecían a la categoría sintáctica (uso inadecuado de la coma y fragmentos de oraciones en lugar de oraciones completas), seguidos de errores morfológicos (omisión de preposiciones y omisión de inflexión). El estudio concluye que la retroalimentación directa del profesor fue más eficaz que la corrección de compañeros por falta de conocimientos lingüísticos de alumnos.

Palabras clave: escritura, retroalimentación del profesor, retroalimentación por pares.

Introduction

Writing is a skill that demands a lot of practice; therefore, teachers should encourage students to practice writing as much as possible. Pangaribuan and Manik (2018) highlight that writing is a complex process because students are required to involve different language and subskills that students have to master, such as grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, text organization, and so on in order to be able to communicate effectively in English. In fact, EFL learners need not only to be creative to express their ideas but also to demonstrate their language knowledge as well as the use of appropriate connectors, good punctuation, cohesion, and coherence.

Thus, to help students improve their English writing skills, teachers must implement a wide range of strategies that assure that students develop these writing skills. It is very common to see that students face serious difficulties to write properly. The most common problems include problems to structure paragraphs, as well as several linguistic problems. Being the most common ones syntactic, morphologic, and semantic errors (Rass, 2015).

Therefore, this research aims to shed lights in this area, especially to analyzes the difference between peer correction and teacher feedback. Also, their efficacy for the improvement of morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors in EFL writing and the perception of students towards these two types of feedback. Two questions were stated to conduct this study: a) Which are the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of the morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors? and b) Which type of feedback: peer correction and teacher feedback do EFL students prefer writing?

Regarding this topic, many authors have conducted different studies to analyze the role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills.

Some previous studies related to this topic have been conducted. In this sense, a study done by Loan (2017) aimed to know the effectiveness of peer and teacher feedback in ESL writing. A paragraph written, short compositions, and five-paragraph academic essays were the resources used to collect the information. The study found positive attitudes addressed teacher feedback more highly than peer feedback.

Another study conducted by Chen (2021) attempted to test the effectiveness of a feedback model that combines teacher and peer feedback systematically on improving learners' writing ability in the context of a multiple draft writing course. The research found that while the traditional educator feedback model created more revisions, the two different feedback models did not create statistically meaningful differences in terms of the number of revisions and writing quality. Nevertheless, combined peer-teacher feedback is more effective in creating more positive attitudes towards peer feedback and self-revision.

In the same token, a study carried out by Nguyen (2018) aimed at the effect of combined peer-teacher feedback on writing accuracy. The study found that there are therefore expected to shed more light on how to help learners overcome their English writing difficulties, improve their writing skills, and reduce their writing errors. Besides, the research is expected to partly replicate how in-service instructors modify teaching methods and materials to improve the writing ability of English as a foreign language.

This study will be presented into three chapters: Chapter one deals with theoretical and scientific information. The second chapter refers to the method used to gather the information. The third chapter is related to the description, analysis, and interpretation of information. After the analysis some conclusion and recommendations are drawn.

Equally the current research will contribute to improve to how to provide correct and effective feedback. In this vein, the outcome found in this investigation will benefit future students of Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja to be conscious of the standing of giving and receiving effective feedback. Moreover, it will contribute to future research and English teachers in the educational field is interested in writing skills and the perceptions knowing the most common errors about peer or teacher feedback.

Chapter one

Literature review

The following section presents the theoretical foundation of peer and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students in terms of EFL writing skill, the importance, challenges, and the most common written errors such as morphological, semantic, and syntactic. Besides, written corrective feedback (WCF) on EFL learners, the importance of effective feedback, written peer/teacher correction, its definitions, characteristics, importance, advantages, and disadvantages, along with previous studies related to the research topic.

Writing in the EFL context

Writing is one of the most significant means of human communication but one of the most difficult to be well-developed, especially for EFL learners. Saddler et al. (2018) affirm that in fact, writing is an essential skill for students since it can be a tool for helping them discover, establish, and improve concepts and ideas.

Writing involves a set of sentences that are related in such a way that the message can be well transmitted. Furthermore, writing encompasses a diversity of language skills, and subskills that students have to master, such as grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, text organization, and so on in order to communicate effectively in English (Pangaribuan & Manik, 2018).

Tanrikulu (2021), agree with the previous information since writing is an ability interrelated with creativity where students have to be focused and concentrated to organize their ideas and opinions to transmit a clear and understandable message to the readers. In this context, to help students improve in writing competencies, the author suggests using collaborative written activities in class to help learners interact with their peers to obtain a better product.

In the same way, Talib and Cheung (2017) emphasize that collaborative writing improves the accuracy of scholar writing and critical thinking. Thus, the authors suggest

implementing technology in cooperative learning to provide learners the opportunity to discuss, explore, cooperate, and develop learning capabilities.

On the other hand, Tsiriotakis et al. (2020) mention that gender, learning status, age and affective variables of the students are interconnected factors that influence the development of written proficiency in English as a foreign language; as well as expertise in the first language (L1) writing, and previous writing instruction in school.

The importance of writing in the EFL students

Writing is important because it allows people conceive, express, and communicate ideas (Schmandt, 2018). It also helps them become more attentive and concentrated. Besides, their promise stages grow, and their note-taking skills too. Moreover, they become more actively involved. In terms of active involvement, it fosters motivation, responsibility, and self-confidence. In short, scholars feel they write with a purpose (Kong & Wang, 2021).

Additionally, Dhanya and Alamelu (2019) claim that writing is an important and effective resource for communication, self-expression, and information gathering. In this vein, writing is not only vital to developing students' academic performance but also contributes to their emotional and social development. Thus, students have to master it because they need it to face this competitive world (Moses & Mohamad, 2019).

According to Javadi (2018), writing is important for teachers to evaluate their students. Therefore, teachers have to assist students with activities in order to improve their writing skills, for example by making them aware of the significance of academic writing skills and by offering and organizing courses that will allow them to acquire assistance and knowledge in supportive writing approaches.

On the other hand, Sakhobiddinova (2022) mentions that writing is the most important skill that students take with them in later life, it requires a lot of work to be mastered though. At the same time, writing is seen as a rule in which written language is more formal than spoken one; therefore, accuracy is more important. In terms of communication, it implies the absence of the person to whom the text is addressed. Hence,

much greater clarity is required, thoughts have to be expressed in a clear and organized way, and sentences formulated carefully and accurately.

Challenges in EFL writing

Saddler et al. (2018), considers that writing is a problematic skill for scholars to develop and learn. The authors manifest that one factor that English foreign language learners face is due to partial or few hours per week at that students are in contact with this skill in school, high school, or university. Consequently, students face difficulties when developing functional language skills, especially when using the writing ability in academic writing and in different social contexts.

Rahman and Mohd (2021) observes that students face difficulties regarding to find information about the topic, create exciting and deep opinions which primes to repetitive jobs, thoughts are not clearly and reliably exhibited, and their essays or paragraphs cannot be planned in a coherent manner because of the absence of direction in their content. Additionally, students face difficulties in terms of exposure to practice in both inside the classroom and outside. Furthermore, the authors highlighted that students from rural areas have a lower level of vocabulary than the urban areas; consequently, rural scholars are not able to type well in English.

Based on this context, Rahman and Mohd (2021) recommend teachers to find a solution by using current trends, for example, the sentence combining strategy to enhance writing skills, since it is an effective tool in improving writing expression in English.

On the other hand, Tsiriotakis et al. (2020) observe that writing in a foreign language is without doubt, more difficult than writing in one's native language because it requires the application and continuous interaction of numerous language competencies, as well as general metacognitive abilities. Moreover, because it requires the integration and application of multiple sub-skills that operate at different processing levels. Therefore, Tan (2011) points out that most of the students are less capable alike, see writing as a difficult task especially when having assessments.

Additionally, for Moses and Mohamad (2019), poor spelling, lack of vocabulary, poor grammar, learners' readiness, lack of exposure to books, and reading materials are the most challenges that EFL learners face in their writing skills. Meanwhile, concerning difficulties when motivating students, lack of materials and resources, learners of diverse levels, and time constraints are the most frequent challenges teachers face in the classroom. Therefore, giving guidance and feedback are the two main factors that teachers must consider to improve the students writing ability.

Finally, students face writing difficulties and one of the major lacks are linked to grammar. Thus, Belkhir and Beyelles (2017) recommend students master English grammar to create good and understandable pieces of writing. The usage of singular-plural forms can distort the message, such as, *many building* (morphological error). In this case, the derivation -s is obligatory to form a plural noun to be following the plural determiner *many*. Another example related to noun phrases and words is *body large*. Here the error is the disordering of a noun phrase. Students have to distinguish that the head noun is the *body* and it has to be placed after the modifier that in this case is *large*.

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

Spahiu and Kryeziu (2021) mention that students have to differentiate between errors and mistakes. In the first case, these are produced when the students learn new rules, while mistakes are incorrectly applied rules. In addition, errors occur because of a lack of knowledge. On the other hand, mistakes occur when learners fail in their language skills. For instance, errors are not self-correctible by their writers while mistakes are, since mistakes can be both intentional or unintentional language deviants.

About morphological errors, Gayo and Widodo (2018) point out that the most common errors produced by the students when writing in English are omission, addition, and misformation which include the derivation, inflection, preposition, article, copula be, personal pronoun, auxiliary, and determiner. While syntactic errors occur in the omission, addition, misformation, and disordering which include the passive voice, tense, noun phrase, auxiliary,

subject-verb agreement, and determiner. The authors conclude that the major sources of errors are interlingual which means they are interferences produced by the influence of their first language.

In terms of errors in the learning of a new language, Sari et al. (2021) agree with interlingual and intralingual errors. The first term refers to interference from the first language. Concerning the second term, it occurs when language learners produce the language using their creativity. However, the authors mention that other sources of errors are produced when students attempt to build up their theories of the target language founded on their limited acquaintance and knowledge. Consequently, intralingual errors are the most common type of errors. Finally, the authors make reference that omission (He *is* playing), addition (They didn't *worked* any more, I *calleded*), misformation (The hen *ated* the corn), and disordering (I playing am basket) are morpheme and syntactic errors.

Regarding intralingual errors, Anggraini and Pradana (2021) state four types of them: a) overgeneralization (occurs when the writers cannot use the use of the target language correctly, such as, I *loves* dacing instead of *I love dancing*, She *musts* play instead of *She must play*), b) ignorance of rule restriction (writers cannot use the exception rules, such as, *She gave me it* instead of *She gave me the notice* c) incomplete application of the rule (in this case, students do not pay attention to elements such as word, sentence, or phrase. The example is *She like cook?* Instead of *Does she like cooking?* and d) false concept hypothesis (in this element, students misinterpret the foreign language, such as, *It was happened last Sunday* instead of *It was last Sunday*).

Concerning semantic errors, Beege et al. (2021) claims that they are the same at complex terms or code lines which can be corrupted. It means that the content or logic cypher is incorrect. Even if the cipher can be syntactic mistakes, variables can be acknowledged wrong or the restriction command can be erroneous or not identifiable. In this context, the authors affirm that while syntactic errors have relation with the surface structure of the task, semantic errors refer to a deeper understanding of the content-task. Consequently, for detecting semantic errors, deeper knowledge must be acquired whereas

for detecting syntactic errors basic programming skills are necessary. In short, since syntactic errors are detected with comparatively high accuracy, semantic errors could not be perceived precisely.

The analysis of semantic errors in the present study are focused on three aspects: literal translation, collocation, and lexical grammar. According to Putri (2019), the most common causes of literal translation are lack of knowledge about the linguistic aspect of the target language and the anxiety of the writers. In terms of collocation, Phoocharoensil (2014) suggests that most mistakes with EFL students are found in collocations due to mother tongue interference. Consequently, collocation errors prevent EFL learners from using English accurately and properly. Finally, Owu and Williams (2017) state that the following errors as lexical grammar: concord errors, wrong register, wrong tense, wrong word use, wrong collocation, ambiguity, punctuation errors, and wrong idiomatic expression use which occurred because of the mother-tongue interference, overgeneralization, and errors due to the effect of teaching, redundancy, omission, and so on.

Concerning syntactic errors, Reski (2021) claims that syntax errors are mistakes in the use of language, and common syntactic errors are incomplete sentence structure, improper use of conjunctions, subject-verb agreement errors, prepositions, articles, and plurals. In the present study, three types of syntax errors are going to be taken into considering as follows: tense, article, and preposition.

In this regard, in terms of tense, Hafiz et al. (2018) reveal that tense is the form that a verb takes to indicate the time when it occurred. Regarding articles, definite and indefinite nouns are stated by the authors. In the first one, it is usually preceded by "the", such as, the tree, and the cows; while. In the second case, the article is preceded by "a" or "an", such as, a dog, a student, and an apple. Besides, articles are also determiners that modify a noun since a, an, and they are not used to modify possessive names or pronouns. Finally, prepositions are short words such as on, in, and to that are written in front of nouns. Moreover, prepositions are the function words that specify how a noun phrase or noun tells the rest of the sentence (Zulfiah, 2020).

Written corrective feedback (WCF) on EFL learners

Pourdana et al. (2021) claims that written corrective feedback simplifies the learners to overpower the linguistic procedure and construction of the second language. Besides, it can enhance the learners' writing accuracy. Moreover, Saukah et al. (2017) believe that applying written corrective feedback in writing classrooms guides learners to convert more aware of their errors. Consequently, students are allowed to identify their weaknesses and strengths in their writing.

Furthermore, feedback is measured as an indispensable enabling approach for English foreign language writers. In this context, several students have shown the usefulness of peer-teacher feedback in English as foreign language writing skills. For example, Demirel and Enginarlar (2016) point out that teacher feedback is viewed as the key condition for enhancement in scholars' writing, and it is the correct and suitable contribution given to learners for modification.

In addition, Bhuana et al. (2021) defines the term, written corrective feedback as a strategy used by teachers in their writing classrooms to correct errors produced by their students when writing a piece of text. This method offers students a guide to correct and rewrite their writing. Besides, the authors mention that this type of method has two different forms. The first one, called direct deals with corrections are made by the teacher on the students' errors. In this sense, the teacher identifies the error, clarifies the ideas, and finally offers the correct form. The second form named indirect corrective feedback refers to any comment provided by the teacher. In other words, the teacher does not provide any correction but makes marks to allow students to find the correct form of the error and correct themselves.

Finally, Pandero and Lipnevich (2022) define feedback as observations or other evidence that learners obtain regarding their achievement on learning tasks or exams, either from the tutor, peers, or another person. Clarke et al. (2022) also favors the importance of

giving feedback because the authors claim that the training in writing should go hand-in-hand with offering feedback since it is crucial to increase students' presentation in writing.

The importance of effective feedback

According to Hakimi (2020), teacher feedback is an important strategy to help students increase their writing skills since students value educators' observations and annotations. Consequently, tutors have found different types and forms of written feedback conducted to learners' improvements. However, most teachers think that a good piece of writing is hinged by only the form of the terminology. Besides, feedback is seen as an essential element in improving learners' writing aids and contributing to students' knowledge.

Many studies have investigated the effect of feedback on learners' writing process. Thus, Fithriani (2019) found that this strategy helps scholars enhance their writing quality. Besides, Kahyalar and Yilmaz (2016) mention that feedback is seen as crucial both to consolidate and to inspire writing learning. In this context, the Vygotskian theoretical framework of sociocultural theory (SCT) is the major explanation for including feedback as an important factor in learning.

In the same way, Sellberg et al. (2022) assures that feedback plays a key role in the learning and advance process both within and else where formal educational backgrounds. In effect, a characteristic of this strategy is the quality of teaching to improve the student's work in writing. In short, feedback is seen as an inherent component in the teaching-learning process.

In this context, Henderson et al. (2019) points out that the following factors influence the success of feedback: enabling factors, the capacity of the people to be involved and the institutional culture, knowing why the design work, challenges, and so on. Furthermore, effective feedback is important not only for educators but also for students. It has to be considered that comments given by the teacher are only one possible part of the process. In this aspect, students and teachers have to make sense of the information, and the implication is that feedback requires helping students the first time to understand the comments and then enact observations.

Finally, according to Ahea et al. (2016) effective feedback is important to improve the learning knowledge of students although it is considered a hard subject in this field. In this vein, teachers must avoid using traditional methods when providing feedback to their students.

Written peer correction

Peer feedback refers to how students have to form opinions, make decisions, look for solutions and respond to authentic reactions from their peers. In this vein, the peer-review writing activity illustrates strategies that can help learners recognize the absence of absolute correct/incorrect situations in writing and can give them more confidence as authors (Van & Aslan, 2022).

In compliance with this, peer correction is an activity of correcting work to students' work which involves them sharing new concepts or ideas. In this activity, students have to make written comments to each other (Najogi & Adnan, 2019). For Al-Jarf (2022), this strategy is used in classrooms in order to improve cooperation, learner autonomy, involvement, and interaction among them.

In peer feedback strategy, students work together to comment on one another's performance or work in the gap of providing feedback on strengths, suggestions for improvement, and weaknesses they might have in their written pieces. In this context, Loan (2017) claims that peer feedback is supported and justified by many theories such as process writing theory, collaborative learning theory, interaction theory, and sociocultural theory.

Particularly, peer correction is important for students to develop their writing skills. Because it makes a positive contribution to write in English in terms of transforming their writing class from being an extension of a grammar course. Besides this, when students are allowed to discuss, share and develop their ideas, they feel motivated to make revisions to improve their writing skills (Al Abri et al., 2021).

According to Yu and Lee (2016), peer feedback is more informative than teacher since it is inclined more at learners' level of progress. Furthermore, it creates more

observations on the content, vocabulary of students text, and organization. This strategy also supports peer learners' attitudes towards writing and helps students keep engaged with their learning process.

Despite theoretical provision and empirical suggestion in support of peer feedback in the foreign language writing, it has not been widely used in the classrooms due to students characteristic, teacher roles, time constraint, and learners' various inappropriate attitudes towards peer-review (Yu & Lee, 2016). In this context, the students prefer to incorporate teacher feedback because the tutor is considered as the professional and the only basis of expert.

Written teacher feedback

Feedback written by teachers concerns the inclusion of any comments, suggestions to improve, or error corrections that are included on students' writing tasks. Teacher feedback can appear as praises, criticisms, questions, symbols in error correction, and so on (Mack, 2009 as cited in Agbayahoun, 2016) claims that teacher feedback is a useful tool that benefit helps students them to improve their writing skills, and of course, teachers should encourage students to revise their written pieces once they received them back. In this way, they can avoid making the same mistakes over and over again.

In this line, Harmer (2019) rescues the role of the teacher as "feedback provider" and believes this is a valuable aspect that helps students to overcome problems in writing.

While Schrempf et al. (2022) declares reflections, the tone of the feedback positive versus negative, and commented phrases as a question as effective characteristics that teachers must have to stimulate. Thus, written feedback comments on students' reflective essays should be formulated as a question and it has to be positive to help students to improve the quality of written feedback comments.

Teacher feedback is important because it helps students to improve their writing skills since it allows students to have a clear idea about their errors. Besides, this technique helps students to learn effectively (Holmeier et al., 2018).

Additionally, Misiejuk et al. (2021) declares that students prefer teacher feedback more than peer feedback due to the fact that educators are more experienced and have a figure of authority and guaranteed quality of teachers' comments. Thus, teacher feedback is considered as the most important and necessary for the students because they have a high level of language knowledge and expertise in teaching the target language.

On the contrary, teacher feedback offers greater improvements in the students' writing, and it has been criticized for being arbitrary, formulaic, and confusing. Besides, this strategy does not produce substantial enhancements in learners' successive writing (Zhao, 2010). In addition, the challenges that teachers face at offering feedback to improve the writing skills demands time investment and increase the workload they have every day (Dolin & Evans, 2017).

Previous studies

The following section includes information on previous studies about peer and teacher feedback to improve writing skills. Several studies have been conducted concerning this theme. Many authors have written papers related to this important topic in the teaching field. Thus, the first study which was done by Loan (2017) aimed to know the effectiveness of peer and teacher feedback in ESL writing. A paragraph written, short compositions, and five-paragraph academic essays were the resources used to collect the information. In this context, peer-teacher feedback was conducted in the first writing with third-year English-major learners. Besides, *Writers at Work-From Sentence to Paragraph* by Laurie Blass and Deborah Gordon was used as material. Sixty students were taken as a sample to gather the data. The study found positive attitudes that addressed to teacher-feedback more highly than peer feedback.

A study conducted by Chen (2021) attempted to test the effectiveness of a feedback model that systematically combines teacher and peer feedback into improving learners' writing ability in the context of a multiple draft writing course. Fifty-seven students were taken as a sample. Different feedback treatments were provided to the experimental and control groups. One thousand hundred ninety-seven essay drafts were used as resources to

compare and code by using three types of revisions such as organization, form, and content. Besides, a questionnaire and reflection to write about learners' writing process were used as resources. The research found that while the traditional educator feedback model created more revisions, the two different feedback models did not create statistical and meaningful differences in terms of the number of revisions and writing quality. Nevertheless, combined prototypical peer-teachers feedback was detected to be more effective in creating more positive attitudes toward peer feedback and self-revision.

Additionally, a study carried out by Nguyen (2018), aimed at the effect of combined peer-teacher feedback on writing accuracy. Forty-eight students were taken as a sample. Writing a paragraph, short compositions, and five-paragraph essays were used as instruments. A survey semi-structured interview of a focus group were used as a technique. The study found that the research was expected to shed more light on how to help learners overcome their English writing difficulties, improve their writing skills, and reduce their writing errors. Besides, the research is partly expected to replicate how in-service instructors modify teaching methods and materials to improve the writing ability of English as foreign language students.

Moreover, a study directed by Huisman et al. (2018) aimed at comparing the writing performance of undergraduate students who either provided or received anonymous written peer feedback in their writing tasks. Besides, the study investigates whether learners' peer feedback perceptions were related to the nature of the peer feedback they received and to their writing performance. A mixed-method was used to gather information. Eighty-three students were used as a sample. And written paragraphs with their corrections were used as instruments. The study found that both providing and receiving feedback led to similar improvements in writing performance. However, no direct relation was found between these peer feedback discernments and students' writing presentation surge.

Furthermore, a study managed by Wichmann et al. (2018) aimed at investigating the effect of sense-making support on feedback uptake as well as on revision skills, in particular problem detections and problem corrections. A qualitative method was used to analyze and

compare the information. Seventy-three students from the university were taken as a sample in an experimental study. Important information was provided to students in order to help them make sense of peer feedback and to reflect on it more deeply. The study found that feedback uptake improved concerning two out of three variables: scholars in the condition with sense-making support made fewer new errors and disallowed more incorrect feedback comments. Besides, writers' revision skills are only enhanced with problem detections. Thus, the researchers conclude that the peer feedback strategy alone might not be sufficient to make successful changes in the text and improve revision skills. Sense-making support was demonstrated to be effective to some range and partly assisted to maximize the benefits of peer feedback.

Finally, a study carried out by Agbayahoun (2016) aimed to determine the nature of the feedback that the teachers provide and to identify their rationale for feedback provision. The research also efforts to provide insights for the learner's opinions about their teachers' feedback. Quantitative and qualitative methods were used to help get a deeper insight into the matter and reach a thorough understanding of the research problems. One hundred thirty-two students who were divided into two categories were taken as a sample. A test in which students were required to write a 15-line paragraph about racism was used as an instrument. The study found that the majority of the students how use of English as a foreign language are not favorable to their teachers' feedback practices and therefore do not use the feedback that they get effectively. The research also found that while the teachers consider their feedback promotes accuracy in writing in their classes, the learners desire a type of teacher feedback that would also take the content of their written production into consideration.

Chapter two

Method

Setting and participants

This study was conducted in a private high school located in Imbabura, Ecuador. Thirty students comprise the sample of the research, which include 20 female and 10 male students and the English teacher. The participants take two class hours of English as a Foreign language per week and the four skills are addressed in those classes. The students belong to first year of Bachillerato General Unificado (BGU) ranged between 14 and 17 years old. The students' proficiency in the target language varies from intermediate levels to low one according to an analytic test applied at the beginning of the research.

Procedure

The first step carried out for the present study was the review of scientific information to be stated on the literature meant to expand background information on the topic being analyzed. Furthermore, a mix method that included both qualitative and quantitative approaches was used to analyze, compare, and contrast information. This study was conducted onsite setting a few days after the students returned to face-to-face classes. The students were asked to write a total of eight paragraphs the first and last paragraphs were used as pre-test and post-test respectively. The pre-test allowed the researcher to know the students' previous knowledge regarding writing skills and the post-test was administered to know the students' progress and achievement regarding English language writing skill at the end of the intervention.

During the whole intervention the participants were asked to write six 120-150-word paragraph about different topics. The topics were proposed according to the lesson plans stated by the English teacher. The paragraphs produced by students were checked in order to provide teachers' feedback and peer correction. The second, fourth and sixth paragraphs were used to provide teacher feedback; meanwhile, the third, fifth and seventh paragraph wrote by the participants were used to provide students feedback with the guidance of the

teacher to help students to give feedback to their peers about the the different types of semantic, syntactic and morphologic errors.

Moreover, the last instrument used to gather data about students' perceptions was the survey which was applied at the end of the writing process to know the students' perception in relation to peer and teacher feedback to improve the writing skill.

Finally, three tables were used to organize, analyze and interpret the data collected. In this branch, table one refers with information of the pre-test, post-test and the variance; the second table dials with the teacher feedback and the students' feedback; and the last table demonstrates the student's perceptions about the teacher and peer feedback. Additionally, conclusions and recommendations are drawn.

Chapter three

Description, interpretation and analysis of results

Once the data was collected throughout the research, they were linguistically analyzed, interpreted, and contrasted with theory and related studies. The analysis focused on the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors. Additionally, this section presents the students' predilections towards peer-teacher feedback in the writing process.

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

Table 1

Pre-test and post-test results

Pre-test	Post- test	Variance
6.50	7.53	0.530

Note: Table 1 shows the average gathered during the pre and post-test.

In table 1, the results allow to make a descriptive statistical analysis to determine the effect of peer and teacher feedback by comparing the results obtained on the pre-test and post-test. In this vein, the average score obtained from the pre-test was 6.50 out of 10 and 7.53 out of 10 on the post-test. As a result, the variance was 0.530. This outcome shows us that the use of written corrective feedback helps students improve their writing skills. To this regard, Agbayahoun, (2016) claims that teacher feedback is a useful tool that benefits students helping them to improve their writing skills.

In the pre-test, the total of errors were 161, of which 33 were semantic errors, 87 were syntactic errors, and 41 were morphological errors. Moreover, in the context of the post-test, a total of 100 errors were found 25 semantic errors, 61 syntactic errors and 14 morphological errors. The results obtained in the pre-test and post-test showed an improvement in the students' writing performance.

To offer positive and adequate teacher feedback, a rubric was used by considering the morphological, semantic, and syntactic aspects. In this context, errors were highlighted and corrected immediately to help students with their improvement to write accurately and avoid them to make the same errors in their next piece of writing.

In terms of semantic, syntactic, and morphological levels, a variety of errors were found in both the pre-test and post-test. The most frequent errors deals with syntactic errors including the inappropriate comma usage, such as, *We wore sunglasse sunscree and a swimsuit **instead of** We wore sunglasses, sunscreen, a swimsuit*; and using sentence fragments instead of complete sentences, and, *First to the beach and then, **instead of** "First, **we went** to the beach and then"*. These outcomes demonstrate us that students have difficulties when using the correct use of the punctuation and complete sentences. Poor punctuation and sentence fragments instead of complete sentence causes inappropriate use of language and lack the of meaning of the sentence. In this regard, Reski (2021) claims that syntax errors are mistakes in the use of language and common syntactic errors are incomplete sentence structure, improper use of conjunctions, subject-verb agreement errors, prepositions, articles, and plurals.

Regarding morphological errors, some examples were omission such as (to, in, with) as (to / in / with) *I traveled Colombia **instead of** I travelled **to** Colombia and omission of inflection (-es / 's and -ing -er) "Because I like swim", **instead of** "Because I like swimming". It is well noticed that students made this type of errors because of their language transfer. To this regard, Gayo and Widodo (2018) conclude that the major source of errors is interlingual, which means they are interferences produced by the influence of their first language.*

Semantic errors included lexical grammar, such as *My fater is an English teacher*, instead of *My father is an English teacher*. In this example, the learners uses the word father as fater. The /Ø/ and /ð/ sounds are the most difficult to produce in the hierarchy of difficulty, consequently learners found it hard to pronounce father /Ø/ and pronounced as /ð/. Concerning collocation errors, "I have to have good organization" instead of "I **need** to have a good organization". It is seen that students made this type of errors since semantic errors

are complex terms. This result consents us to deduce that semantic aspects could not be perceived precisely and, to this veing, Beege et al. (2021) mention that they are the same at complex terms or code lines which can be corrupted. It means that the content or logic cypher is incorrect. Even if the cypher can cause syntactic mistakes, variables can be acknowledged wrong or the restriction command can be erroneous or not identifiable.

On the contrary, the most frequent errors in the post-test were the following: Syntactic including pronouns "*In they economy*" instead of "In **their** economy", word order "I went to my father visited" instead of "I went to **visit my father**", plurals "*The ticket were very expensive*" instead of "*The **tickets** were very expensive*" and semantic collocation errors, such as, "She took a lunch" instead of "She had a lunch". In addition, it is important to mention that some pieces of writing were not finished as teacher instructions required, writing 120-150 words.

Concerning process of the peer and teacher feedback, students did not make clear, specific, and explainable reasons for the writings. Besides, peers did not write an important number of comments or add more information explaining their corrections. The process of peer correction faced many challenges due to students' lack of vocabulary, grammar, and experience in performing the technique. Even though the teacher provided students with clear instructions on how to perform the peer-feedback training, the activity was not satisfactory as projected. To this regard, despite theoretical provision and empirical suggestion in supporting of peer feedback in the foreign language writing, it has not been widely used in the classrooms due to students characteristic, teacher roles, time constraint, and learners' various inappropriate attitudes towards peer-review (Yu & Lee, 2016). In this branch, the students prefer to incorporate teacher feedback because the tutor is considered as the professional and the only basis of expert.

On the contrary, teacher feedback enabled them to provide comprehensive and clear feedback on students' errors. Consequently, it was more accurate and clear than peer feedback due to the experience and knowledge of the teacher. In that respect, the impact of process of the peer and teacher feedback was visible regardless of the unimportant

difference in the pre-test and post-test marks. To this regard, Loan (2017) found positive attitudes addressed teacher-feedback more highly than peer feedback.

In short, teacher feedback and peer corrections are effective teaching tools to be used in the classroom because they help students' writing development correctly. In addition, these kinds of strategies are necessary to benefit the learning writing process (García & Alastuey, 2017).

Table 2

Teacher and Peer feedback results

	Teacher Feedback (%)	Peer Feedback (%)
Semantic errors	45.0	27,9
Syntactic errors	6.0	21.2
Morphological errors	49.0	50.9

Note: Table 2 shows the results obtained from the most frequent errors found in the teacher and peer feedback in terms of semantic, syntactic and morphological errors.

Table 2 shows the results obtained between teacher and peer feedback which was classified into three categories and subdivided into twelve subcategories of study to know the influence of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of errors as follows: semantic (literal translation, collocation, lexical grammar), syntactic (articles, verb tense, and preposition), and morphological (omission, addition, misformation), errors.

Therefore, table 2 shows the results gathered during the process in this way: teacher feedback shows that 45.0% of errors are semantic, 6% are syntactic, and 49% are morphological. On the contrary, peer feedback confirms that 27.9% of errors are semantic, 21.2% are syntactic, and 50.9% are morphological.

The following section will be described and analyze the errors found in relation to teacher feedback; in this sense, the semantic errors found in the present study were based on literal translation, collocation, and lexical grammar. The statistics gathered showed 146 semantic errors, 15% errors in literal translation, 17.2% errors in collocation, and 67.8%

errors in lexical grammar. Some examples found were “I am going to study my studies” **instead of** “I am going to continue my studies” and “I will get a job to sustain my college expenses” **instead of** “I will get a job to pay my college tuition semester”; this result shows us that the teacher found errors on students’ writings about literal translation which are made by the students lack of knowledge; to this concern, Putri (2019) mentions that literal translation refers to the lack of knowledge about the linguistic aspect of the target language.

Some examples found in collocation errors were the following: “I will return my house” **instead of** “I will come home” and “My parents made vacation in April” **instead of** “Family vacation was in April”; the outcomes allow us to infer that students made this type of errors by their interlingual errors; to this concern, Rezai and Davarpanah (2019) asserts that collocation errors are produced when the mother tongue interferes with the target language.

Furthermore, some examples related to lexical grammar were the following: Either John or his sisters is going to participate. **Instead of**, Either John or his sisters are going to participate; Neither my brothers nor my sister are interested in attending. **Instead of**, Neither my brothers nor my sister is interested in attending; based on the results, we can assume that students confuse did not know that “two singular subjects connected by or, either/or, or neither/nor require a singular verb. If one of the subjects is plural, the verb in an or, either/or, or neither/nor sentence agrees with the noun or pronoun closest to it; to this regard, Owu and Williams (2017) state that concord errors refers to lexical grammar which occurs because of the mother-tongue interference, overgeneralization, and errors due to the effect of teaching, redundancy, omission, and so on.

On the other hand, on peer feedback performance, it was noticed a deficient number of errors found among peers. The information gathered just showed seven semantic errors, 20.5 % errors in literal translation, 30 % errors in collocation, and 45.5% errors in lexical grammar. In this case, peer feedback errors of literal translation, collocation, and lexical grammar do not have a substantial difference; based on the outcome, it allows us to assimilate that peers cannot identify as much errors as teachers due to they lack of knowledge and experience: to this concern, Yu and Lee (2016) mention that teachers are

not been widely used peer feedback strategy in their classrooms due to students characteristic, , time constraint, and learners' various inappropriate attitudes towards peer-review. In this contexts, the students prefer to incorporate teacher feedback because the tutor is considered as the professional and the only basis of expert.

Thus, some examples of peer feedback related to literal translation errors were regarding collocations "*We tasted seafood*" **instead of** "***We tried** seafood*" and "*I did the bed*" **instead of**, ***I made the bed***" Phoocharoensil (2014) suggests that most mistakes with EFL students are found in collocations due to mother tongue interference. Consequently, collocation errors prevent EFL learners from using English accurately and properly.

Concerning lexical grammar errors found in peer feedback contained within My moter came with me instead of My mother came with me. It is well noticed that uses the word mother as moter. The /Ø/ and /ð/ sounds are the most difficult to produce in the hierarchy of difficulty. In effect, students found it hard to pronounce mother /Ø/and pronounced as /ð/.

Despite the peer feedback assumed in every class, the teacher checked the pieces of writing as required. In this context, a study carried out by Harris and Brown (2013) aimed at peer feedback and its difficulties found that learners tended to value teacher responses higher than peer feedback. Besides, scholars were sometimes concerned that their observations would upset their peers, which controlled friendship bias. Finally, it can be mentioned that students do not believe in their capability to make the correct decisions.

Since the results were collected considering the paragraphs in which students received teacher feedback, significant differences were observed among literal translation, collocation, and lexical grammar errors.

The second aspect described based on the teacher feedback deals with syntactic errors, in this study, three types of syntax errors in students writing were found. As shows the table 2, syntactic errors acknowledged in teacher feedback show the lowest proportion of the statistics collected. Twelve syntactic errors were perceived, 50.1% errors of articles, 14.2% errors of tense, and 35.7% errors of preposition. The highest number of errors

recognized belong to the misuse of articles. While the results of syntactic errors were not significant, the misuse of articles was the most problematic grammar point.

Some examples of the misuse of articles found in the study were “*I went to house*” **instead of** “*I went to **the** house*”; “*during winter*” **instead of** “*during the winter*” and “I made trip last year” **instead of** “I made a trip last year”. Based on the results, we can assume that students have difficulties by using the correct way of articles since they are the most difficult to master; to this regard, Crompton (2011) asserts that articles are the most difficult to master.

Some examples of the misuse of prepositions found in the study were “*I live at Ibarra*” instead of “I live **in** Ibarra”; “*I will go the park*” instead of “*I will go **to** the park*”. Based on this result, we can assimilate that students did not know that prepositions need to be chosen carefully to correctly show spatial, time, and logical relationships; to this concern, Zulfiah (2020) mention that preposition are short words that are written in front of nouns. Moreover, prepositions are function words that specify how a noun phrase or noun tells the rest of the sentence.

Some verb tense errors found by the teacher in the students’ writing were “I going to” **instead of** “I will go”, “*I gone to*” **instead of** “*I went to*”, “*I did walk*” **instead of** “*I walked*”. This outcome, allow us to assume that students cannot identify the correct use of the verb tense which are definite and indefinite; in this context, Hafiz et al. (2018) reveal that tense is the form a verb takes to indicate the time it occurred. In addition, the authors assure that there are two types of articles, definite nouns and indefinite.

In this regard, Nawangsasi and Wijana (2021) mention that even though prepositions look simple, important roles are held by them, such as marker to the structure of a sentence, mark special relationships between objects, persons, and locations.

By the contrary, analyzing the data collection about peer feedback, the results discovered that peers identified only 6 errors, 95% errors in articles, 5% errors of tense, and 0% errors of a preposition. It can be noticed that peers were not able to identify the majority of errors in terms of tense and preposition since students lack knowledge of grammatical

rules and lack of vocabulary; to this concern, Holmeier et al. (2018) claims that teacher feedback is important because it helps students to learn effectively.

In effect, a large number of syntactic errors were related to the misuse of articles, in teacher and peer feedback it was found that the misuse of “*the*”, “*a*”, “*an*” are the most frequent errors committed in writing. For instance, students confuse “*a apple*” with “*an apple*”, another common error is “*I am student*” Correct: “*I am a student*”.

Regarding morphological errors, the present study focuses on three types of errors which are, omission, addition, and misformation. In this sense, Gayo and Widodo (2018) remark that omission is an error that deals with omitting English linguistic features from a sentence. While addition refers to the presence of an extra-linguistic element in English utterances. In short, the additions of such elements result in errors in the language. Concerning misformation, it refers to the misuse of appropriate linguistic elements. Moreover, it results in erroneous utterances in English. Moreover, Gayo and Widodo (2018) allusion that the two main sources of errors in the learning of a new language are interlingual and intralingual errors. Interlingual comes from interference from the first language, while intralingual occurs when language learners produce the language using students’ creativity and writers’ own limited knowledge and experiences.

Table 2 shows that in teacher feedback there are 153 morphological errors which include omission, addition, and misformation of errors. For instance, the highest number of errors occurred is in the use of addition with a percentage of 65.2%. For example, “*Many peoples travel to Perú*” instead of “*Many people travel to Perú*”, and “*There were manys caws on my farm*” instead of “*There were many cows on my farm*”. Then, in second place of common errors are omission with a percentage of 28.4% for example, “*She eating*” instead of “*She **was** eating*”, “*We go eat*” instead of “*We go **to** eat*”. The lowest number of errors occurred in using the misformation with a percentage of only 06.4%. In this case, the most common errors are inflection, copula be, preposition, article, personal derivation pronoun, auxiliary, and others. Some examples found in the present study were “*That dress **have** a beautiful colorful*” instead of “*That dress **has** a beautiful color*”, and “*My breakfast **were** very*

late" instead of "*My breakfast **was** very late*". These exercises belong to the use of auxiliaries.

Nevertheless, the statistics collected in peer feedback disclose that there were 14 morphological errors identified by peers, 65.7% errors of misformation, 20.4% errors of omission, and 16,9% errors of addition, In this vein, the most frequent error was related to misformation; some examples of errors are the following: inflection/ third person "The dog run in the park" instead of "*The dog **runs** in the park*" and auxiliary "Does you like it?" instead of "**Do** you like it?". And the least frequent was found in errors of addition. Some examples of errors of omission found by peers are, in the article "*I live in city*" instead of "*I live in **the** city*" and "*My sister usually goes to cinema*" instead of "*My sister usually goes to **the** cinema*". Regarding the errors of addition, peers found in prepositions and articles, for example, "*The cat is on the sea*" instead of "*The cat is **by** the sea*" and "*Orange tree **it** is big*" instead of "*Orange tree is big*".

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

Feedback is measured as an indispensable enabling approach for English foreign language writers. In this context, several studies have shown the usefulness of peer-teacher feedback in English as a second language writing skills. For example, Demirel and Enginarlar (2016) found that teacher feedback is viewed as the key requirement for enhancement in scholars' writing, and it is the correct and suitable contribution given to learners for modification. Besides, their study found that while the traditional teacher feedback model created more revisions, the combined peer-teacher feedback model was more efficiently in creating more positive attitudes towards peer feedback and self-revision. In short, satisfaction is achieved by the students when they receive feedback from teachers on their pieces of writing, producing improved writers.

In this gap, an online survey was addressed to thirty students who had to provide information about their perceptions of peer and teacher feedback. The participants were between the ages of 14 and 17 enrolled in 1st of high school, 20 females and 10 males who

answered the survey once the process had finished. The survey was integrated with twelve statements related to knowing the perceptions that students have about teacher and peer feedback.

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

N°	Statements	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Total (%)
1	1. I consider it is important to receive peer feedback in written assignments.	60.0	26.7	13.3	100
2	2. I consider it is important to receive teacher feedback in written assignments.	79.3	20.7	0.0	100
3	3. The feedback delivered by my peer helps me to improve my writing skills.	46.7	36.7	16.7	100
4	4. The feedback delivered by teacher helps me to improve my writing skills.	83.3	13.3	3.4	100
5	5. My peer provides me with feedback through comments, questions, or additional information.	43.3	43.3	13.4	100
6	6. The teacher provides feedback through comments, questions, or additional information.	70.0	23.3	6.7	100
7	7. The feedback delivered by my classmate is clear and easy to understand.	53.3	30.0	16.7	100
8	8. The feedback delivered by my teacher is clear and easy to understand.	60.0	40.0	0.0	100
9	9. I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my peer.	55.2	39.0	6.9	100
10	10. I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my teacher.	79.3	17.2	3.5	100
11	11. The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve in ...				
	Grammar use (verb agreement, sentence construction, capitalization, and punctuation).	41.0	41.0	18.0	100
	Word formation (spelling)	48.0	41.0	11.0	100
	Vocabulary misuse	51.0	39.0	12.0	100

12	12. The feedback provided by my teacher has helped me to improve in ...				
	Grammar use (verb agreement, sentence construction, capitalization, and punctuation).	80.0	20.0	0.0	100
	Word formation (spelling)	75.0	25.0	0.0	100
	Vocabulary misuse	70.0	15.0	15.0	100

Note: The data was gathered online to know the students' perceptions about teacher and peer feedback.

Regarding the first statement, "I consider it is important to receive peer feedback on written assignments", 60% of students agree, 26.7% are neutral, and 13.3% disagree; this outcome allow us to know that students prefer this strategy to improve their writing skills. and feel a positive attitude in favor of peer feedback. These results are contradictory to the writings comments where students were not able to find too many errors in their peers' writings. Poor peer correction abilities were the key to lacking this activity.

To help improve this action, trainee teachers offered immediate and direct feedback on their assignments. Consequently, students will be able to improve in their peer corrections. Although, this type of work, students had a problem identifying more complex errors, concluding that this was the first time that students had the opportunity to apply peer correction strategy in their classes; to this regard, Al-Jarf (2022) claims that peer correction is used in classrooms to improve cooperation, learner autonomy, involvement, and interaction among them.

On the contrary, 79.3% of students perceive teacher feedback as an important exercise in written assignments, and 20.7% of them point to a neutral position. These results disclose that a large number of students contemplate teacher feedback as important in their writing skills to guide, improve, and engage in its development. During the development of the activity, many students did different questions to the teacher to clarify their doubts, concluding that students prefer teacher feedback rather than peer correction. In this gap, teacher feedback is important because it helps students improve their writing skills since it

allows students to have a clear idea about their errors. Besides, this technique helps students learn effectively (Holmeier et al., 2018).

In the third statement, 46.7% of students agree that the feedback delivered by peers helps them improve their writing skills, 36.7% of them have a neutral perception, and 16.7% disagree with helpful peer feedback. These results do not reveal many differences between agreeing and neutral. Thus, this means that students' perception is divided. However, 46-7% believe that peer feedback allows them to clarify their ideas as they explain them to classmates and as they formulate questions about their classmates' writing.

In peer correction and teacher feedback, it was detected that students made more complex questions regarding grammar structures due to teacher has an immediate impact on learning progress for their experience and level of knowledge; however, students were more confident and more willing to ask their peers about more simple rules due to their lack of knowledge regarding vocabulary, grammar, and so on. In this context, Vélez (2022) recommends teachers apply peer correction in their classrooms since it provides students with opportunities for practicing, interaction, communication, and reflection.

In the fourth statement, 83.3% of students agree, 13.3% have a neutral position, and only 3.4% disagree that teacher feedback helps them to improve their writing skills. These results reveal that most students perceive teacher feedback as a helpful tool for them to improve their writing skills.

In the research, it was distinguished that many students received feedback from their teachers due to effective feedback assisting them to reflect on their writing and their learning strategies so they can make adjustments to make better progress in their pieces of writings. In this regard, A study carried out by Misiejuk et al. (2021) found that students prefer teacher feedback more than peer feedback because educators are more experienced and have a figure of authority and teachers' comments guaranteed quality. Thus, teacher feedback is considered the most important and necessary for the students because they have a high level of language knowledge and expertise in teaching the target language.

Concerning statement five, 43.3% of students perceived that their peers provide them with feedback through comments, questions, or additional information, 43.3% of them have a neutral opinion, and 13.4% disagree with this opinion. These results show a contradictory decision from students since from 30 samples gathered, peers were not able to make any comments or suggestions on their peers' writings.

In addition, during the process of peer correction, it was noticed that students did not ask questions or make any suggestions to their peers as part of the feedback process. In conclusion, students were not able to add more information to the writing pieces, they just focused on assigning a grade to their peers. It occurred due to the lack of knowledge on how to distinguish errors and categorize them into syntactic, semantic, and morphological errors.

The next sentence shows that 70% of students believe that the teacher provides feedback through comments, questions, or additional information, 23.3% of them are neutral on their opinions, and 6.7% disagree with this idea. These results are in agreement with those results of the activity carried out when providing direct feedback which consisted of finding the errors, correcting, and explaining them.

In this reference, Schrempf et al. (2022) declare that the tone of the feedback (positive versus negative, and commented phrases as a question as effective characteristics that teachers must have to stimulate. Thus, written feedback comments on students' reflective essays should be formulated as a question and it has to be positive to help students improve the quality of written feedback comments.

Regarding statement seven, 53,3% of students agree that the feedback delivered by their classmates is clear and easy to understand, 30% have a neutral opinion, and 16.7% disagree with the declaration. These findings demonstrated that the majority of students understand the process of peer corrections. Nevertheless, these results were inferred in their peer corrections since most of them were only simple marks and signs instead of giving reasons. On the other hand, 16.70% of students perceived that the peer correction was not clear or easy to understand. In this fact, the result looks near to reality because they match

with the evidence gathered since the majority of students were not able to provide observations or additional evidence to clarify any doubt on the pieces of writing.

In this framework, Kuyyogsuy (2019) claims that peer feedback has been considered the way of involving students in process of providing, sharing ideas, and receiving constructive feedback to improve their writing skills. Besides a teaching strategy to improve the development of writing skills is recommended as another method for English teachers in EFL contexts.

Concerning statement eight, 60% of students perceive that the feedback delivered by the teacher is clear and easy to understand and 40% of them adopt a neutral position. The results shown in this case give a clear idea that students feel comfortable with teacher feedback provided in the writing process due to it has a positive impact on the learners. In addition, it could be, due to the teacher offering immediate and direct oral and written feedback after finishing the class, there by students are helped to understand and improve future writings. Besides, students had the opportunity to ask questions, especially about new topics and complex grammatical structures. On the contrary, 40% of students are not sure of their response, in some cases, students do not look into the teacher feedback as required. Jessop and Tomas (2017) claim that due to learning being an experimental and progressive process, it requires repeated practice in specific areas which have to be a critical longer-term dimension in that it provokes reflection, thinking, and considered action by the students.

About the ninth statement, 55.2% of students feel comfortable receiving feedback from their peers, 39% of them are neutral in their opinions, and 6.9% disagree with the announcement. Even though these results show that the perception of students on peer feedback is positive, it is noticed that the majority of students distinguish peer correction as a favorable aspect in their learning of writing skills. One of the reasons for this result can be because peers are sensitive to the individual needs of the student. Still, it can be determined that appropriate peer feedback, should be specific, constructive, kind, justified, and relevant.

In this context, Yu (2021) assure that using peer feedback as a model in process writing is important in teaching English language skills. First of all, it helps the growing focus

on peer and collaborative learning that cater to the real processes experienced by learners while writing and leads to creativity. Second, it involves collaborative learning in which students review and evaluate each other's writing and offer each other with feedback. Finally, it benefits as it enhances understanding of the learning process and; therefore, improves the quality of the final assignment.

In the next statement, the results have shown that 79.3% of students feel comfortable receiving feedback from their teachers, 17.2% of them have a neutral opinion, and 3.5% disagree with the declaration. These results determine that the student's perception of teacher feedback is highly positive. Thus, it concludes that the practice of providing feedback after each assignment can be beneficial for students. Additionally, to motivate students to improve their writing, oral feedback was provided after finishing each writing, allowing them to work in a good and comfortable learning environment.

In this sense, teacher feedback is important because it helps students to improve their writing skills since it allows them to have a clear idea about their errors. Besides, this technique helps students to learn effectively (Holmeier et al., 2018).

Regarding statement eleven, 41% of students consider that the feedback provided by their classmates has helped them to improve in grammar use, 48% in word formation (spelling), and 51% in vocabulary misuse. These findings show that in the students' responses to the survey there is no congruence with the data collected in the process of peer feedback. It can be concluded that the selection of the answers, in some cases, was not understood or well-reasoned by students. In the statistics gathered, only 7 errors were found in peer feedback, in contrast with teacher feedback, the peer correction is not dependable.

However, 41% of students regarding grammar use (verb agreement, sentence construction, capitalization, and punctuation), word formation (spelling), and 38% of them have a neutral position. According to these results, a large number of students are not sure about the effectiveness of peer feedback when correcting grammar use, word formation (spelling), and vocabulary misuse. In this context, it was observed that peer feedback was

more effective when peers were instructed to check errors of misinformation even though students found a few errors, (see table 2) for detailed information.

Despite these differences, however, lack of knowledge and the absence of a good comprehension of applying the strategy remain as much a feature of the importance of learning as the huge benefits for improving their pieces of writing. In this context, Wichmann et al. (2018) found that feedback uptake improved concerning two out of three variables: scholars in the condition with sense-making support made fewer new errors, and disallowed more incorrect feedback comments. Besides, writers' revision skills are only enhanced with problem detection. Thus, the researchers conclude that the peer feedback strategy alone might not be sufficient to make successful changes in the text and improve revision skills. Sense-making support was demonstrated to be effective to some range and partly assisted to maximize the benefits of peer feedback.

Regarding the last statement, 80% of students perceive that the feedback provided by teachers has helped them to improve in grammar use (verb agreement, sentence construction, capitalization, and punctuation), 75% of them in word formation (spelling), and 70% of them in vocabulary misuse. These results are consistent with the process of providing effective feedback. It was noticed that the teacher described the students' work, offered suggestions/scaffolding, and assessed progress and achievements in their writings.

In this context, Setiyorini et al. (2020) mention that grammar is a basic language component that needs attention and emphasis from EFL teaching practitioners since students still meet some difficulties in using tenses and they do not recognize the language structure as well. In effect, grammar enables learners to combine linguistic units in a grammatical sentence with its rules (Afdaleni, 2018). In addition, Patoc and Lasaten (2019) point out that by using grammar, writers can clarify their thoughts vividly and meaningfully. In the same way, Sundari and Nery (2021) found that the most dominant grammatical error made by students was an error of spelling.

However, 20% of students regarding grammar use (verb agreement, sentence construction, capitalization, and punctuation), 25% about word information (spelling), and 15% about vocabulary misuse are neutral in their opinion. In the teacher feedback, the evidence shows that the pre-service teacher used different strategies to communicate the errors and the correction. In the same way, only 15% of students disagree about the effectiveness of teacher feedback, although the trainee teacher explained the errors and offered appropriate correction right after finishing each class. This process allowed writers make progress on the topics proposed by the tutor.

In this regard, a study done by Sermsook et al. (2017) addressed to examine the language errors in the writing process found that the most frequently committed errors were spelling, articles, punctuation, subject-verb agreement, capitalization, and fragment, respectively. The authors conclude that the primary sources of the errors were intralingual, interlingual, and interference. In addition, the level of knowledge about grammar, lack of vocabulary, and students' carelessness.

Conclusions

It is concluded that both, peer and teacher feedback are beneficial for the development of writing skills in EFL contexts since they help learners to improve writing assignments considering comments, questions, and additional information provided.

According to the results obtained in the study, morphological errors are the most frequent ones. Sixty-eight errors were found in students' writings. It was noticed that most of the students face challenges with omission of inflection 's' – 'es' – 'ing', and 'er'.

The second most frequent errors found were semantic including 62 errors. It was noticed that students have difficulties regarding literal translation, collocation, and lexico grammar. This last aspect was the higher percentage of errors in this section. For instance, students cannot distinguish the correct use of nouns, adjectives, and adverbs.

The less frequent errors deal with 56 syntactic errors. Most of the students had problems using the correct articles, verb tense, and preposition. It can be concluded that these types of errors were the result of mother tongue interference, insufficient grammar, and vocabulary knowledge.

Regarding teacher feedback, students have positive perceptions about it because they provide students comments, suggestions, and the solution to their pieces of writing. Besides, students are offered with specific knowledge, immediate and direct feedback.

Regarding peer correction, it was less important for students according to the results obtained in the survey provided by students. The main reason is students did not provide their peers with detailed explanation of what they are doing correctly or incorrectly.

Recommendations

Both peer correction and teacher feedback are beneficial for students. Teachers should implement more frequently these strategies into their classrooms more frequently since they contribute to students writing skills improvement.

Regarding morphological errors, it is necessary that teachers plan a lesson according to students' needs, age, background and level of knowledge by implementing activities addressing to full immersion into the linguistic and cultural environment of the target language.

Concerning semantic errors, teachers should find methods, strategies, and activities avoiding students to repeat the same type of error each time into their pieces of writing. Since these errors are occurred by the of the first language (L1) influence and insufficient knowledge about the second language (L2).

As syntactic errors occur due to the language transfer and cultural differences between L1 and L2, teachers should find the way to help students to avoid making errors in articles, verb tense and preposition by providing them with necessary spaces to practice more written exercises.

Teachers should know that students prefer their feedback to improve writing skills. Thus, it is necessary to distinguish the type of needs students have to apply both type of feedback such as direct and indirect feedback depending on the context.

As peer correction is not well accepted by their peers, teachers should guide them until students gain experience applying this strategy. Besides, teachers have to make their students aware of the importance that written comments and suggestions have to improve their writing skills.

References

- Afdaleni. (2018). Students' Interest Level in Learning English Grammar. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(4), 61–65.
- Agbayahoun, J. P. (2016). Teacher Written Feedback on Student Writing: Teachers' and Learners' Perspectives. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 6(10).
- Ahea, M., Ahea, M., Kabir, R., & Rahman, I. (2016). The Value and Effectiveness of Feedback in Improving Students' Learning and Professionalizing Teaching in Higher Education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(16), 38-41.
- Al Abri, A., Al Baimani, S., & Bahlani, S. (2021). The role of web-based peer feedback in advancing EFL essay writing. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal (CALL-EJ)*, 22(1), 374-390.
- Alharthi, S. (2021). From Instructed Writing to Free-Writing: A Study of EFL Learners. *SAGE Open*, 11(1), <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211007112>.
- Al-Jarf, R. (2022). Blogging about current global events in the EFL writing classroom: Effects on skill improvement, global awareness and attitudes. *British Journal of Teacher Education and Pedagogy*, 1(1), 73-82.
- Anggraini, M. P., & Pradana, S. A. (2021). Grammatical Errors Made by Eighth-Grade Students in Speaking English. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 14(1), 30-46.
- Azis, K. (2021). Morphological and syntactical errors analysis on students writing skill at Pamulang University, South Tangerang, Banten. *Lexeme: Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 61-69.
- Beege, M., Schneider, S., Nebel, S., Zimm, J., Windisch, S., & Rey, G. D. (2021). Learning programming from erroneous worked-examples. Which type of error is beneficial for learning?. *Learning and Instruction*, 75, 101497.
- Belkhir, A. & Benyelles, R. (2017). Identifying EFL learners essay writing difficulties and sources: a move towards solution the case of second year EFL learners at Tlemcen

- University. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching, and Educational Research*, 16(6), 80-88.
- Bhuana, G. P., & El Fauziah, U. N. (2021). Affective damage from teachers' written corrective feedback. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 6(2), 287-299.
- Chen, J. (2021). Research on the Effect of Peer Feedback Training in English Writing Teaching--A Case Study of Students in Business English Major. *English Language Teaching*, 14(6), 12-24.
- Clarke, O., Chan, W. Y. D., Bukuru, S., Logan, J., & Wong, R. (2022). Assessing knowledge of and attitudes towards plagiarism and ability to recognize plagiaristic writing among university students in Rwanda. *Higher Education*, 1-17.
- Crompton, P. (2011). Article errors in the English writing of advanced L1 Arabic learners: The role of transfer. *Asian EFL Journal*, 50(1), 4-35.
- Demirel, E., & Enginarlar, H. (2016). Effects of Combined Peer-Teacher Feedback on Second Language Writing Development.
- Devere Bacon, E., Satienchayakorn, N., & Prakaiborisuth, P. (2021). Integrating Seamless Learning within a Peer-Assisted Learning Center to Develop Student English Academic Writing Skills. *rEFLections*, 28(2), 147-167.
- Dhanya, M., & Alamelu, C. (2019). Factors influencing the acquisition of writing skills. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 8(7), 259-263.
- Dolin, J., & Evans, R. (Eds.). (2017). *Transforming assessment: Through an interplay between practice, research and policy* (Vol. 4). Springer.
- Fithriani, R. (2019). ZPD and the benefits of written feedback in L2 writing: Focusing on students' perceptions. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 19(1), 63-73.
- 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.

- Hafiz, S. M., Omar, A. M. A., & Sher, K. M. (2018). Analysis of syntactic errors in English writing: A case study of Jazan University preparatory year students. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(11), 113-120.
- Hakimi, M. (2020). Teacher written feedback in EFL classroom: Abu hayyan al-Tawhidi high school-Kenitra, Morocco-as a case study. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*.
- Harmer, J. (2019). *The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teaching*. *ELT Journal*, Volume 73, Issue 3, Pages 363–365. doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccz017.
- Harris, L. R., & Brown, G. T.L. (2013). Opportunities to consider when using peer- and selfassessment to improve student learning: Case studies into teachers' implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 36(11), 101-111. Doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2013.07.008
- Henderson, M., Phillips, M., Ryan, T., Boud, D., Dawson, P., Molloy, E., & Mahoney, P. (2019). Conditions that enable effective feedback. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(7), 1401-1416.
- Holmeier, M., Grob, R., Nielsen, J. A., Rönnebeck, S., & Ropohl, M. (2018). Written teacher feedback: Aspects of quality, benefits and challenges. In *Transforming Assessment* (pp. 175-208). Springer, Cham.
- Huisman, B., Saab, N., Van Driel, J., & Van den Broek, P. (2018). Peer feedback on academic writing: Undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(6), 955–968. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1424318>
- Iriarte, M. G., & Alastuey, C. B. (2017). *Peer vs. Teacher corrective feedback and its effect on grammar*. Máster En Formación Del Profesorado De Educación Secundaria. Universidad Pública de Navarra.
- Javadi-Safa, A. (2018). A brief overview of key issues in second language writing teaching and research. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 6(2), 12-25.

- Jessop, T., and C. Tomas. 2017. "The Implications of Programme Assessment Patterns for Student Learning." *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 42 (6):990–9.
- Kim, T. Y., & Kim, Y. (2020). Structural Relationship Between L2 Learning Motivation and Resilience and Their Impact on Motivated Behavior and L2 Proficiency. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-020-09721-8>
- Kong, S. C., & Wang, Y. Q. (2021). The influence of parental support and perceived usefulness on students' learning motivation and flow experience in visual programming: Investigation from a parent perspective. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(4), 1749-1770.
- Kuyyogsuy, S. (2019). Promoting Peer Feedback in Developing Students' English Writing Ability in L2 Writing Class. *International Education Studies*, 12(9), 76-90.
- Lee, I., Mak, P., & Burns, A. (2016). EFL teachers' attempts at feedback innovation in the writing classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(2), 248-269.
- Loan N. (2017). A case study of combined peer-teacher feedback on paragraph writing at a university in Thailand. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 253-262
- Misiejuk, K., Wasson, B., & Egelanddal, K. (2021). Using learning analytics to understand student perceptions of peer feedback. *Computers in human behavior*, 117, 106658.
- Moses, R. N., & Mohamad, M. (2019). Challenges Faced by Students and Teachers on Writing Skills in ESL Contexts: A Literature. <https://www.scirp.org/journal/ce>
- Najogi, J., & Adnan, A. (2019). Using Peer Correction towards Students Writing Ability In Writing Analytical Exposition Text At Senior High School. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8(1), 127-138.
- Nawangasasi, E., & Wijana, I. D. P. (2021, April). Errors in the usage of English Prepositions produced by college students in Yogyakarta. In *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings* (Vol. 3, pp. 57-63).
- Nguyen, T. 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.

- Owu-Ewie, C., & Williams, M. R. (2017). Grammatical and lexical errors in students' English composition writing: The case of three senior high schools (SHS) in the central region of Ghana. *Sino-us English teaching*, 14(8), 463-482.
- Panadero, E., & Lipnevich, A. A. (2022). A review of feedback models and typologies: Towards an integrative model of feedback elements. *Educational Research Review*, 35, 100416.
- Pangaribuan, T., & Manik, S. (2018). 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), 164-178. <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n1p164>
- Patoc, L. A. F., & Lasaten, R. C. S. (2019). Grammatical Errors Reflected in the Narrative Compositions of Grade 7 Students: Bases in the Development of a Learning Support Material in English Grammar. *Asian EFL Journal*, 21(2.4), 57–87.
- Phoocharoensil, S. (2014). Exploring learners' developing L2 collocational competence. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(12), 2533-2540. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.12.2533-2540>
- Pourdana, N., Nour, P., & Yousefi, F. (2021). Investigating metalinguistic written corrective feedback focused on EFL learners' discourse markers accuracy in mobile-mediated context. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-021-00111-8>.
- Putri, T. A. (2019). An Analysis of Types and Causes of Translation Errors. *ETNOLINGUAL*, 3(2), 93-103.
- Rahman T. and Mohd N. (2021) Enhancing ESL Learners' Sentence Construction via Sentence-Combining Practice. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, Volume 11, Issue 6. DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.11.06.2021.p11451
- Rass, R. A. (2015). Challenges Face Arab Students in Writing Well-Developed Paragraphs in English. *English Language Teaching*, 8(10), 49-59.
- Reski, A. N. (2021). Syntax Errors in English Writing. *Educia Journal*, 1(1), 6–8. <http://www.scieclouds.com/ojsnew/index.php/ej/article/view/5>

- Saddler, B., Ellis-Robinson, T., & Asaro-Saddler, K. (2018). Using Sentence Combining Instruction to Enhance the Writing Skills of Children with Learning Disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 16(2), 191-202.
- Sakhobiddinova, D. K. K. (2022). Importance Of Writing Essays And Its Descriptions. *Scientific progress*, 3(1), 590-593.
- Sari, P. P. N., Budasi, I. G., Adnyani, N. L. P. S., & Suwastini, N. K. A. (2021). the Error Analysis of Interlingual and Intralingual Interferences of the Students: a Case Study of Tourism Study Program. *Lentera Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan*, 24(1), 69-81.
- Saukah, A., Dewanti, D. M. I., & Laksmi, E. D. (2017). The effect of coded and noncoded correction feedback on the quality of Indonesian EFL students' writing. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 247–252. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8127>
- Schrempf, S., Herrigel, L., Pohlmann, J., Griewatz, J., & Lammerding-Köppel, M. (2022). Everybody is able to reflect, or aren't they? Evaluating the development of medical professionalism via a longitudinal portfolio mentoring program from a student perspective. *GMS Journal for Medical Education*, 39(1).
- Sellberg, M., Skavberg Roaldsen, K., Nygren-Bonnier, M., & Halvarsson, A. (2022). Clinical supervisors' experience of giving feedback to students during clinical integrated learning. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice*, 38(1), 122-131.
- Sermsook, K. et al. (2017). An analysis of errors in written English sentences: A case study of Thai EFL students. *English Language Teaching*, 10 (3). DOI:10.5539/elt.10n3p101
- Setiyorini, T. J., Dewi, P., & Masykuri, E. S. (2020). The Grammatical Error Analysis Found in Students' Composition. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 10(2), 218-233.
- Spahiu, I., & Kryeziu, N. (2021). Grammatical mistakes of Albanian students in learning English as a foreign language. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S3), 814-822.

- Sundari, I., & Nery, R. (2021). An Analysis Of Students'grammatical Error In Writing Personal Letter. *Elt Echo: The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context*, 6(2).
- Talib, T., & Cheung, Y. L. (2017). Collaborative Writing in Classroom Instruction: A Synthesis of Recent Research. *English Teacher*, 46(2).
- Tan, B. H. (2011). Innovative writing centers and online writing labs outside North America. *Asian EFL Journal*, 13 (2), 391-418. http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/PDF/June_2011.pdf
- Tanrikulu, F. (2021). Students' perceptions about the effects of collaborative digital storytelling on writing skills. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-16.
- Tsiriotakis, I. K., Grünke, M., Spantidakis, I., Vassilaki, E., & Stavrou, N. A. (2020). The impact of an explicit writing intervention on EFL students' short story writing. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 5, p. 565213). Frontiers Media SA.
- Van Duong, V., & Aslan, E. (2022). L2 writing through wiki-mediated collaborative tasks. *Foreign Language Learning in the Digital Age: Theory and Pedagogy for Developing Literacies*.
- Wichmann, A., Funk, A., & Rummel, N. (2018). Leveraging the potential of peer feedback in an academic writing activity through sense-making support. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 33(1), 165–184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-017-0348-7>
- Wu, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2021). The effects of providing and receiving peer feedback on writing performance and learning of secondary school students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 58(3), 492-526.
- Yu, S. (2021). Giving genre-based peer feedback in academic writing: Sources of knowledge and skills, difficulties and challenges. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(1), 36-53.
- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Peer feedback in second language writing (2005–2014). *Language Teaching*, 49(4), 461-493. doi: 10.1017/s0261444816000161

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

Zulfiah, F. (2020). An analysis of syntax errors in descriptive essays. *Etnolinguial*, 4(2), 160-

Appendix

Appendix A: 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 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 understand the message or meaning of the writing.	Capitalization, paragraphing, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes were not used appropriately (or were not found in writing). These errors make it hard to

	No errors were made in spelling and part of speech.	Few errors were made in spelling.	Frequent errors made in spelling.	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.					

Apéndice 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			