



UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA PARTICULAR DE LOJA
La Universidad Católica de Loja

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

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

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

Trabajo de titulación previo a la obtención del título de:

Licenciada en Ciencias de la Educación Mención Inglés

Autor: Eras Oñate, Blanca Isabel

Director: Inga Ordóñez, Gabriela Cecibel

SAN MIGUEL DE LOS BANCOS

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, 26 de Julio, 2022.

Magíster

Alba Bitalina Vargas Saritama

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

Ciudad.-

De mi consideración:

Me permito comunicar que, en calidad de director del 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 Blanca Isabel Eras Oñate ha sido orientado y revisado durante su ejecución, así mismo ha sido verificado a través de la herramienta de similitud académica institucional, y cuenta con un porcentaje de coincidencia aceptable. En virtud de ello, y por considerar que el mismo cumple con todos los parámetros establecidos por la Universidad, doy mi aprobación a fin de continuar con el proceso académico correspondiente.

Particular que comunico para los fines pertinentes.

Atentamente,

Director: Mgtr. Gabriela Cecibel Inga Ordoñez

C.I: 1103982482

Correo electrónico: gcinga@utpl.edu.ec

Declaración de autoría y cesión de derechos

Yo, Blanca Isabel Eras Oñate, 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, de la carrera de Ciencias de la Educación Mención Inglés, específicamente de los contenidos comprendidos en: Chapter one: Literature Review, Chapter two: Method, Chapter three: Analysis and Discussions, Conclusions and Recommendations, siendo Gabriela Cecibel Inga Ordoñez, directora del presente trabajo; también declaro que la presente investigación no vulnera derechos de terceros ni utiliza fraudulentamente obras preexistentes. Además, ratifico que las ideas, criterios, opiniones, procedimientos y resultados vertidos en el presente trabajo investigativo, son de mi exclusiva responsabilidad. 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 de este trabajo.

Que la presente obra, producto de mis actividades académicas y de investigación, forma parte del patrimonio de la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja, de conformidad con el artículo 20, literal j), de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior; y, artículo 91 del Estatuto Orgánico de la UTP, que establece: "Forman parte del patrimonio de la Universidad la propiedad intelectual de investigaciones, trabajos científicos o técnicos y tesis de grado que se realicen a través, o con el apoyo financiero, académico o institucional (operativo) de la Universidad", en tal virtud, cedo a favor de la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja la titularidad de los derechos patrimoniales que me corresponden en calidad de autor/a, de forma incondicional, completa, exclusiva y por todo el tiempo de su vigencia.

La Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja queda facultada para ingresar el presente trabajo 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.

.....

Autor: Blanca Isabel Eras Oñate

C.I.:1723344899

Correo electrónico: bieras1@utpl.edu.ec

Dedication

This thesis is undoubtedly dedicated to my husband Nicolás and little daughter Saraí because they have given me emotional support and understanding over my prolonged absences at home. In addition, to my wise mother and magnanimous father, for providing the spiritual and unconditional encouragement to finish my career. To my older sister Anita, who has always encouraged me to study and overcome boundaries. To my brothers José and Patricio because they believed and praised God for this day to arrive.

Acknowledgement

Achieving this goal would not be possible without the intervention of important characters in my life. First, I am grateful to God because he allowed me to be healthy, and I pushed myself to overcome boundaries to finish my career. Moreover, my esteem with the Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja since this institution gave me the academic training to become a better human being to service society.

In addition, I would like to convey my gratitude to my sister and classmate Evelin, with who I have spilled tears and shared happiness because she delivered extra help to finish my career by sharing explanations and expertise. In addition, my recognition to the Magister Gabriela Inga, my director, for her guidance, accompaniment, and predisposition to give support during the development of this thesis. Additionally, I would like to thank Magister Verónica Espinoza, because she had the charisma and vocation to teach, even sacrificing time on weekends to give support from the beginning to the end of this research.

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.....	6
Literature Review	6
1.1. Writing in the EFL context.....	6
1.1.1. <i>The importance of writing in the EFL students</i>	7
1.1.2. <i>Challenges in EFL writing</i>	8
1.1.3. <i>The most common and frequent written errors: morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors</i>	10
1.2. Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) on EFL learners	11
1.2.1. <i>The importance of effective feedback</i>	12
1.2.2. <i>Written Peer Correction</i>	14
1.2.3. <i>Written Teacher Feedback</i>	17
Chapter two	23
Method	23
2.1. Setting and Participants	23
2.2. Procedure	23
Chapter three.....	26

Analysis and Discussion	26
Conclusions.....	50
Recommendations.....	51
References.....	52
Appendixes.....	63
Appendix A. Rubric.....	63
Appendix B. Peer feedback checklist.....	66
Appendix C. Students survey.....	67

List of tables

Table 1 Pre-test and Post-test results.....	26
Table 2 Teacher and Peer feedback results.....	29
Table 3 Students' perception about teacher and peer feedback.....	45

Abstract

The project titled “The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students”, arises to analyze the effects written teacher and peer feedback have on the frequency of written errors committed in the semantic, syntactic, and morphological categories. The participants were twenty-six students at a senior level of a public high school situated in San Miguel de Los Bancos, Ecuador. This study employed a mixture of quantitative and qualitative approaches and the instruments were pre and post-test, six paragraphs per participant, a survey, and a checklist, to collect the data. The results reveal that both peer and teacher feedback contributed significantly to improving students' writing skills while decreasing the frequency of semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors. In addition, the students showed an affinity for the teacher feedback since they believe that the teacher's comments are more suitable and allowed them to greatly improve their writing skills.

Keywords: writing skill, written teacher feedback, peer correction.

Resumen

El proyecto titulado “El papel de la corrección entre pares y la retroalimentación del docente en la mejora de la escritura en estudiantes de bachillerato”, analiza los efectos que tienen estos dos tipos de retroalimentación sobre la frecuencia de errores escritos cometidos en las categorías semántica, sintáctica y morfológica. Los participantes fueron veintiséis estudiantes de primer año de bachillerato de un colegio público ubicado en San Miguel de Los Bancos, Ecuador. Este estudio empleó una combinación de enfoques cuantitativos y cualitativos y los instrumentos fueron un pre y post test, seis párrafos por participante, una encuesta y una lista de verificación para recopilar los datos. Los resultados revelan que ambos tipos de retroalimentación contribuyeron significativamente a mejorar las habilidades de escritura de los estudiantes al tiempo que disminuyeron los errores semánticos, sintácticos y morfológicos. Además, los alumnos mostraron afinidad por la retroalimentación del maestro ya que consideran que sus comentarios son más adecuados y les permitieron mejorar considerablemente sus habilidades de escritura.

Palabras claves: habilidades de escritura, retroalimentación escrita del maestro, corrección entre pares.

Introduction

Nowadays, educational Institutions explore innovative strategies for learners to master writing skills in order to enhance EFL communication all over the world. Since writing is the most fruitful skill because this is a prolific skill that boosts the creativity and imagination of the students (Selvaraj and Aziz, 2019), teachers use it from premature levels in the language input and output.

In order to develop their students writing skills, EFL teachers opt to apply written teacher and peer feedback in their classroom. This enriches the learners' cognitive and metacognitive levels since it covers the strength and weaknesses during the writing process (Brookhart, 2017). Nevertheless, EFL learners find it arduous to write texts and organize ideas into paragraphs because they make consecutive errors in the morphological, semantic, and syntactic fields which disrupt the meaning of their writings.

Therefore, to find the most effective feedback strategy and provide solutions for the problems that EFL learners face, the present study has the main purpose of analyzing the differences between peer and teacher feedback and discovering their influence on the enhancement of morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors in EFL writing. To achieve this objective, two research questions have been proposed. The first one is: Which are the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors?; and the second question is: which type of feedback: peer correction and teacher feedback do EFL students prefer for writing?.

Some previous studies related to this topic have already been carried out, among them is the one carried out by Huisman et al. (2018), which compared the roles of providing and receiving peer feedback and their influence on writing achievement. This study used mixed qualitative and quantitative methods, and research instruments such as essays, learning platforms, and questionnaires were employed. The outcomes triggered that peer feedback has a notable impact on the enhancement of EFL students' writing skills.

In addition, Zhan (2016) carried out a study to illustrate the students' and teachers' perceptions of teacher feedback in EFL writing classes. This investigation employed qualitative and quantitative methods and determined that written teacher feedback covered most aspects of the English language.

Moreover, Ebadi et al. (2017) conducted an investigation to examine the impact of online peer feedback in digital sources versus face-to-face feedback on writing skills in EFL learners. And to reach the purpose, mixed qualitative and quantitative approaches were evidenced. The outcomes disclosed that Google Docs as an online source afforded more benefits in the writing skill compared that face-to-face feedback.

Regarding the methodology implemented during this inquiry, the researcher handled a mixed method in order to answer the two research questions. On the one side, a quantitative approach was used in order to process the data obtained from the following research instruments: pre and post-tests, a rubric, six paragraphs, and a checklist. On the other hand, it comprised a qualitative approach to examining the effects and challenges that students faced when composing their writing pieces.

This research work is divided into three chapters. The literature review comprises chapter number one which covers the relevant scientific information and perceptions of researchers regarding this topic. This information was collected from physical and digital books and journals. Next, chapter two details the setting and participants who were the main actors during this research. Likewise, it contains the step-by-step procedure and methodology considered during the present investigation. Subsequently, chapter three involves the analysis of the outcomes obtained within this study to answer the two research questions. Finally, six conclusions and recommendations were proclaimed at the end of this chapter.

Additionally, all those who make up the educational community are the principal beneficiaries of this project. First, based on this research findings, authorities and teachers can integrate EFL programs to help students to improve their writing skills. Similarly, the

community and students will get benefits as an answer to their English needs in the local city. Furthermore, other researchers will also benefit from this study since they will be able to use this data to contrast or support their findings. Nevertheless, regarding limitations, none occurred because learners participated in this project as volunteers, and the authorities showed readiness to scaffold and learn about the outcomes of this investigation.

Chapter One

Literature Review

The present chapter comprises information regarding the writing skill in the EFL context, the importance of this skill for EFL students, the challenges in EFL writing, and the most common and frequent written errors within the morphological, semantic, and syntactic fields. In addition, the themes of written corrective feedback (WCF) on EFL learners, written peer correction, and written teacher feedback are included, explaining their definition, characteristics, importance, advantages, and disadvantages. Furthermore, this section encompasses some previous research related to the effects of errors feedback has on EFL learners.

1.1. Writing in the EFL context

Despite the fact, that there are four language skills in the EFL teaching-learning process, writing is considered the most essential skill since it holds a diversity of purposes (Selvaraj & Aziz, 2019). Similarly, Rini and Cahyanto (2020) point out that writing is an active and prolific language skill. Thus, the students must master this skill to transform quick ideas into harmonious, cohesive, and proficient texts exteriorized in symbols.

In this regard, Sakkir (2020) contributes with a careful definition of EFL writing. He highlights that it is a systematic process that writers must follow in order to organize, adjust, and improve their ideas in a paper. In this way, the readers will clearly understand the written message. In addition, other authors argue that writing requires a profuse process that starts by choosing a topic to write, employing brainstorming techniques to collect ideas, and writing an outline until reaching a final draft (Sundari & Febriyanti, 2017).

In addition, Elfatah and Said (2016) state that EFL writing involves cognitive and cultural aspects. The authors explain that learners need to develop linguistic competencies to engage in written language. Likewise, they must recognize the different writing styles to convey feelings and thoughts according to their purposes and needs. Furthermore, the aforementioned authors state that EFL writing does not only aim to achieve competence in

the ability to write but it is also related to cultural aspects. They further explain that writing is needed for learners as human beings to share knowledge, wisdom, and experience through written words.

According to Bhowmik (2021), writing in the EFL context is a language acquisition process carried out strictly within the class. He adds that this procedure is reflexive and recursive because the learners are involved in the planning, reformulation, and review stages. However, the author mentions that it is not a permanent process, since writers can review their performance and change it as many times as they can until they complete the task successfully.

Additionally, Qadir et al. (2021) state that learning how to write in the EFL context implies acquiring grammar, terminology, and construction competence. For instance, writers must combine grammatical structure and vocabulary to link words aesthetically through formal written language. Similarly, the aforementioned authors ensure that students require information about the topic and strategies to organize their ideas before writing since the success or failure of their final product will depend on this.

1.1.1. The importance of writing in the EFL students

As stated by Hall (2019), writing is an important skill because learners own a natural desire to write from an early age in order to convey their feelings and thoughts. Likewise, Yang (2020) points out that people, as human beings, are surrounded by individuals, and writing helps them to communicate efficiently through a narrative composition. In this sense, Klimova (2013) underlines that it is undeniable that writing plays a fundamental role in human life since it allows to transmit the writer's inner self.

Additionally, research indicates that EFL writing is vital as it helps develop phonological awareness, vocabulary, and creativity (Hall, 2019). The author emphasizes that writing boosts these language aspects, which will serve as a base for writers to expand different dimensions of learning. Moreover, Selvaraj and Aziz (2019) expose that English writing "promotes creativity, imagination, and understanding" (p. 3). They further explain that

this skill constitutes a mental process where writers activate their mastermind and spark creative thoughts to put them in words. On the other hand, Yang (2020) assures that the importance of EFL writing lies in the fact that it is a tool that helps answer ethical issues. He points out that EFL writers are well recognized and acknowledged because they are able to lead the world by conveying facts, emotions, imagination, or experience using their own words.

According to the Ministerio de Educacion de el Ecuador (2016), the ability to write in English as a foreign language is indeed necessary for the academic life of students because it improves communication skills and learning. Furthermore, writing in EFL acts as a scaffolding that eases the production and application of the knowledge studied while also acquiring new. In addition, when learners develop EFL writing, they will also grasp feedback and discover ways to convey themselves accurately and productively (Ministerio de Educacion de el Ecuador, 2016). Moreover, Teng (2020) affirms that EFL writing performance is positively correlated with six parameters of metacognition, including the processes for planning, monitoring, and assessing students' own understanding and performance.

According to Selvaraj and Aziz (2019), acquiring writing skills is vital for a successful social and professional life. The author defends that writers are esteemed for work in any business because current workplaces prefer to hire people who own excellent writing skills. In addition, Irvin (2010) emphasizes that EFL writing is fundamental because it nurtures human coexistence. The author assures that writing embraces a relationship of consensus where writers explain their agreement and disagreement; consequently, this process guarantees the understanding of a debated subject.

1.1.2. Challenges in EFL writing

For Harmer (2018), writing is a challenging skill for EFL learners because it involves different types of compositions. The author underlines that learners are unable to start writing since they spend too much time becoming familiar with and recognizing what genre,

pattern, and purpose they must write. Similarly, Fata et al. (2018) state that writing involves a mental process as well as a visual product. They add that EFL students find it challenging to produce words, link sentences, and organize ideas into a written speech. Likewise, Harmer (2018) affirms that EFL writing becomes a challenge since it follows a rigorous process of planning, drafting, reviewing, and editing before producing a final work.

Additionally, Alsied and Ibrahim (2018) warn that since writing at advanced levels contains complex and scientific topics, writing skill becomes defiant for EFL learners. The authors set that writing is not an easy assignment because it requires adequate information, training, hard work, and enough time. Equally, Febriyanti et al. (2018) ensure that EFL writing is an effortless project since it will enhance learning and contribute to reflexive practice. However, they add that it is counter-productive for learners who own limited vocabulary, scarcity of ideas, discouragement, and lack creativity.

Moreover, Hidayati (2018) claims that writing skill is an arduous goal, especially for learners from EFL and ESL contexts. The author points out that these students face two demanding aspects: The author points out that these students face two demanding aspects: First, they must master language aspects such as correct grammar, appropriate vocabulary, valuable content, and accurate mechanics. Additionally, they need to develop skills for ordering their ideas for them to have logic, unity, and cohesion.

According to Rosyada and Sundari (2021), EFL writing is one of the most challenging skills because, in order to write texts such as paragraphs and essays, learners need to start a long process to develop creativity, fluency, and accuracy. However, the authors mention that students need time, persistence, and energy to accomplish this difficult task. Similarly, Leki (2001) argues that developing English writing skills requires commitment and dedication from EFL students. In addition, the author claims that learners do not receive enough hours of writing practice in the EFL classroom which makes it more difficult for them to enhance their writing accuracy.

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

According to Kirkgöz (2010), errors are imminent during the foreign language acquisition process, especially when working on writing skills. This is due to the fact that when EFL learners start writing they display characteristics of both the target language and the mother tongue. Therefore, the author distinguishes two main types of errors: interlingual and intralingual. And he further sets that these errors influence the writing of the EFL learners since students prefer to write using the linguistic characteristic of their native language (L1). Similarly, Wang and Wen (2002) state that since writing in English as a foreign language covers the challenging task of learning the linguistic features of a new language, students make frequent written errors.

In addition, Goldouz and Baleghizadeh (2021) ensure that adult EFL learners make grave written errors triggered in verb forms (morphological errors), verb tenses (syntactic errors), and word order. Also, Khatter (2019) asserts that EFL students make grammatical, syntactic, and morphological errors, which may be due either to interlingual or intralingual transfer. Other researchers also analyze common errors conducted by learners in this challenging process and declare that written errors in EFL learners are mostly related to morphology and syntactic branches (Gayo and Widodo, 2018). Meanwhile, other authors such as Almahameed and Al-Shaikhli (2017) indicate that EFL learners also make a large number of errors involved with the semantic and syntactic areas.

Regarding morphological errors made by EFL learners, investigations point out the most relevant aspects involved within this field (Anggraeni, 2018). First, the author considers that morphological errors implicate the misuse of the units of grammar (morphemes) in the formation of the words. Moreover, Pasaribu et al. (2021) set that the morphological errors were analyzed by dividing them into omitting, adding, and misusing errors (p. 8702). The authors conclude that the most frequent morphological errors are the ones concerning misusing derivatives because the learners do not develop grammatical competence.

Nevertheless, Gayo and Widodo (2018) express that the most common morphological errors relapse in categories of adding, omitting, and misformation words by the bad management of the function and content words. The authors prove that the highest number of errors appear in the omission of the copula be (e. g. am, is, and are).

Concerning syntactical errors, Anggraeni (2018) maintains that they occur when learners lack the knowledge of how to write a sentence using the correct structure. The author also sets that the three main syntactical errors most frequently made are in tenses verb, subject-verb-agreement, and adverb. He also discovers that the syntactic errors submerge inside the omission and addition of suffixes and the misformation and misordering of words into sentences. The author cites an example: "She believe that with Rafli, she will be happy" (p. 78), and he indicates that the syntactic error triggered in the misformation of the verbal tense due to missing suffix-s next to the verb 'believe'.

According to Nesterenko (2013), the branch of semantics studies the meaning and interpretation of words in a real context. Moreover, Caramazza and Hillis (1990) admit that the typical semantic errors affect the correct choice of the words. As a result, these errors distort the understanding of a word and the speech. Moreover, Almahameed and Al-Shaikhl (2017) declare that since EFL learning employs the majority of sub-systems of a language, most students confuse the real meaning of the words triggering semantic written errors within two stages: errors at the sentence level and errors at the word level.

Nevertheless, Goldouz and Baleghizadeh (2021) point out that the field of error analysis is valuable in the EFL teaching-learning since it demonstrates the students' level of performance while also enhancing their language skills (Goldouz & Baleghizadeh, 2021). The author also suggests that any analysis is insufficient if students do not receive adequate corrective feedback on the errors made in the different areas of the English language.

1.2. Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) on EFL learners

According to Nation (2009), written feedback is both a valuable source that determines EFL students' linguistic performance and a memorable fount for the learners.

Thus, Zhang et al. (2021) affirm that written corrective feedback (WCF) is a written response mechanism in which an EFL instructor identifies and marks written linguistic errors. Similarly, Lee et al. (2021) point out that WCF is a correction system for EFL students where the teacher adjusts a writing instruction based on morphological, semantic, or syntactic errors in the written text.

In addition, Farjadnasab and Khodashenas (2017) determine a WCF classification. Among the different types of feedback is direct corrective feedback (DCF), the authors state that this typology allows the teacher to explicitly correct linguistic features. That means the instructor apart from communicating the existence of the error to EFL students, also replaces it. Similarly, Karim and Nassaji (2019) confirm the conception of the above author, considering that DCF is a strategy that English teachers can use to cross out errors and rewrite the correct ones.

Moreover, Karim and Nassaji (2019) another type of written feedback is indirect corrective feedback (ICF) which refers to the EFL instructor emphasizing the existence of written errors and indicating their localization by underlining the omission or showing it on the margin of the line, but without expressing the correct form. In addition, Westmacott (2017) suggests that ICF is more subjective than DCF because the professor announces where the error is by highlighting or revealing its existence but without modifying the original text.

According to Farjadnasab and Khodashenas (2017), teachers also employ metalinguistic strategies to provide WCF in EFL classrooms. First, Pourdana et al. (2021) incorporate that metalinguistic written feedback (MCF) involves using codes, numbers, or other signals to indicate the essence of the error. However, Farjadnasab and Khodashenas (2017) add that it is a mix of numbers and letters. For instance, the authors sustain that metalinguistic feedback allows the teacher to write a number next to a short comment for writers to overcome their written errors.

1.2.1. The importance of effective feedback

According to Jug et al. (2019), effective feedback maximizes the learning since it is a reciprocal process where the professor engages the students with the topic and objectives of the lesson. Additionally, the instructor also persuades them to pay attention and creates an appropriate environment for learning while students receive suggestions about their final product. Moreover, several investigations add that effective feedback generates an inclusive classroom because it considers the individual needs of the students and the group (Karimova et al., 2021).

Furthermore, effective feedback enriches the cognitive and emotional levels of the students (Brookhart, 2017). The author assures that when the teacher provides relevant information to show the students' progress by focusing on their fortitudes and weaknesses, learners rectify their errors in L2 writing. In the same way, the above-mentioned author asserts that this feedback will strengthen EFL learners' self-esteem and self-concept. Therefore, Karimova et al. (2021) figure that effective feedback is necessary since it allows the teacher to use appropriate language to be understood while learners open their minds to receipt knowledge and come up with innovative ideas.

In addition, Henderson et al. (2019) affirm that effective feedback gives training for learners to make good decisions by themselves in the future. The author ensures that feedback is the core of the teaching-learning process because it focuses on learners and their performance. They further expose that effective feedback enables learners to acquire skills under the assistance of a teacher while also moving toward autonomy to interpret the instructions and evaluate their jobs.

Moreover, Wiggins (2012) adds that effective feedback is a process that supports learners in achieving their language learning goals. The author suggests that despite the arduous effort that students make to get successful work, it is vital for them to receive feedback from someone else who expresses concretely the errors and omissions for learners to correct them and reach the objective of the course. Furthermore, Zhang et al. (2021) maintain that the importance of effective feedback allows EFL learners to identify and

compare the characteristics of the language input with the failed choice in the language output.

1.2.2. Written Peer Correction.

Nowadays, peer correction is defined as an instructional method since EFL teachers use it for students to develop their language skills (Huisman et al., 2018). Moreover, Sato (2017) considers that written peer correction (WPC) is a phenomenon of natural interaction with an affective and social correspondence whose objective is to create sceneries of awareness of lacks, gaps, or errors in written texts. Nevertheless, investigations admit that peer correction is a method for teaching-learning a language that consists of delivering and receiving observations and comments about their text from other classmates (Ramírez & Guillén, 2018).

According to Ramírez and Guillén (2018), there are some elements of written peer correction in an EFL classroom. First, the author expresses the existence of a relationship between two participants (giver-receiver) where one student provides comments on the written work of his classmate, and another receives the observations. However, other authors consider this type of feedback is an individual assignment since a learner reads a text to deliver comments and suggestions in a personalized way (Maatouk & Payan, 2020).

In addition, it is the English instructor who sets the parameters and criteria for peer correction (Ramírez & Guillén, 2018). The authors point out that learners can use some tools suggested by the teacher as checklists, feedback sheets, codes, and logs error during the WPC. Moreover, they declare that these strategies permit learners to acquire more precision at the moment to classify the errors while also reducing the grades of panic of the students. Moreover, Maatouk and Payant (2020) expose that teachers can exemplify appropriate versus inappropriate suggestions for students to adopt for their comments do not hamper successful peer feedback.

According to Tauhidah et al. (2016), the process of WPC implicates involving the learners in the task of seeking different types of errors in their partner's writing i.e.

morphological, syntactic, and semantic errors. This is done in order for learners to acquire experience and be conscious of the existence of these mistakes and their own omissions. Moreover, the WPC is characterized by using symbols or marks that learners employ to signal the errors (Tauhidah et al., 2016).

Therefore, Robles and Torres (2020) agree that peer correction is a scaffolding for learning since the students master EFL writing by giving and receiving comments from their peers. Wahyuni (2018) states two alternatives to receipt and process new information: the field-dependent strategy employed when students have extrinsic motivation. This style must contain structured feedback because it will influence the language input. However, the author highlights that EFL students who are more confident working alone will prefer to receive a field-independent approach.

Apart from this, Wahyuni (2018) underlines that WPC contributes positively to the formation of the writers' personalities because the participants will appreciate and value the relationship in the classroom by being respectful and humanitarian. Moreover, Kadek (2020) states that the use of WPC provides autonomy to the students to make decisions, fosters cooperative work, and encourages the learners to acquire a sense of obligation to themselves. Thus, the learners uptake current information to get enough knowledge and deliver appropriate feedback (Kadek, 2020).

Additionally, Itmeizeh (2016) supports that WPC is vital for learners to reach a better academic performance since students write texts and read comments. And they are also under the teacher's guidance. In the same way, Ferris (2010) transmits that peer feedback has a decisive impact on students to improve their linguistic competence because students make corrections between classmates, and they graphically underline grammatical errors. Moreover, WPC allows learners to activate their multiple intelligences by making it less probable to repeat similar mistakes in the future (Ferris, 2010).

Investigations tend that WPC will manage learners toward a successful professional life since it foments the students' observation and reflection (Ferris, 2010). Similarly,

Maatouk and Payant (2020) state that after receiving the WPC, learners correct their errors considerably, and the quality of their composition enhances; as a result, the practitioners will develop linguistic competence in the English language and become able to have rather opportunities to work anywhere.

The most prominent advantage of using WPC is connected to “Social constructionists believe” (Wahyuni, 2018, p. 261) because learners can build insight through spontaneous and social interaction. Moreover, Mahmoud (2012) sets that learners own a natural habit of practicing reciprocal communication when doing activities in the classroom. And some studies have noticed that WPC allows learners to share knowledge, negotiate and exchange ideas, comments, and advice using the target language (Wahyuni, 2018).

In addition, studies emphasize that the core of WPC is the interaction (Ramírez & Guillén, 2018). Likewise, Harmer (2018) asserts that rapport is the essence of a good relationship in the EFL classroom. Thus, the author indicates that the use of WPC contributes to creating a good relationship between the teacher and the student since the learners feel that their opinions have value and the environment for the teaching-learning process becomes more positive, and less threatening.

Furthermore, Uymaz (2019) assures that peer correction guarantees more time for feedback, increases the assessment skills of EFL students, and reduces the circumstances of making similar errors by being conscious of the mistakes of their peers. In that sense, Maatouk & Payant (2020) add that peer correction boosts the reading and comprehension skills since it guarantees twice the individual reading on the same paper for the learner to be conscious of the macrostructure while all students finish reading the speeches before marking errors on the writing.

Moreover, investigators emphasize that the WPC strategy allows learners to develop cognitive and metacognitive skills (Robles & Torres, 2020). They ensure that students acquire new insight while learners also expand critical thinking by reviewing their peers' writing. Therefore, students learn from peers by accepting contributions to their written

works, and they also acquire the responsibility to write in a better way (Ramírez & Guillén, 2018).

According to Robles and Torres (2020), a disadvantage of using WPC is that some students do not reach the objective of peer correction. The authors explain that learners waste their time for learning by doing other activities and procrastinating peer correction. Similarly, Najogi and Adnan (2019) state that a negative aspect involves that this activity may be time-consuming. The authors suggest that the teacher spends so much time showing the students the instructions, and learners also consume time when deciding and writing comments into texts.

Another disadvantage is that learners have not developed the skills and the competence to evaluate accurately and critically their peers' writing (Kuyyogsuy, 2019). In addition, Robles and Torres (2020) notice that students are reluctant to peer feedback and do not follow the recommendations since they believe they own better language competence. Therefore, various studies show that failure of written peer correction lies in the students' demotivation since they feel their errors are exposed when their classmates read their writing (Kuyyogsuy, 2019).

1.2.3. *Written Teacher Feedback*

Nowadays, teachers are concerned about helping students overcome grammatical errors (Irwin, 2017). Besides, Sanja (2016) states that teachers can use written feedback to support and guide the learners toward the progress in the EFL acquisition process. Furthermore, investigations add that written feedback refers to providing the students with written comments about their compositions (Irwin, 2017). Additionally, Zhan (2016) contributes that writing teacher feedback (WTF) is a tool employed by the teacher in the EFL classroom to improve the writing skills of the students through individualized instruction.

Regarding the characteristics of teacher feedback, investigations aim that this type of feedback implicates a relationship between teacher and student where strickly the EFL professor seeks to influence positively the performance of the students' writing skills (Han,

2017). Moreover, the author underlines that educators must consider the students' thoughts and beliefs to engage them in successful feedback. In addition, Kleij (2019) mentions that the objective of the written teacher feedback is to convey a message based on the students' written work considering their level and individual characteristics.

Furthermore, researchers support that written teacher feedback is based on two perspectives (Correa & Flores, 2018). First, the author assumes that it is the perspective of 'what'; this stage encompasses the corrections on grammatical and morphological errors and the organizing of the ideas. Similarly, these authors mention the scene of 'how'; it is the way how these comments are grafted onto the text and presented to students. Nonetheless, Correa and Flores (2018) attribute that written teacher feedback is more positive and corrective without penalizing the errors that writers make.

According to Evans et al. (2010), written teacher feedback is an ingenious phase of an instructional methodology. It allows for improving the writing skills in the EFL teaching-learning process since students uptake the instructions and output successful writing. Similarly, researchers sustain that it is a dynamic process since the recommendations delivered by the teacher adapt to the needs and backgrounds of the learners. (Hyland, 1998).

Regarding the importance of the written teacher feedback, Rastgou et al. (2020) note that it is definitely significant for the practitioner since they will develop multilateral aspects of the language. The authors further affirm that students will expand the accuracy in grammatical structures and fluency due to the appropriate organization of the ideas. Nevertheless, Hyland (1998) figures that it does not follow a permanent format since teachers use other English skills to make the written teacher feedback comprehensible. For example, the teacher can open an oral dialogue to be aware that the feedback's objective was achieved.

Additionally, written teacher feedback will trigger the learners to increase their "levels of self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and self-regulation" (Kleij, 2019, p. 187). The author

points out that if teachers focus on delivering positive feedback and reinforcing the students' achievement, it will strengthen the formation of the attitude of a resilient learner; as a consequence, learners will receive the written feedback as a scaffold to achieve improvements at long period.

Moreover, Kleij (2019) asserts that EFL students consider it more reliable and trustworthy to receive written feedback from their teacher. The author explains that teacher feedback supports the writer because students can identify the errors by themselves. The above-mentioned researcher expresses that students are not reluctant to be criticized by the teacher; in other words, learners believe that they can not improve their writing skills without the teacher's suggestions.

Therefore, researchers attribute that the most prominent and positive effect of using written teacher feedback involves grammatical accuracy (Susanti, 2017). Some studies prove that direct, indirect, and metalinguistic written feedback benefit the learners to broaden their English writing skills in the article system (the, a, or an). Similarly, Quintanilla et al. (2018) set the importance of adopting written teacher feedback to boost significant learning in the EFL classes. Moreover, the authors consider that after receiving teacher feedback, learners will acquire critical and reflexive thinking to confirm or change some aspects of the English language to apply in similar situations.

Regarding the advantages of the written teacher feedback, Susanti (2017) counts that it is more accurate and concrete since the teacher underlines specific written errors that students make when they write; as a consequence, the learners uptake the suggestions delivered and make corrections to their writings. In addition, Fahmi and Cahyono (2021) point out that teacher feedback boosts learners to refine the writing process and enrich the content and organization of the ideas in the written speech.

Additionally, Sermsook et al. (2017) declare that WTF supports learning linguistic features in English since this strategy help to overcome grammatical and morphological errors (Sermsook et al., 2017). For instance, the author provides some examples: "Paula is a

lady pretty” and “She name is Mook” (p. 43). The author shows that teacher feedback striking and motivates the learners to correct the linguistic structure and overcome the misuse of the possessive pronoun. In this way, Sermsook et al. (2017) assure that the teacher feedback guarantees real communication by avoiding misunderstanding.

Another benefit of teacher written feedback is that it reduces the gap between short and long periods for students to achieve a language proficiency or academic goal (Gan et al., 2021). Similarly, the author conveys that successfully written teacher feedback indirectly impacts the students’ perception of the course achievement. In addition, Correa and Flores (2018) point out that teacher feedback encourages self-discovery and productive skills since students have changed short stories by reorganizing their ideas, adapting, and composing clearer ones without grammatical errors.

To illustrate a disadvantage of employing WTF, Susanti (2017) shows that it often confuses learners due to the complexity of the recommendations; as a result, the use of written teacher feedback may not be efficient. Similarly, the author adds that this individualized response to students’ writing consumes so much time and effort. In line with the above, Fahmi and Cahyono (2021) claim that written teacher feedback forces the EFL instructors to use so much time to review and correct the learners’ grammatical errors. As a result, WTF will prevent them from reviewing the content and management of the writing aspects so important to reach linguistic competence.

In addition, Susanti (2017) points out that teachers usually focus the feedback only on grammatical and mechanical aspects, and they do not reinforce elements of content and style. In addition, implementing teacher-written feedback does not always guarantee that the writing process leads to a final version because the only source of feedback is the EFL teacher, who will provide corrections and grade student work (Uymaz, 2019). Furthermore, Özkul and Ortaçtepe (2017) argue that written teacher feedback does not always contribute to the development of EFL learners’ writing due to the teachers’ rudimentary characteristics and methods.

And since authors have conducted current research to gather information about the influence that feedback has on language achievements, six previous studies will clarify the advantages and gaps in written peer correction and writer teacher feedback on students' writing skills performance in the EFL context.

The first previous study was developed by Huisman et al. (2018) and the purpose was to compare providing versus receiving peer feedback and expand insight into the influence on consecutive writing achievement. This investigation used a mixed qualitative and quantitative method, and the participants were 83 EFL students. During the study, some instruments such as essays, learning platforms, and questionnaires were employed. In addition, the preliminary and final essays were analyzed by an experienced research assistant and teaching staff, respectively, where aspects of the language were interpreted, such as content, linguistic structure, style and references, presentation, and spelling errors. The results demonstrated that providing and receiving peer feedback has positively influenced the improvement of the students' writing skills.

In the second study, Zhang and Hyland (2018) proposed to explore the students' engagement in writing with the guidance of teacher feedback and automated computer feedback. This study was a naturalistic case involving two Chinese and two advanced students. The instruments were 400 and 1000 words essays, semi-structured interviews, and the AWE program. In addition, this inquiry used the parameters of morphology, semantics, syntax, and content. The findings were that some modern programs such as (AWE) and teacher feedback boosted students' participation in the writing tasks.

In the third study, Zhan (2016) set the main purpose of investigating the students' and teachers' judgment about teacher feedback in EFL writing classes. This investigation utilized qualitative and quantitative methods, and the sample was 62 EFL students. The instruments were twelve narrative and descriptive essays, questionnaires, and semi-structured interviews. In addition, the study considered content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. The research findings evidenced that written teacher feedback

comprised all aspects of the English language; however, students were mostly influenced by feedback on organization, leaving little space for increasing dialogue about their feedback practice.

The following study was carried out by Maatouk and Payant (2020), whose purpose was to foster students' interaction through collaboratively written correction feedback. This investigation had a qualitative and exploratory approach. It involved a group of participants who were a reviewer, an author, and a novice writer. The instruments were a framework model and checklists, and this study focused on some categories such as grammar, organization, and vocabulary. The results demonstrated that collaborative feedback supported the writing skill because it served as scaffolding for novice writers while combining collaborative learning.

Furthermore, in the fifth study, Correa and Flores (2018) developed an investigation to analyze the students' decisions around teacher feedback. This study was conducted under a qualitative exploration approach, and the participants were an English teacher and ten 10th-grade students. The instruments were written documents: 2 drafts and a final story. Also, a diagnosed test was employed, compressing parameters of grammar structure, syntax, and contents. The results exposed that most students modified their works by adopting the teacher's advice and showing relevant progress.

Regarding the last study, Ebadi et al. (2017) sought to examine the impacts of online peer feedback through a digital source 'Google Docs' versus face-to-face feedback on writing skills in EFL learners. For this study, a mixed approach was used, with qualitative and quantitative evidence. The participants were ten EFL learners and an instructor. The instruments were pre-tests, post-tests, IELTS academic writing program, two tasks, and a semistructured interview. Furthermore, this investigation used parameters of semantic, lexical, grammatical range, and accuracy of the content. The results pointed out that peer-to-peer online grading using Google Docs provided immeasurable benefits for EFL learners in developing writing skills.

Chapter two

Method

2.1. Setting and Participants

This research was carried out in a public high school located in San Miguel de Los Bancos, Pichincha province, Ecuador, in order to collect relevant data about EFL students writing skills. The institution covers the sublevels of kindergarten, primary and secondary, in morning and evening shifts.

The participants were 26 students at a senior level of high school who attend the morning shift. They were a group of teenagers, 54% of them were women, while 46% were men, and their ages ranged from 15 to 16 years old. Moreover, the participants have an intermediate English proficiency level and receive English classes face to face twice a week for 40 minutes.

2.2. Procedure

In order to reach the main purpose proposed for this research, as well as to answer both research questions, some fundamental steps were followed.

The first was based on the compilation of scientific information that supports the definition and the importance of written corrective feedback. The author also explored different authors' perceptions regarding teacher feedback, peer correction, and the effects on the development of the EFL learners' writing skills. Moreover, six previous studies were also described. All this information is located in the first chapter of this work, under the name of "Literature review". This information was gathered from sources such as physical and online books as well as academic journal articles.

The second step was the methodology planning, in order to gather the qualitative data, the researcher set out to use pre and post-tests, a rubric, six paragraphs written by the students, and a checklist. On the other hand, the quantitative approach was employed to grade the pre and post-test paragraphs, tabulate the frequency and the percentage of the errors detected in the written compositions and register the students' perceptions about both

teacher and peer feedback. These numerical outcomes were attached to an excel sheet to obtain a more controlled and precise measurement of the statistical results.

Regarding the third step, it involved the data collection process which was planned and executed in eight classes. Within the first class, the pre-test was carried out. The students were asked to write a paragraph of 120 to 150 words on the topic "My last vacation". To grade the paragraphs, the researcher used a rubric, whose score ranged from 0 to 10 points. This rubric was focused on evaluating the students' linguistic competence in semantic, syntactic, morphological, and mechanical aspects.

The fourth step was the implementation of written teacher feedback and written peer correction. This activity consisted of the author asking the students to write six paragraphs on topics that they have already reviewed and that are according to their English proficiency level and background. Three of these six paragraphs were reviewed under the written teacher feedback criteria. The researcher used the rubric mentioned above to analyze the students' compositions on topics such as my house, daily routines, and my favorite sport.

On the other hand, the three remaining paragraphs were corrected using written peer feedback where students had to underline, make marks, or write symbols on the errors that they found in their classmates' work. Specifically, peer correction was carried out in the paragraphs about my school, my role model, and my favorite dish. To analyze these results, the teacher used a checklist based on ten items, and to reinforce peer feedback, the EFL instructor also employed the teacher feedback rubric.

The fifth step was the post-test which consisted of pupils writing another paragraph using the same topic as the pre-test "My last vacation", and the researcher used the same technique and rubric to analyze the outcomes. Furthermore, the students' survey was applied, which contained twelve close questions formulated in order to know the EFL students' perceptions and preferences about both types of WCF.

The last step covered the analysis, explanation, and contrast of the quantitative information with the information from the literature review to answer the two questions

formulated in this research. This data was organized into three tables: Table 1, contains the average score of the pre and post-test results and explained the impact of teacher and peer feedback exposing the variance which resulted from these two averages. Table 2 reveals the frequency and percentage of errors in the semantic, syntactic, and morphological categories and analyzed the intervention of the teacher and peer feedback. Finally, Table 3 encompasses the results of the students' survey with the analysis of the percentage of the preferences in receiving both types of written feedback. Furthermore, at the last of this analysis, six conclusions and six recommendations were established based on the results obtained during the whole research.

Chapter three

Analysis and Discussion

This chapter contemplates the description, analysis, and interpretation of the outcomes obtained during the applications of the instruments. This information is presented in three tables, the first of which covers the results of the pre and post-tests in order to know the impact of both the teacher and peer feedback on the improvement of the EFL learners' writing skills. The second table contains the numerical and percentage data of the semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors made by the students during both types of feedback. The third table includes the students' perception of both types of written corrective feedback. This information is analyzed, exemplified, and duly supported to answer the two research questions formulated at the beginning of this investigation.

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
3.92	5.4	1.09

Note: The pre and post-tests were graded based on a rubric from 0 to 10.

This table contains the average grades obtained by the participants during the pre-test and post-test activities. As shown, the pre-test average grade was 3.92 out of 10 which reached 5.4 out of 10 in the post-test. The third element exposed in Table 1 is the variance obtained from both average grades. It is a dispersion measurement that represents the variability between the pre and post-test regarding the arithmetic media. The variance reached a rate of 1.09, which implies that there was a relevant improvement in the students' writing performance after receiving written teacher feedback and written peer correction. It also indicates that there was a reduction of the EFL students' morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors.

In the pre-test activity, the students had to write a paragraph of about 120-150 words with the topic 'last vacation'. And despite that participants used the Spanish and English languages to write, they were not able to complete the extension of words suggested. The instructor examined and graded the students' linguistic performance through a rubric that considered semantic, syntactic, morphological, and mechanical aspects. For example, learners wrote, *hay spent estray*. This example relapsed in semantic errors since this clause does not have a correct English structure, in addition, it uses incorrect punctuation, maintains spelling errors, and it is difficult to understand.

The reasons why learners reached 3.92 out of 10 in the pre-test can be due to the fact that writing is one of the most demanding skills for EFL learners. Indeed, Harmer (2018) ensures that writing is a challenging skill because learners require a great deal of time to recognize the patterns of writing, the purpose, and the audience.

In addition, the researcher perceived that these errors were committed due to the lack of English writing practice after they received online classes for more than two consecutive school years. In this regard, Gayo and Widodo (2018), and Goldouz and Baleghizadeh (2021) claim that teenager EFL learners make several errors due to the interlingual and intralingual transfer.

Moreover, the results obtained in the pre and post-test yielded a variance of 1.09 which shows that there is no distortion with the media and therefore, the information is reliable. Furthermore, the high improvement in students' writing ability was because they developed this skill in face-to-face classes. The EFL students also received written comments from the teacher and peers that helped them stop making the same errors.

To corroborate these findings, Yang (2020) and Brookhart (2017) state that effective feedback aims to help students overcome errors while contributing to students' self-esteem. However, Harmer (2018) states that since the ability to write was fostered as a habit, the students started the writing process motivated and enthusiastic; however, they make errors in the target language influenced by creativity.

Analyzing the post-test outcomes, the participants got an average of 5.4 out of 10 since they wrote paragraphs in 50 to 60 words, with fewer errors compared to the pre-test paragraphs. And even though students overcome errors in the structure of a sentence, they made errors at the sentence level, spelling, capitalization, and subject-verb agreement within morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors, as shown in the following sentences.

Morphological error:

Wrong: *My famili and I went to the beach.*

Right: *My family and I went to the beach.*

In the above sentence, learners made a morphological error since they omitted the morpheme *y* replacing it with the letter *i* in the word *family*.

Mechanic error

Wrong: *i ate Rice fish and ice cream.*

Right: *I ate rice, fish, and ice cream.*

This example reveals some mechanical errors related to capitalization and punctuation.

From the post-test results, it can be deduced that the improvement in the grades is mainly due to the intervention, that is, to the WCF that the students received. For instance, peer feedback contributed to the improvement of this skill because the participants were able to identify and underline several errors from their peers, especially errors committed in syntactic and mechanical categories. Similarly, Tauhidah et al. (2016) convey that an advantage of peer correction is that learners acquire skills to recognize the errors from their pairs and their ones while developing other English skills like reading.

In the same way, written teacher feedback was also effective because it was innovative, individual, and general. In other words, the EFL teacher aimed that all the pupils to understand the written comments. For instance, in the case of this study, the researcher gave group feedback using the students' writing works to discuss the semantic,

morphological, and syntactic errors. On this statement, Hyland (1998) corroborates that the written teacher feedback is not permanent since it can be adapted.

After analyzing the results in Table 1, it was noted a protruding impact on the improvement of writing skills of EFL students due to the influence of the written peer and teacher feedback, since the participants overcame errors and developed cognitive and metacognitive skills. Concerning this Wiggings (2012) ensures that successful feedback is delivered from someone else, teacher or peer, able to identify the occurrence of the errors for learners to make emphatic decisions which will reinforce the emotional levels of the students.

Table 2

Teacher and Peer feedback results

	Teacher's feedback		Peer's feedback	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Semantic	72	25.50%	34	44%
Syntactic	84	29.50%	12	16%
Morphological	129	45 %	31	40%

Note: Frequency and percentage of semantic, syntactic and morphological errors identified during teacher and peer feedback.

Table 2 summarizes the quantitative data gathered during teacher and peer feedback interventions. The researcher discovered that during teacher feedback, the participants made a total of 72 semantic errors, 84 syntactic errors, and 129 morphological. Meanwhile, in the peer correction activities, the EFL learners identified a total of 34 semantic errors, 12 syntactic errors, and 31 morphological errors.

Comparing the outcomes found in both types of feedback, the major amount of errors identified occurred during teacher feedback, with a rate of 285 errors. The highest rate was within the morphological category with 45%, followed by the syntactic group with 29.5%, and finally, the semantic aspect with 25.5% of the errors. On the other hand, when carrying out peer feedback, students detected a total of 77 errors. The highest rate was located in the

semantic aspect which represents 44% of the total errors, followed by morphological errors which correspond to 40%, and syntactic errors which denote 12% of the total.

Next, the errors found during teacher feedback are analyzed in detail through examples taken from the paragraphs written by the students. These errors are analyzed by dividing them into the three types of written errors, which in turn are divided into subcategories.

The semantic errors in the teacher feedback are classified into three subcategories: errors at the word level, errors at the sentence level, and literal translation errors. The literal translation subtype reached the highest frequency of errors, with 38 errors. The EFL instructor detected that most students translated complete sentences from their native language without considering the restrictions in the EFL context. In that sense, Chanysheva (2010) assures that the semantic field admits certain transformations and replacement of a word by another; however, EFL learners must consider aspects such as the culture, structure, and grammatical rules before translating the language. Some literal translation examples found during teacher feedback are the following:

Literal translation error example:

Wrong: *is funny play and do exercise.*

Right:*it is fun to play and exercise at the same time.*

The above sentence reflects literal translation because the learners misused the adjective *funny* instead of using the adjective *fun* to describe something that people enjoy. Similarly, they wrote the verb *play* without adding the preposition *to* and added two verbs; *do* and *exercise*. Hence, the students wrote meaningless sentences in their compositions because they did not respect the grammatical rules and organized words in the wrong context due to the interference of their L1. According to Almahameed and Al-Shaikh (2017), learners build a negative transfer in the English language from native languages; as a result, they generate interlingual errors.

Literal translation error example:

Wrong: *In my house are four person mon, dad, my brother and I.*

Right: *I live with my mother, father, and brother at home.*

That sentence is incorrect since the students did not comply with the grammatical rules of the English language in the phrases *house are*, *four person* and *mon* instead of using *house is*, *four people*, and *mom*. In fact, it is worth mentioning that learners also affected the syntactic level of the sentence due to the literal translation errors when they wrote the paragraphs on the topic *my house*. Those errors surged because learners translated term by term from their mother tongue into the target language. Regarding this situation, Choubane (2021) sets that learners make literal translation errors when they match incorrectly the grammar and syntactic elements, thus creating incorrect words, sentences, or paragraphs influenced by the interference L1.

With regard to the next aspect in the semantic category, it was the errors at the sentence level. These errors occurred 27 times which placed them as the second most frequent semantic error. The results showed that the participants misused words or phrases and presented grammatical errors that affected the understanding of the utterance due to the intralingual interference. To corroborate this premise, Almahameed and Al-Shaikh (2017) assert that learners make semantic errors because they lack knowledge about rules in the foreign language.

Example of errors at the sentence level:

Wrong: *I have one pets and love so much, is dog color black and su name is oso*

Right: *I have a pet, it is a dog that I love very much because it is black and his name is oso.*

The above example presents semantic errors because it lacks order, coherence, and structure since the student made multiple errors such as phrases listed, word order errors, misused affixes, and so on, as a result, this sentence turned incomprehensible. Those errors are associated with evolutive errors in the production of the target language, low proficiency levels, and other social factors (Orbe, 2017). To justify this information, Rajab (2016)

assures that learners fall into errors at the sentence level when they break the English language rules due to lack and insufficient knowledge of a language and the hypergeneralization of rules in unknown structures.

The least frequent subcategory within the semantic errors was related to errors at the word level. The educator found 7 of this type of error and the participants made errors at the word level since they misused words when they composed their paragraphs. Those errors were attributed to literal translation or word resemblances between native languages and L2. Concerning this type of semantic error, Almahameed and Al-ShaikhI (2017) exclaim that they occur because learners make literal translations and mis-analogy of the words in the sentences.

Example of errors at the word level:

Wrong: *My house remains in the neighborhood of the Cisne.*

Right: *My house is located in the "el Cisne" neighborhood.*

The above example illustrates that the participant misused the word *remains* to refer to the location of a house since the verb *remain* makes more sense for people who stay in the same place. The possible root of those errors remount the literal translation from the pupils' native language and the lack of vocabulary in the English language at the moment learners write. This premise is sustained by Almahameed and Al-ShaikhI (2017) since they claim that errors at the word level consist of the misuse of the words because the participants translate their native language into English.

As shown in Table 2, the following type of errors are syntactic. When performing teacher feedback, a total of 84 syntactic errors were detected by the EFL instructor. This category is subdivided into three subcategories: subject-verb agreement errors, conjunctions errors, and null subject errors. The participants made most errors inside the subcategory of subject-verb agreement since it involved 57 out of 84 occurrences. Those outcomes could be because learners used nouns and verbs without considering the rules of irregular nouns, irregular verbs, and adjectives. This in turn is due to both interlanguage and interlingual

transfer. To justify this affirmation, Gayo and Widodo (2018) point out that there are two causes for the students to make syntactic errors, namely L1 transfer and intralingual interference in the L2.

Subject-verb-agreement error example:

Wrong: *Our house have five bedroom.*

Right: *Our house has five bedrooms.*

In the example above an error was made since the verb *have* did not undergo the transformation of the irregular verb *have* to *has* after the singular noun *Our house*.

Wrong: *My room is red and white and have drawing on the wall.*

Right: *My room is red and white and has a drawing on the wall.*

The sentence explained above has a singular subject with two complements linked through the verbs *is* and *have*. The respondents misselected the verb *have* since the two verbs must agree with the subject in both time and number as *is* and *has*. Those errors were committed due to intralingual and interlingual transfer. In that sense, Almahameed and Al-Shaikhi (2017) declare that subject-verb-agreement errors can be due to L1 and L2 interference because the agreement system in Spanish and English is similar since the verb in the predicate has to be in agreement in number and person with the subject.

In addition, another subtype in the syntactic field was conjunction errors, within this subcategory 18 errors were found. The students added, omitted, and substituted coordinating and subordinating conjunctions to join clauses with each other due to intralinguistic transference when they wrote about their favorite sports. According to Gayo and Widodo (2018), learners make errors by omitting and substituting conjunction and those errors are attributed in most cases to intralingual errors rather than interlingual ones.

Conjunction error example:

Wrong: *Second, Because it gives me health.*

Right: *Second, because it gives me physical health I play soccer.*

In this case, the participants misused the conjunction *because* and created a dependent clause without adding an independent one. In addition, the students failed to formulate complex sentences due to misusing subordinate conjunctions. The reasons were the absence of knowledge of the norms to structure clauses into sentences and the negligence of the writers in forming sentences. Regarding the above situation, Pangaribuan et al. (2018) expose that most students decline in using subordinate conjunctions when creating complex sentences due to interlingual transfer and carelessness.

Conjunction error example:

Wrong: *We have a bathroom, a kitchen, a garage, a garden.*

Right: *We have a bathroom, a kitchen, a garage, and a garden.*

Similarly, the students made an error in the prior sentence since they listed words and omitted the conjunction *and* to adhere word with words in this sentence. Those errors could be attributed to the transference of the native language and the students' creativity when using the target language. In that sense, Almahameed and Al-Shaikhl (2017) set that conjunctions errors are associated with the L1 transfer and intralingual interference.

The last subcategory in the syntactic level is the production of null subject errors. It comprised 9 errors. Teacher feedback revealed that participants missed subjects such as nouns or pronouns in their paragraphs. These errors may be committed due to negative transference from their mother tongue. In connection with the point previously mentioned Almahameed and Al-Shaikhl (2017) claim that the syntactic field refers to how the word and phrases are organized and structured into the sentences, however, EFL learners can misconstrue utterances easily due to language transfer.

Null subject error example:

Wrong: *∅ play with my friends.*

Right: *I play with my friends.*

This example reflects an error because the students did not write a subject in the sentence. They omitted nouns, and pronouns in the sentences, producing incorrect

grammatical structures in simple sentences. Those errors were attributed to the interference of the native languages because it allows implicit subjects in the utterances. Besides, Almahameed and Al-Shaikhl (2017) and Rothman and Iverson (2007) expose that null subject errors occurs because Spanish is considered a pro-drop language that admits subjects or pronouns not articulated, whereas, English is a non-pro-drop language whose subject must be explicitly mentioned to avoid making grammatical English errors.

As displayed in Table 2, the last error category corresponds to morphological errors. This area encompasses the highest number of errors identified by the educator, with a frequency of 129, representing 45% of the total errors found. These errors data were separated into three subcategories titled omission, addition, and affixes errors.

Regarding omission errors, this subcategory reached a frequency of 64 errors. The outcomes show that learners missed elements of the language such as morphemes, content words, and function words in their writing. The main reason was that learners were influenced by the first language as well as intralingual transfer. In relation to this, Gayo and Widodo (2018) convey that syntactic errors consist of the omission and usage of the morphemes due to the lack of grammatical knowledge.

Omission error example:

Wrong: *I get dresed.*

Right: *I get dressed.*

This example represents an omission error since the students wrote the word *dresed* and omitted the morpheme *s* in the content word *dressed*. The cause for omission errors was the negligence to check the paragraphs before handing them. Saputri (2017) conveys that omission errors are due to the absence of items that must be mentioned. Hence, Pasaribu et al. (2021) ensure that omission errors are attributed to typographic errors as well as intralingual errors. Moreover, the researcher is aware that learners also omitted words into the sentence that triggered major errors. According to the above information,

researchers consider that morphological error at the level of omission causes a vagueness interpretation of the meaning of the sentence that affects the syntactic level (Rahman, 2019).

Moreover, the next subtype of morphological errors is addition errors. These errors constituted the second-highest subcategory since they reached a frequency of 40 errors. This means that learners added unnecessary morphemes, nouns, verbs, and more elements into the sentence which disrupted the comprehension and meaning of the utterances (Rahman, 2019). In addition, Pasaribu et al. (2021) consider that morphological errors are caused by the absence of a typo check and also by interlingual factors.

Addition error example:

Wrong: *I like to play with my football friends.*

Right: *I like to play with my friends.*

In the prior sentence, the participants made an addition error since they added the word *football* next to the word *friends* when the first element was not necessary. And taking away the word *football*, the sentence became more precise and clear. Hence, Gayo and Widodo (2018) admit that addition errors only trigger morphological errors. In addition, Pasaribu et al. (2021) highlight that learners add more elements in the sentences due to a lack of practice in writing and interlingual aspects, as a result, the utterances lead to readers' confusion and misunderstanding.

Furthermore, the last subcategory within the morphological aspects detected by the teacher is affixation errors. The EFL instructor identifies a total of 25 affixation errors. The outcomes show that the participants misused derivational suffixes, derivational prefixes, and inflectional suffixes that triggered the wrong choice of allomorphs next to the word's root due to interlingual, intralingual aspects (Kalee et al., 2018; Ramadan, 2015; Gayo & Widodo, 2018).

Affixation error example:

Wrong: *I recommend that you practice this sport to inprove your physical activity.*

Right: *I recommend that you practice this sport to improve your physical activity.*

The prior sentence clarifies the incorrect use of the derivational prefix *im* at the beginning of the root of the word *prove* because the student wrote, *improve* using the unit of system *n* instead of *m*. Those errors could be attributed to the misinterpretation of the rules and concepts in the target language; consequently, learners misformed grammatical elements. In relation to the mentioned above, Gayo and Widodo (2018) state that learners make suffixes errors caused by the intralanguage transference since they omit several members due to the incomplete application of the rules in the target language.

Inflectional suffixes error example:

Wrong: *I have one pets.*

Right: *I have a/one pet.*

The above sentence reflects an inflectional suffix error since the learners added the morpheme *s* to the word *pet*. Hence, deleting the suffix *s* out of the word *pet* made the sentence more understandable. Those errors showed that learners ignored the use of the morphemes as well as the roots of the words; as a result, learners misformed new words in the target language. This affirmation is sustained by Gayo and Widodo (2018) who explain that learners made suffixes errors since they are unaware of the rules of word formation and use their mother tongue to write in the target language. Moreover, Katter (2019) conveys that errors are a natural process in second language acquisition and affirms that analyzing them is a strategy used to discover EFL learners' weaknesses and strengths in the target language.

On the other hand, concerning the results of peer feedback, like the previous ones, they are divided into three types of written errors: semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors, which in turn are divided into subcategories.

According to the data from Table 2, semantic errors took up the highest rate of errors detected, the students were able to find 34 errors within that category. Similarly, these errors were divided into three subcategories: errors at the word level, the sentence level, and literal translation. Within this aspect, errors at the sentence level were the most frequently found,

they reached a frequency of 23 errors. These results reveal that learners made most semantic errors when they wrote their written compositions because they employed wordy sentences and misspelled words, turning the sentences incomprehensible due to the interference of their native language. In this respect, Orbe (2017) claims that semantic errors are the most challenging for learners due to the interference and the inadequate application of the rules in the language.

Example of error at the sentence level:

Wrong: ... *iT lunch, rice, salsas, jus, some rice.*

Right: ...*I prepare some rice, with sauce and a glass of juice for lunch.*

In the previous sentence, the students made errors at sentence level because they wrote nouns separated by commas, misspelled the words *juice* and *sauce*, repeated the word *rice*, and omitted the verb in this sentence, as a result, learners produced long phrases that affected the comprehension of the message. These errors may be committed due to the misapplication of the English grammar rules. In regard to this, Rajab et al. (2016) ensure that learners create errors at the sentence level because they lack the knowledge to arrange the words in the sentences.

The second most frequent subcategory of semantic errors identified by the EFL learners is literal translation error. The students detected 6 literal translation errors within their classmates' paragraphs. The learners made errors in literal translation when they wrote words, clauses, and sentences due to the effects of the interlingual transfer. Aim (2019) assures that learners commit errors in the semantic field when they reword texts using language from their mother tongue in L2.

Literal translation error example:

Wrong: *In my college there are many tables.*

Right: *There are many tables in my high school.*

The above example reflects a literal translation error since the students translated word to word from Spanish to the English language. Indeed, they wrote a chain of errors that

affected the meaning of the utterances. For instance, they wrote *college* when the correct one was *high school*. Researchers claim that the students make literal translation errors because they create sentences and structure their paragraphs using their native language; therefore, learners infringe the L2 rules (Rajab et al., 2016).

Regarding the errors at the word level, the learners found 5 errors in this subcategory. In this context, the pupils chose the wrong words to form clauses, phrases, and sentences when they wrote their compositions. This is usually due to the fact that learners lack appropriate vocabulary and are influenced by interlingual interference. Concerning this premise, Almahameed and Al-Shaikhl (2017) point out that learners make different types of semantic errors, i.e., errors at the word level due to both interlingual and intralingual transfer.

Example of error at the word level:

Wrong: *She is handsome.*

Right: *She is beautiful.*

In this example, the students used the adjective *handsome* to describe a female which constitutes an error since the adjective *handsome* is ascribed to men, while the adjective *beautiful* is more applicable to define the physical qualities of women. The possible reason for committing those errors was that learners did not have enough vocabulary to use the English language. Therefore, Almahameed and Al-Shaikhl (2017) assure that the students made errors at the word level because they use synonymy, polysemy, and monosemy words in inappropriate contexts.

Example of error at word level:

Wrong: *He is comilòn and comedian.*

Right: *He is an glutton and a comedian.*

Here, the learners presented an error at the word level because they borrowed the word *comilòn* from their native language, Spanish. These errors were committed because the students did a negative transfer that consisted of transferring words from their mother tongue into the target language. In concordance with the above information, Nesterenko

(2013) affirms that teenagers compare and transfer knowledge from their native language to a second language because they have the misconception that both languages L1 and L2 work in a similar way.

According to Table 2, the second category of written errors corresponds to syntactic errors which reached a rate of 12 occurrences. It is worth emphasizing that this category included the lowest number of errors identified compared to the semantic and morphological errors during this investigation. Syntactic errors were further divided into three subsections, there were errors in subject-verb-agreement, word order, and prepositions.

The subject-verb-agreement errors comprise the first subsection of syntactic errors. This subcategory reached a frequency of 6 errors. The results reflected that the students altered the exterior structure of the language when they wrote their paragraphs due to both the poor input in the L2 and language transfers. In that sense, Gayo and Widodo (2018) point out that the learners make syntactic errors due to the lack of knowledge to apply the grammatical rules and the transference of the language.

Subject-verb-agreement error example:

Wrong: *He have a farm.*

Right: *He has a farm.*

The above sentence shows that the students made formation errors from the irregular verb *have* since it is not in concordance with the subject in time and number. Indeed, learners made subject-verb agreement errors due to little practice of the target language, especially in the simple present. In light of this, Nurjanah (2017) exposes that subject-verb-agreement errors involve the omission, addition, and misformation in the surface of the structures caused for both intralingual and interlingual transfers misleading the precise language input.

Following the same line of syntactic errors, another subcategory corresponds to word order errors underlined during the peer feedback activity, covering a frequency of 4 errors. The outcome reveals that learners put words such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, and so on, in

incorrect places within sentences due to the wrong application of the grammatical rules in L2 and the intralingual transfer. In this context, Gayo and Guidodo (2018) declare that the students make grammatical and syntactic errors due to the internal conflict that creates the grammatical rules in L2 and the overgeneralization of the language.

Word order error example:

Wrong: *It has a blackboard big.*

Right: *It has a big blackboard.*

From the above example, it was visible that the participants misplaced the noun *blackboard*, and the adjective *big* since the adjectives describe a noun and adjectives have to be before the nouns. Therefore, the students made word order errors because the input and output of the language are influenced by the student's mother tongue (Spanish language), where effectively, the adjectives are located after the nouns. In relation to this, Almahameed and Al-Shaikhl (2017) set that learners make grammatical errors in the target language due to interference from the native languages.

The last subcategory in the syntactic field is preposition errors, the students found only 2 of these errors. That means that the participants chose wrong prepositions, made misformation, and incorrect addition words when they wrote their paragraphs due to the interference of the language. In that sense, researchers consider that writers make syntactic errors because they do not use the grammatical aspects of the EFL in a precise way (Tetreault and Chodorow, 2008).

Preposition error example:

Wrong: *My lunch is in one plate.*

Right: *My lunch is on a plate.*

The previous example shows an error since the learners used the preposition *on* to refer to a flat surface. Indeed, learners made conjunction errors since the general principle in the English language is using the preposition *on* to hold something as *soup on a bowl*. Then, the correct preposition is *in a plate*. In addition, Suzanne (2021) conveys that it is

transcendental that learners domain the grammatical rules to use the prepositions because it improves the understanding of the message in the utterances; however, preposition errors are committed due to the influence of both first and second language.

Moreover, according to the data displayed in Table 2, the last aspect is related to morphological errors. During this research, the participants detected 31 morphological errors which results in a higher percentage than syntactic errors but lower than semantic ones. This category is also divided into three subsections: omission, addition, and misordering errors.

Regarding the omission errors, the learners found 17 of these errors during peer correction. These results mirror that the participants missed inflexional and derivational suffixes and words in the utterances. Therefore, researchers support that morphological errors are triggered due to interlanguage and intralingual aspects (Gayo and Widodo, 2018).

Omission error example:

Wrong: *It has some potato.*

Right: *It has some potatoes.*

The students had errors in this sentence because they omitted the inflexional suffixes for the plural in the word *potato*. The possible reasons to make these errors were that learners lost certain English linguistic elements in their written speech. It occurred because learners produced the target language influenced by their creativity without taking into account the rules in the L2. In relation to the mentioned above, Sarinah (2018) sets up that since learners are unable to complete the linguistic rules, they omit several elements in a word, phrase, or sentence, as a result, they produce omission errors.

The next subtype of morphological errors detected by the EFL learners were addition errors. The participants were able to identify 10 of these errors when performing peer correction. These outcomes revealed that the students introduced unnecessary words or items in their paragraphs due to the interference of the native language. This conception is supported by Gayo and Widodo (2018) who point out that there are two reasons to make morphological errors and they are intralingual and interlingual transfer.

Addition error example:

Wrong: *She mother is confident and friendly.*

Right: *She is confident and friendly.*

The previous example reflects an addition error since the participants made double marking errors when they added the noun *mother* next to the pronoun *she* which altered the sentence structure. Similarly, Kumala et al. (2018) indicate that double marking addition errors happen because learners add unnecessary components in the sentences. In addition, learners added letters, items, and words in their utterances due to a lack of practice and carelessness when writing paragraphs. Consequently, Pasaribu et al. (2021) convey that lack of English writing practice and negligence of the students when writing are factors that triggered most of the addition errors.

Misformation errors were the last aspect in the morphological category. During peer feedback, 4 misformation errors were identified. Despite the fact that the educator found a few errors of this type, it could be noted that learners employed a group of morphemes in an incorrect order influenced by intralingual transfer. In relation to this, Hendrawaty (2018) assures that learners make grammatical errors since they produce the language though it is wrong.

Misformation error example:

Wrong: *It has then windows.*

Right: *It has ten windows.*

The above example points out an error since the participants included the morpheme *h* in the word *ten* creating a misformation error. These errors happened due to the intralingual transfer in the production of the target language. In relation to the mentioned above, Hendrawaty (2018) declares that misformation errors occur when learners select a word of a class to represent another word in a different group.

By analyzing the outcomes of written teacher feedback, the researcher was able to infer that this feedback was effective because the EFL instructor has developed linguistic

competencies to recognize errors. In the same way, the educator had the knowledge of how correctly provide feedback by using the rubric to underline the errors impartially. In addition, the teacher feedback identified a greater number of errors in morphological, semantic, and syntactic categories by analyzing word-by-word and line-by-line students' compositions. Moreover, the teacher delivered more positive, clear, and explicit feedback since she used the target language and direct and indirect strategies. To support this information, researchers convey that effective feedback is a dynamic process because it adapts to the needs of the students (Karim and Nassaji, 2019; Farjadnasab and Khodashenas, 2017).

Additionally, according to the checklist instrument used to evaluate peer feedback performance, learners identified lower errors from their peers' compositions because they were not aware of the existence of semantic, morphological, and syntactic errors. Nevertheless, the participants did pay more attention to mechanical errors. Similarly, learners wrote words like *no entiendo*, because they could not understand the target language. In addition, peers underlined and corrected errors and changed the wrongs by rights for being supportive of their peers. In that case, Wahyuni (2018) expresses that peer feedback influences positively the students' personalities because they become more respectful and humanitarian.

After interpreting Tables 1 and 2, it can be deduced that teacher feedback was the most effective in underlining and correcting morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors. Conversely, during peer feedback, the students identified a lower quantity of written errors. Therefore, in response to the first research question, applying both types of WCF combined demonstrated a positive influence on recognizing and correcting errors in paragraphs caused by interlingual and intralinguistic transfers. In addition, through the intervention, a good teacher-student relationship was fostered, as well as camaraderie, respect, and interaction between peers.

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

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

Nº	Questions	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagre %	Total %
1	I consider it is important to receive peer feedback in written assignments	70	15	15	100
2	I consider it is important to receive teacher's feedback in written assignments.	92	8		100
3	The feedback delivered by my peer helps me to improve my writing skills.	27	58	15	100
4	The feedback delivered by my teacher helps me to improve my writing skills.	88	12		100
5	My peer provides me with feedback through comments, questions or additional information.	46	31	23	100
6	The teacher provides feedback through comments, questions or additional information.	92	8		100
7	The feedback delivered by my classmate is clear and easy to understand.	54	27	19	100
8	The feedback delivered by the teacher is clear and easy to understand.	100			100
9	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my peer	30	58	12	100
10	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my teacher.	92	8		100
11	The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve in...				
	Grammar use(Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization and Punctuation)	73	19	8	100
	Word formation (Spelling)	16	69	15	100
	Vocabulary misuse	8	15	77	100
12	The feedback provided by the teacher has helped me to improve in.....				
	Grammar use(Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization and Punctuation)	100			100
	Word formation (Spelling)	92	8		100
	Vocabulary misuse	85	15		100

Note: The survey instrument collected the students' perceptions at the levels of agreement, neutral, and disagreement about teacher and peer feedback.

Table 3 contains the percentages in the agree, neutral, and disagree scale from the survey applied to the EFL students. These data are analyzed aiming to discover the learners' perceptions and preferences about the teacher and peer feedback in order to answer the second question planned at the beginning of this research. The author contrasts interprets and supports the students' answers regarding the teacher and peer feedback preferences using the twelve utterances as follows.

The first and second statements involved the importance of receiving written teacher and peer feedback, 70% of the participants agree that peer feedback is a valuable source and a fount of knowledge because it helped learners to reduce the concurrence of written errors. In that sense, Martin and Cippel (2021) assure that peer feedback contributes to communicative competence, but sometimes learners are uncomfortable delivering comments. In contrast, 92% of them agree that teacher feedback is necessary. The reason could be because the learners were pleased to hand over their tasks to receive written suggestions and comments from the teacher since she is a professional who has developed competencies in written language. According to Correa and Flores (2018), there is a preference for receiving teacher feedback because it is more positive and formative.

The third and fourth utterances covered the relationship among the feedback provided and the improvement of the writing skills. The result showed that 58% of the students were neutral which may be because they did not have the conviction that there are relevant effects of peer feedback on their writing skills with only three peer feedback interventions. However, 88% of them affirmed that WTF was a prized tool to enhance their writing skill because they expanded their vocabulary knowledge, acquired accuracy in grammar, and learned how to smoothly organize their ideas in their writing pieces. In that sense, Kleij (2019) declares that learners feel that they are not able to improve their writing skills without receiving the teacher's suggestions.

Moreover, the fifth and sixth statements asked about the comments, questions, or additional information delivered during both types of WCF. The results reflected that 46% of

the participants agreed with having received written comments from their peers since they underlined, circled words, and used marks to approve or disapprove peer works. In addition, they wrote notes using their native language due to a lack of knowledge of the English language. Therefore, Pham et al. (2020) advise that learners must be well trained and practice before applying peer feedback in order for their performance to assist in this process with effective comments. On the other hand, 92% of the students agreed with having received written comments and extra information from the EFL teacher feedback. The reason could be because the teacher used a red pencil to provide these comments for learners to observe and internalize the correct ones. Furthermore, Susanti (2017) claims that written teacher feedback is concrete and helpful because the teacher writes comments next to the errors.

In addition, the participants answered about the clarity and understanding of the feedback on the seventh and eighth utterances. On the one hand, 54% of the learners agreed that the peer feedback was clear and easy to understand. This percentage reflects that half of the participants understood the peer feedback provided by their partners. However, the other half had comprehension problems since their classmates wrote signals as "X" in each line of their peer compositions. Nonetheless, 100% of the students agreed that the teacher's feedback was clear and easy to understand since the instructor used different strategies to deliver appropriate feedback taking into account the individual needs and backgrounds of the students.

The ninth and tenth utterances sought around which type of feedback students felt more comfortable receiving. In this regard, 58% of the learners expressed neutral responses about receiving peer feedback. The possible reason for this choice was that learners thought that their errors would be exposed inside and out of the class. In addition, the participants believed to have a higher language proficiency than their peers. In that sense, Torres and Robles (2020) affirm that learners appear reluctant to receive peer feedback because writers consider having a more advanced English level than their peers. On the contrary, the results

also revealed that 98% of the participants agreed with feeling confident receiving teacher feedback, this may be due to the teacher using the learners' strengths to reduce their weaknesses. The teacher was also generous with the words and written comments, and learners could use this support as a scaffolding to get improvements.

Furthermore, the last two statements investigated learners' perception of the level of improvement in aspects of written language. Regarding peer feedback, 73% of the students agreed that they improved in grammar, 69% maintained the same level in word formation, and 77% did not agree on having enhanced their vocabulary. These percentages could occur due to a lack of practice or preparation of students to perform peer correction since they have not developed security and self-confidence in themselves. Similarly, students only focused on the correct structure since they did not count on a tool to give more precise feedback. Indeed, Ramírez and Guillén 2018 claim that learners can use a checklist and rubric in peer feedback because these means are constructive for learners to identify and classify the errors while reducing the levels of the students' anxiety.

Conversely, concerning teacher feedback, 100% of the students affirmed having improved their grammar structure, 92% agreed on having developed the word-formation, and 85% asserted they reformed their vocabulary misuse. These results revealed that learners had more affinity for receiving written teacher feedback because it helped the participants to improve their written performance in semantic, syntactic, and morphological aspects. This type of feedback also helped them to reduce the number of errors in sentence structure, spelling errors, and vocabulary misuse. Additionally, Correa and Flores (2018) affirm that the teacher feedback makes comments on local aspects concerning word use and structure and global ones like vocabulary misuse by using positive written feedback for the students to adopt these suggestions.

After describing, interpreting, and contrasting the EFL learners' answers to the survey, the second research question can be answered. Written teacher and peer feedback are valuable sources for learners to overcome their written errors. Nevertheless, the

participants showed more affinity to receiving teacher feedback because the professor gave helpfully and enduring written comments considering the learners' strengths to help them to overcome their mistakes. In that sense, Sanja (2016) points out that the objective of written feedback is to support learners produce the written language in different circumstances making fewer errors than before.

Conclusions

Based on the pre and post-test results, teacher and peer feedback made a great contribution to the development of the EFL learners writing skills because the students corrected semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors and created well-structured and complete sentences after these interventions.

During teacher feedback, a higher number of morphological errors were identified, more specifically in the subcategories of omission, addition, and affixes. The main causes of these errors were the interlingual and intralingual transfer.

At the time of peer correction, semantic errors were detected with the highest frequency. Subtypes of semantic errors at the word level, sentence level, and literal translation were identified. These errors were mainly caused by the students distorting the meaning of their sentences as a result of L1 and L2 interference.

Syntactic errors of subject-verb agreement and prepositions were also frequently found during teacher feedback. The causes of this type of error were L1 and intralingual transfer when writing in English.

Most of the students showed a preference for receiving written teacher feedback as they consider it helpful to reduce their written errors and therefore significantly improve their writing skills. In addition, students consider that teacher feedback is quite clear and complete, and they feel comfortable receiving it.

Regarding the students' perceptions of the peer feedback, the participants did not evidence an improvement in their writing skill in aspects of word formation and vocabulary misuse due to being unfamiliar with the peer feedback process, and lacking a tool to give more precise written feedback.

Recommendations

EFL instructors should apply WCF more frequently or in a continuous way so that learners can improve their writing skills. On the other hand, the teacher should encourage learners to create well-structured paragraphs and essays with fewer errors in consecutive writing sessions.

In order to overcome morphological errors, students should read their compositions line by line before handing them to the teacher or students. This reading practice can help learners to acquire morphological awareness.

It is necessary to use English language dictionaries to reduce the number of errors in the semantic category in order for the students not to translate words or sentences from L1 into English. In addition, learners should use dictionaries to make peer feedback more precise.

The EFL teacher should provide grammatical rules or examples of types of writing before students start their writing. These examples give learners extra help for dismissing the number of errors, and peers will use these examples to deliver appropriate written comments in the feedback.

To hand closer feedback to learners, the teacher should examine the students' strengths and weaknesses in periodically writing skills to suggest feasible English programs that help to overcome individual and global lacks of the students.

This research will conclude by giving a suggestion, and it is to obtain a better impact of peer correction in the improvement of the writing skill the students have to be well trained in developing peer correction and supported with tools like rubrics or checklists for them to acquire experience in the givers and receivers roles in written feedback.

References

- Almahameed, Y. S., & Al-Shaikhl, M. (2017). Understanding syntactic and semantic errors in the composition writing of Jordanian EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 6(6), 158-164.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.6p.158>
- Alsied, S. M., & Ibrahim, N. W. (2018). Exploring challenges encountered by EFL Libyan learners in research teaching and writing. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(2), 1-17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22492/ijll.3.2.06>
- Amin, E. (2019). Using awareness raising in syntactic and semantic errors to foster translation performance among Majmaah University EFL students. *Arab World English Journal*, 10(2), 196-212. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.16>
- Anggraeni, N. K. (2018). Morphological and syntactical errors in English essays written by EFL students. *Inference: Journal of English language teaching*, 1(3), 74-81.
<https://journal.lppmunindra.ac.id/index.php/inference/article/view/5624>
- Bhowmik, S. (2021). Writing instruction in an EFL context: learning to write or writing to learn Language?. *Belta Journal*, 5(1), 30-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.36832/beltaj.2021.0501.03>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to give effective feedback to your students* (2nd edition). ASCD Learn Teach Lead. <https://n9.cl/5gbf8>
- Caramazza, A., & Hillis, A. E. (1990). Where do semantic errors come from?. *Corte*, 26(1), 95-122. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452\(13\)80077-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452(13)80077-9)
- Chanysheva, Z. Z. (2010). *Translatology and practice of translation* (3rd edition). Universidad Pedagógica Estatal de Bashkir. M. Akmulla. <https://studopedia.org/6-154542.html>
- Chen, S., Nassaji, H. & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: a case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 1(5), 1-17.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y>

- Choubane, S. (2021). An investigation of the influence of L1 on EFL students paragraph writing: case of first year English language students at setif 2 university. *Algerian Journal of Manuscripts*, 17, pp.120-135.
<https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/160/17/3/187544>
- Correa, R., & Flores, J. (2018). Students' decisions about the teacher's types of written feedback on short stories in English. *Revista de Lingüística, Filosofía y Literatura*, 28(2), 248-264. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15443/rl2819>.
- Ebadi, S., Rahimi, M., & Horati, H. (2017). Exploring the impact of online peer-editing using Google Docs on EFL learners' academic writing skills. *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 30(8), 787-815. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1159614>
- Elfatah, M. A., & Said, S. (2016). Using facebook to develop grammar discussion and writing skills in english as a foreign language for university students. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 13(12), 932-952. 10.17265/1539-8072/2016.12.004
- Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., & Allen, E. (2010). Written corrective feedback: the practitioners' perspective. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 47–77.
<https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119191>
- Fahmi, M. A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2021). EFL students' perception on the use of grammarly and teacher feedback. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 6(1), 18-25.
<https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v6i1.849>
- Farjadnasab, A., & Khodashenas, M. (2017). The effect of written corrective feedback on EFL students' writing accuracy. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 2(2), 30-42. <https://www.sid.ir/en/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id=526154>
- Fata, I. A., Bahri, S., & Muridhal, M. (2018). From picture to text: the use of picture in ELT writing class. *Celt: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature*, 18(2), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.24167/celt.v18i2.1654>

- Febriyanti, G., Dewi, N., & Dewi, I. (2018). Using self-assessment to assess rural young learners' writing skills in English as a foreign language classroom. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 2(2), 109-115. <https://n9.cl/xd1y4>
- Ferris, D. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and Practical Applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 181-201. 10.1017/S0272263109990490
- Gan, Z., An, Z., & Liu, F. (2021). Teacher feedback practices, student feedback motivation, and feedback behavior: How are they associated with learning outcomes?. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697045>
- Gayo, H., & Widodo, P. (2018). An analysis of morphological and syntactical errors on the English writing of junior high school Indonesian students. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 17(4), 58-70. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.17.4.4>
- Goldouz, E., & Baleghizadeh, S. (2021). Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions about the most serious types of written errors and the most effective feedback types to treat them. *Mextesol Journal*, 45(1), 1-13. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1289010>
- Graham, S. (2019). Changing how writing is taught. *Review of Research in Education*, 43, 277–303. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.3102/0091732X18821125>
- Hall, A. H. (2019). Every Child is a Writer: Understanding the Importance of Writing in Early Childhood. *Institute for child success*. 1-14. <https://n9.cl/ohqu2>
- Han, Y. (2017). Mediating and being mediated: learner beliefs and learner engagement with written corrective feedback. *System*, 69, 133-142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.07.003>
- Hanafi. (2020). Morphological error analysis of Muhasabah column at Sabili Islamic magazine. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Cultural Studies*, 3(1), 22-28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.48181/jelts.v3i1.9109>
- Harmer, J. (2018). *How to teach English* (18th edition). Pearson education.

- 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. [10.1080/07294360.2019.1657807](https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1657807)
- Hendrawaty, N. (2018). An analysis on students' errors in writing sentence patterns. Available online at *Loquen: English Studies Journal*, 11(1), 63-85. <https://n9.cl/ocfm2>
- Hidayati, K. H. (2018). Teaching writing to EFL learners: an investigation of challenges confronted by Indonesian teachers. *LANGKAWI Journal of the Association for Arabic and English*, 4(1), 21-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v4i1.772>
- Huisman, B., Saab, N., Driel, J., & 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>
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 255-286. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(98\)90017-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90017-0)
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.) Cambridge. <https://n9.cl/0a3g2>
- Irvin, L. L. (2010). What is academic writing?. In Ch. Lowe, & P. Zemliansky (Eds.) *Writing spaces: readings on writing* (1st ed., pp. 1-17). Parlor. <https://n9.cl/0soy1>
- Irwin, B. (2017). Written corrective feedback: student preferences and teacher feedback practices. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(2), 35-58. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1167256.pdf>
- Itmeizeh, M. J. (2016). Impact of peer correction on reducing english language students' mistakes in their written essays in PAUC and learners' attitudes towards this technique. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(11), 2068-2078. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0611.02>

- Jaszczur, M. (2018). Effective feedback as a way to improve the quality of teaching [Conference Paper]. 10th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies, Kraków, Poland. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2018.1840>
- Jug, R., Jiang, X. S., & Bean, S. M. (2019). Giving and receiving effective feedback: a review article and how-to guide. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine*, 143(2), 244–250. <https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.2018-0058-RA>
- Kadek, S. L. (2020). The effects of self- and peer- correction techniques on students' writing competency. *Lingua Scientia*, 27(1), 34-44. <https://doi.org/10.23887/lis.v27i1.22524>
- Kalee, S., Rasyid, Y., & Muliastuti, L. (2018). Error analysis on the use of affixation in Indonesian paper written by thai student. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(3), 289-293. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i3.4307>
- Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2019). The effects of written corrective feedback: a critical synthesis of past and present research. *Instructed second language acquisition*, 3(1), 28-52. <https://doi.org/10.1558/isla.37949>
- Karimova, S. K., Nazarova, G. X., & Akiyeva, F. (2021). The role of effective feedback in language teaching. In *E-Conference Globe*, pp. 233-237. <https://n9.cl/btjsoi>
- Khatter, S. (2019). An analysis of the most common essay writing errors among EFL Saudi female learners. *Arab World English Journal*, 10(3), 364-381. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no3.26>
- Kirkgöz, Y. (2010). An analysis of written errors of Turkish adult learners of English. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 4352-4358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.692>
- Kleij, F. (2019). Comparison of teacher and student perceptions of formative assessment feedback practices and association with individual student characteristics. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 175-189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.06.010>
- Klimova, B. F. (2013). The importance of writing. *Paripex - Indian Journal of Research*, 2(1), 9-11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15373/22501991/JAN2013/4>

- Kumala, B. P., Aimah, S. & Ifadah, M.(2018). An analysis of grammatical errors on students' writing. *2 nd English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC)*, 2, 144-149. <https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/ELLIC/article/view/3513>
- Kuyyogsuy, S. (2019). Promoting peer feedback in developing students' English writing ability in L2 writing class. *International Education Studies*, 12(9), 76-90. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n9p76>
- Kuyyogsuy, S. (2019). Students' attitudes toward peer feedback: paving a way for students' English writing improvement. *English Language Teaching*, 12(7), 107-119. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n7p107>
- Lee, I., Luo, N., & Mak, P. (2021). Teachers' attempts at focused written corrective feedback in situ. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 54, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100809>
- Maatouk, Z., & Payant, C. (2020). Moving beyond individual peer review tasks: a collaborative written corrective feedback framework. *BC TEAL Journal*, 5(1), 19-31. <https://ojs-o.library.ubc.ca/index.php/BCTJ/article/view/341>
- Mahmoud, A. (2012). Strategy-based peer assistance in EFL writing: an alternative to traditional peer correction. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(10), 1987-1992. 10.4304/tpis.2.10.1987-1992
- Ministerio de educación de el Ecuador (2016). Introduction English as a foreign language. *Currículos de los niveles de educación obligatorio: nivel bachillerato* (2nd edition., pp. 192-317). Cambridge university.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v8i1.103309>
- Nation, I.S.P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. Routledge.
- Nesterenko, N. (2013). *Introduction to applied linguistics* (1st edition). Ediloja.

- Nurjanah, S. (2017). An analysis of subject-verb agreement errors on students' writing. *The Journal of English Language Teaching In Foreign Context (ELT-Echo)*, 2(1), 13- 25.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.24235/eltecho.v2i1.1590>
- Orbe, M. (2017). *Sentence-level errors in written English essays of selected MAAP Midshipmen: what can we do about it?*. <https://n9.cl/zkgfb>
- Özkul, S., & Ortaçtepe, D. (2017). The use of video feedback in teaching process-approach EFL writing. *Tesol Journal*, 8(4), 862-877. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.362>
- Pangaribuan, T., Haddina, E., & Manik, S. (2018). The students' error in using conjunction (because, since, as, in case) in the sentences. *English language teaching*, 11(4), 91-100. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n4p91>
- Pasaribu, A. N., Pasaribu, T. K., Hutauruk, M. N., & Marbun, L. (2021). Error in Students' Thesis Writing: Syntactical and Morphological Error Analysis. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(4), 8695-8704. <https://n9.cl/apoy3>
- Pham, V. P., Huyen, L. H., & Nguyen, M. T. (2020). The incorporation of qualified peer feedback into writing revision. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 45-59.
<https://caes.hku.hk/ajal/index.php/ajal/article/view/732>
- Pourdana, N., Nour, P., & Yousefi, F. (2021). Investigating metalinguistic written corrective feedback focused on EFL learners' discourse markers accuracy in mobile-mediated context. *Asian. J. Second. Foreign. Lang. Educ*, 6(7), <https://n9.cl/zuv11>
- Qadir, S., Bostanci, H., & Kurt, M. (2021). Writing Apprehension Among English as a Foreign Language Postgraduate. *SAGE Open*, 11(2), 1–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F21582440211007121>
- Quintanilla, A., Kloss, S., & Salcedo P. (2018). How do Chilean pre-service teachers correct errors in writing?. *Revista Brasileira de Lingüística Aplicada*, 18(3).
<https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-6398201812447>

- Rahman, I. A. (2019). Morphological errors analysis on students' synopsis writing. *English Language in Focused (ELIF)*, 1(2), 81-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24853/elif.1.2.81-88>
- Rajab, S., Darus, S., & Aladdin, A. (2016). An investigation of semantic interlingual errors in the writing of Libyan English as foreign language learners. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 7(4). 277-296. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol7no4.18>
- Ramadan, S. (2015). Morphological errors made by Jordanian University students. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 14, 25-31.
<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234693091.pdf>
- Ramírez, I., & Guillén, P. M. (2018). Self and peer correction to improve college students' writing skills. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(2), 179-194.
<https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v20n2.67095>
- Rastgou, A., Storch, N., & Knoch, U. (2020). The effect of sustained teacher feedback on CAF, content and organization in EFL writing. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 8(2), 41-61. <https://dx.doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2020.120888>
- Rini, T. A., & Cahyanto, B. (2020). Supporting elementary students creative writing skill with assessment as learning. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research* 487, 51-57. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201112.010>
- Robles, R. M., & Torres, J. M. (2020). Filipino ESL teachers' attitudes, practices and challenges in using peer correction strategy in teaching writing. *Ciencia (HEALS) humanities, education, arts, language, social sciences*, 1(1), 1-26. <https://n9.cl/sa9ko>
- Rosyada, A., & Sundari, H. (2021). Learning from home environment: academic writing course for EFL undergraduates through google classroom application. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 8(2), 710-725.
<https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i2.18374>
- Rothman, S., & Iverson, M. (2007). The syntax of null subjects in L2 Spanish: comparing two L2 populations under different exposure. *Revista española de lingüística aplicada*, 20, pp. 185-216. <https://n9.cl/3jk95>

- Sakkir, G. (2020). The effectiveness of pictures in enhance writing skill of senior high school students. *INTERFERENCE: Journal of Language, Literature, and Linguistics*, 1(1), <https://ojs.unm.ac.id/INTERFERENCE/article/view/12803/7446>.
- Saputri, N. L. (2017). Morphological and syntactical error analysis on the students' descriptive composition of private vocational high school. *Scope: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(2), 174-184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/scope.v1i02.1353>
- Sato, M. (2017). Oral peer corrective Feedback. In H. Nassaji, & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning* (1st edition). Routledge.
- Selvaraj, M., & Aziz, A. A. (2019). Systematic review: approaches in teaching writing skill in ESL classrooms. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 8(4), 450-473. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v8-i4/6564>
- Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). The impact of teacher corrective feedback on EFL student writers' grammatical improvement. *English Language Teaching*, 10(10), 43-49. 10.5539/elt.v10n10p43
- Sundari, H., & Febriyanti, R. (2017). Writing apprehension in the writing class: Indonesian EFL learners context. *Deiksis*, 9(1), 34-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/deiksis.v9i01.863>
- Susanti, A. (2017). Indonesia teachers' corrective feedback on students' L2 writing: state of the art. *ABJADIA. International Journal of Education*, 2(2), 81-94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18860/abj.v2i2.5364>
- Suzanne, N. (2017). An analysis of preposition errors: The case of in, on, and at. *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 11(1), 13-21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24036/ld.v11i1.7408>

- Tauhidah, R., Yusuf, Y. Q., & Silviyanti, T. M. (2016). Responding and correcting feedbacks of peer correction activity in writing class. *Proceedings of the First Reciprocal Graduate Research Symposium*, 1(1), 151-157. <https://n9.cl/ww5nw>
- Teng, F. (2020). The role of metacognitive knowledge and regulation in mediating university EFL learners' writing performance. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 14(5), 436-450. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2019.1615493>
- Tetreault, J., & Chodorow, M. (2008). The ups and downs of preposition error detection in ESL writing. *In Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Computational Linguistics (Coling 2008)*, 865-872. <https://aclanthology.org/C08-1109.pdf>
- Uymaz, E. (2019). The effects of peer feedback on the essay writing performances of EFL students. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 11(2), 20–37. <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4675-5321>
- Wahyuni, S. (2018). Peer correction on writing quality of college students having different cognitive styles. *Inferensi*, 12(2), 259-282. <https://doi.org/10.18326/infsl3.v12i2.259-282>
- Wang, W., & Wen, Q. (2002). L1 use in the L2 composing process: an exploratory study of 16 Chinese EFL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11(3), 225-246. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(02\)00084-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00084-X)
- Westmacott, A. (2017). Direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback: student perceptions. *Íkala revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 22(1), 17-32. <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n01a02>
- Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven Keys to Effective Feedback. *Educational Leadership*, 70(1), 10-16. <https://n9.cl/l8xf>
- Yang, S. (2020). Critical pedagogy for foreign-language writing. *UC Berkeley*, 12(2), 110-127. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L212245911>

Zhan, L. (2016). Written teacher feedback: student perceptions, teacher perceptions, and actual teacher performance. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 73-84.

10.5539/elt.v9n8p73

Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., & Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL students' preferences for written corrective feedback: do error types, language proficiency, and foreign language enjoyment matter?. *Front psychol*, 12, 1-12.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.3389%2Ffpsyg.2021.660564>

Zhang, Z. V., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 36, 90-102.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004>

Appendixes

Appendix A. Rubric

PARAMETERS	EXCELLENT (10 - 7.6)	GOOD (7.5 - 5.1)	FAIR (5 - 2.6)	POOR (2.5 - 0)
SEMANTIC CRITERIA 6	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 8	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 + c	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 +	Some of the words, phrases, and sentences were complete (50%). There were still several sentences (50%) that were underdeveloped. Some sentences followed an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type	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

	omplement, depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)	verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)	of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)	respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)
MORPHOLOGICAL CRITERIA 3	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 5	Capitalization, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes are used appropriately. No errors were made in spelling and part of speech.	Capitalization, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes are used somewhat appropriately. Few errors were made in spelling.	Capitalization, paragraphing, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes were not used very appropriately. These errors make it more difficult to understand the message or meaning of the writing. Frequent errors made	Capitalization, paragraphing, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes were not used appropriately (or were not found in writing). These errors make it hard to understand the meaning/message of the writing due to these errors.

			in spelling.	Numerous errors made in spelling.
--	--	--	--------------	-----------------------------------

Appendix B. Peer feedback checklist

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

Appendix C. Students survey

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