



**UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA PARTICULAR DE LOJA**  
*La Universidad Católica de Loja*

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

**CARRERA DE CIENCIAS DE LA EDUCACIÓN**

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

Trabajo de titulación previo a la obtención del título de:

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

**Autora:** Jiménez Collahuazo, Luz Marianela

**Directora:** Morocho Pintado, Cristina Kathalina

CARIAMANGA

2022



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

2022



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

2022

## **Aprobación del director del trabajo de titulación**

Loja, 02 de de septiembre del 2022

Magíster

Alba Bitalina Vargas Saritama

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

Ciudad.-

De mi consideración:

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

Particular que comunico para los fines pertinentes.

Atentamente,

Mgr. Cristina Kathalina Morocho Pintado

C.I: 1104869795

### **Declaración de autoría y cesión de derechos**

“Yo, Luz Marianela Jiménez Collahuazo, declaro y acepto en forma expresa lo siguiente:

- Ser autora del Trabajo de Titulación denominado: The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students, específicamente de los contenidos comprendidos en: se debe colocar los nombres de los capítulos elaborados en el Trabajo de Titulación, por ejemplo. Introducción, Capítulo 1. Literature review, Capítulo 2. Method, Capítulo 3. Description, interpretation and analysis of results, Conclusiones y Recomendaciones, siendo Mgtr. Cristina Kathalina Morocho Pintado, directora del presente trabajo; y, en tal virtud, eximo expresamente a la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja y a sus representantes legales de posibles reclamos o acciones judiciales o administrativas, en relación a la propiedad intelectual. Además, ratifico que las ideas, conceptos, procedimientos y resultados vertidos en el presente trabajo investigativo son de mi exclusiva responsabilidad.
- Que mi obra, producto de mis actividades académicas y de investigación, forma parte del patrimonio de la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja, de conformidad con el artículo 20, literal j), de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior; y, artículo 91 del Estatuto Orgánico de la UTPL, que establece: “Forman parte del patrimonio de la Universidad la propiedad intelectual de investigaciones, trabajos científicos o técnicos y tesis de grado que se realicen a través, o con el apoyo financiero, académico o institucional (operativo) de la Universidad”.
- Autorizo a la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja para que pueda hacer uso de mi obra con fines netamente académicos, ya sea de forma impresa, digital y/o electrónica o por cualquier medio conocido o por conocerse, sirviendo el presente instrumento como la fe de mi completo consentimiento; y, para que sea ingresada al Sistema Nacional de Información de la Educación Superior del Ecuador para su difusión pública, en cumplimiento del artículo 144 de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior.

Firma:

Autor: Luz Marianela Jiménez Collahuazo

C.I.: 1720634722

### **Dedication**

This work is dedicated to my daughters Leslie and Josselyn Imaicela Jiménez. A special feeling of love and gratitude to my beloved brother César Jimenez, who has always been my support and inspiration to accomplish this goal. Besides, to my especial gratitude to the tutor of my thesis Mgtr. Cristina Morocho for help guidance to finish my objective.

Marianela

## **Acknowledgement**

My profound gratitude to Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja and all my teachers for providing me with information and instilling in me the virtues necessary to succeed in life. I would also like to express my gratitude to my tutor, Mgtr. Alba Vargas, for her unwavering support and patience in helping me complete this assignment.

Marianela

## Contents

Cover.....	I
Aprobación del director del trabajo de titulación.....	II
Declaración de autoría y cesión de derechos.....	III
Dedication .....	V
Acknowledgement.....	VI
Contents.....	VII
Abstract .....	1
Resumen.....	2
Introduction .....	3
Chapter one .....	5
Literature review.....	5
Writing in the efl context.....	5
The importance of writing in the efl students .....	6
Challenges in efl writing .....	7
The most common and frequent written errors: morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors .....	9
Written corrective feedback (WCF) on EFL learners .....	12
The importance of effective feedback.....	13
Written peer correction.....	14
Written teacher feedback.....	16
Previous studies related to the effects of error feedback in second language students .....	17
Chapter two .....	20
Method .....	20
Setting and participants .....	20
Procedure .....	20
Chapter three .....	22
Description, interpretation and analysis of results .....	22
Conclusions.....	37
Recommendations .....	38
References.....	39
Appendix .....	48

**List of tables**

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

### **Abstract**

The purpose of this study is to investigate the role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students focusing on the efficacy for the reducing the number of semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors. Twenty-six students from second grade of a high school located at an urban area of Azuay province was selected as a sample. The participants were asked to write eight paragraphs of 120 –150 words; two of them were the pre and the post-test which have the topic “My future plans” while the other six paragraphs were about different themes according to the curriculum. Written paragraphs were provided both teacher and peer feedback. The findings shown that the most frequent errors were morphological including omission (‘s’, preposition, ‘Be’, article); followed by semantic errors (literal translation, collocation, and lexical grammar). Regarding teacher feedback, students have positive perceptions because comments and suggestions to improve their pieces of writing were provided. However, peer correction was not positive at all because of students’ lack of knowledge and experience when correcting their classmates’ written pieces.

*Key words:* peer correction, writing skill, teacher feedback.

## Resumen

El propósito de este estudio es investigar el rol de corrección entre pares y retroalimentación del maestro para mejorar habilidades de escritura en estudiantes de secundaria, para reducir errores semánticos, sintácticos y morfológicos. 26 estudiantes de segundo grado de una escuela secundaria ubicada en la provincia del Azuay fueron tomados como muestra. Se solicitó a los participantes que escribieran ocho párrafos de 120 – 150 palabras, dos de ellos fueron el pre y post-test tienen como tema “Mis planes futuros” mientras que para los otros seis párrafos se utilizaron diferentes temas según el currículo. Los párrafos escritos recibieron retroalimentación de profesores y compañeros. Los errores más frecuentes fueron morfológicos, incluida la omisión ('s' - 'es' - 'ing' y 'er', preposición, 'Be', artículo); seguido de errores semánticos (traducción literal, colocación y gramática léxica). Sobre la retroalimentación de profesores, los estudiantes tienen percepciones positivas porque les brindan comentarios, sugerencias para mejorar sus escritos. Sin embargo, la retroalimentación de los compañeros no fue positiva del todo debido a la falta de conocimiento y experiencia de los estudiantes al momento de corregir sus escritos.

*Palabras clave:* retroalimentación de compañeros, habilidad de escritura, retroalimentación del profesor.

## Introduction

The role of writing in English has been considered as the most important factor in providing information around the world. In this sense, students need to acquire new knowledge such as the use of correct grammar, punctuation, spelling, and so on to provide an effective and understandable message for readers (Ria & Setiawan, 2022).

Besides, writing is considered the most important skills by researchers from the other three concerning listening, speaking, and reading since writing is seen not only a finished product towards thinking about writing as a process. Consequently, teachers have to focus their attention to help students improve errors, especially the syntactic, morphologic, and semantic aspects of EFL writing.

This research aims to analyze the differences between peer correction and teacher feedback and their efficacy for the improvement of morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors in EFL writing and the perception of students towards these teaching techniques.

Two questions were stated to identify the type of feedback students selected such as a) Which are the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of the morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors? and b) Which type of feedback: peer correction and teacher feedback do EFL students prefer writing?

This research work includes three chapters; the first chapter deals with academic and scientific information related to this study. The second one refers to the method used to collect data. Regarding the third chapter, it makes reference to the analysis, description, and interpretation of data. Finally, some conclusions and recommendations are included.

Some previous studies focused on the role of peer correction and teacher feedback to improve writing skills have been analyzed and selected. In this context, a study led by Bhuana and El Fauziah (2021), attempted to investigate English foreign language students' emotive answer to the teachers' written corrective feedback. To collect the data, a qualitative method was used. The researchers found that the teachers' written corrective feedback had undesirable effect to the students' feelings, particularly for the students who had standard and low expertise level in writing; consequently, this strategy also demotivates students. Thus, the

researchers endorse teachers contemplate numerous possessions before they give some written feedback as it can disturb the scholars' attitude in a negative way.

A study done by Suryani et al. (2019) aimed to investigate the result of peer feedback on students' writing skills and the scholars' observations on the training of peer feedback. The study found that students who were provided peer feedback had better writing skills than those who were given teacher feedback. Besides, the researchers found that students had positive perceptions of writing since peer feedback helps them become less stressed.

In the same token a study conducted by Egred (2022) aimed to analyze the differences between peer correction and teacher feedback and their effectiveness in improving morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors. The results revealed that the combination of both peer and teacher feedback were effective in helping students reduce semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors. The study also found that students prefer both types of feedback, however hesitate to fully assume their evaluative role during the implementation of peer correction.

The present research will contribute not only to English teacher, but also to all professionals interested in knowing how to provide effective feedback in the educational field. Besides, this study will benefit for future researchers to continue the investigation in the use of peer or teacher feedback strategy. It will also help students for Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja to distinguish what type of feedback is adequate for their future students.

## **Chapter one**

### **Literature review**

This chapter provides information to the current study. In terms of writing skills, their importance, challenges, and the most common and frequent written errors such as morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors. Besides, written corrective feedback on EFL learners, importance of effective feedback, written peer/teacher feedback, its definition, characteristics, importance, advantages, and disadvantages. At the end of it, previous studies related to the topic will be drawn.

#### **Writing in the EFL context**

In the EFL context, writing is perceived as one of the main skills that scholars require to master to become effective communicators (Abdelmohsen et al., 2020). In this context, Al-Ani (2017) mentions that writing is considered one of the salient skills that students have to dominate because it demands a more considerable in-depth acquaintance of the grammar scheme and writing agreements than other open aids.

Consequently, students are taught to apply rules in written form where the English syllabus aims to improve learners' English language skills with an importance of writing. This is because writing is adjudicated as crucial skill that students are required to be adept to fulfill the need in the educational field nowadays. Besides, it allows students to communicate their ideas or thoughts with clarity and ease to the reader audience (Eck, 2022).

Writing is a process developed in each stage where learners are engaged in a determined activity. In this context, Ria and Setiawan (2022) claim that there are four stages in the writing process that are planning, drafting, revising, and editing. In the first stage, students plan what they are going to write, in the second stage; students write their first draft of their written piece, in the third stage; students check their pieces in order to correct any possible mistake, and in the fourth and last stage; students edit their final written piece, checking punctuation, spelling, and mistakes in general.

Talib and Cheung (2017) claim that writing skill helps recover learners' labor through the development of collaboration and interaction. Consequently, teachers have to use this type of strategy since collaborative writing is effective in text coherence, grammar, and cohesion. Besides, it helps scholars' writing quality not only in grammar and vocabulary but also in content and organization of the ideas. When students are assigned to work collaborately they share ideas and support each other to attain the objective of the activity and obtain a better product.

Rusinovci (2022) refers to the process approach which is focused on how a text is written instead of how is the final product. In this sense, this approach is based on three phases such as pre-writing, drafting, evaluating, and revising. The pre-writing activity is the stage where students are involved with strategies to help them discover and get into the topic. Then, students are asked for many drafts of a written work. In this stage, discussion and feedback activities provided by readers help the writers to check their drafts. To make effective the draft process the author suggests integrating the following steps in teaching writing: generating ideas (pre-writing); writing the first draft with an emphasis on content (discovering meaning) since the writer, the content and the purpose, and the many drafts are the key elements of a writing process.

To conclude, Rusinovci (2022) mentions two types of approaches that integrate the teaching writing process, as the genre approach and the process approach. In this gap, planning, drafting, conferencing, editing and peer review are elements of the process approach. While considering and understanding the purpose, audience, and context are the components of the genre approach.

### **The importance of writing in the EFL students**

Writing is a vital ability that will benefit students the rest of the scholars' lives. Familiarizing and working on writing with current actions in schools, could surge learners' self-assurance and they will fall in love with writing on an extensive path. In this context, writing skills are vital for lower primary pupils to endure learning in all academic areas, communication, and self-expression. In addition, writing training in schools encourages the

perfection of penmanship as well as overall academic advance. Furthermore, as a consequence of sharing general information, vocabulary, and basic knowledge, students will become more empowered as writers, and how they engage with their tasks (Moses & Mohamad, 2019).

In this context, Chorfi et al. (2022) agree with Mosses and Mohamad (2019) in terms that writing activities require to be introduced to scholars since elementary school so that the learners can create effective fragments of writing later. Even though, there are many topics in elementary schools, writing is known as one of the maximum vital theoretical themes for pupils.

Writing is a skill that encompasses numerous aspects, but is a key for English language learners. For instance, grammar knowledge is one of the essential aspects of effective writing, especially in organizing ideas, creating, and as well as decoding concepts into understandable writings (Alharthi, 2021). In the same way, learners have to be adept writers in order to contribute to a literate society since writing aids are fundamental factors of literacy. Meanwhile, writing skills are important nowadays for the increasing society literacy and changes in technology have altered and the author hopes it will continue rising in the next decades by changing the way how people will use language to think and communicate.

Cer (2019) points out that writing is important because it is a unique mode of learning since it involves active brain participation. Moreover, this skill improves students' language, develops cognitive functions of the brain, and enhances intellectual writing skill. In terms of effective writing, it occurs by reinforcing the learning process and combining eye, hand, and brain all together, concentration is vital to present a good result.

### **Challenges in EFL writing**

According to Pangaribuan and Manik (2018) lack of grammar and limited vocabulary are the challenges students face in the writing skill the most. Consequently, students are not able to formulate ideas from their minds into written language. Besides this, students have problems organizing and expressing their proposition to write. In this context, students should

use the prewriting techniques because they help them to organize their ideas before the real writing comes.

As writing demands to have not only grammatical and rhetorical strategies but also judgemental and conceptual basics, students face challenges in their writing tasks. In this sense, writing has to be learned and trained progressively to help the learners master it well. In terms of complexity, many people affirm that writing is difficult because it requires much time, much effort, and great attention towards the theme (Pangaribuan & Manik, 2018). Hence, writing is an intricate activity for foreign language learners since it requires a self-confident level of writing resolutions, grammar, linguistic knowledge, and vocabulary. This skill also needs thinking techniques that let the language learners to declare themselves proficiently in the other language (Tanis et al., 2020).

Other challenges that students face when writing English are not only the ability to use structures but also conceptual of varied skills, for example, mechanical and stylistic skills. Mechanical refers to the use of adequately those agreements unusual to the written language such as spelling and punctuation. While stylistic skill is in charge of employing sentences and using language efficiently. In addition, word and sentences level mistakes in writing language are problems students faced while in class (Graham & Hall, 2016). However, Budiharto (2019) found that lexicosemantic errors, prepositions, errors with verbs, and articles are the most common errors that students have in their writing tasks. Thus, the author illustrates that the learners write without any planning or purposeless. For Derakhshan and Karimian (2020) punctuation, spelling, and organization problems are challenges that learners face in their writing. So the authors recommend students take an intensive English lesson before they take the main course of their esteemed range.

Finally, Anh (2019) mentions that writing is affected by various factors such as the teaching methods, the material, and the students themselves; for instance, it is recommendable for teachers raise pupils' motivation and awareness through improving the feedback by developing writing materials.

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

As learning a language face many challenges, it needs consistent effort to overlook problems in writing skill. Thus, teachers have to find current trends to help students in organizing, creating, and deciphering ideas in their writing pieces. In this sense, Eshghinejad (2016) mentions that English as foreign language learners face critical issues in ineffectiveness, writing fluency, spelling and grammatical errors, and vocabulary misuse areas. In this gap, the author thinks that the key to writing fluency is by offering motivation to the English language learners to write as much and as often as possible. Thus the author suggests tutors increase conducive environments where students can frequently write topics related to their interests but are guided by their educators. When students have finished their writing, it is recommendable, that teachers provide feedback to help learners to improve their tasks.

A study carried out by Shousha et al. (2020) found that students' writing errors primarily fall in the category of grammar and syntax. In terms of syntactic errors, Journal and Alqhtani (2018) classified into seven syntactic subcategories such as adverbial-relative clauses, sentence structure, conjunctions, verbs, articles, and prepositions. In the same way, Alqhtani (2018) found that the most frequent errors in writing tasks are preposition and syntactical errors.

In this gap, Alqhtani (2018) defines syntax as the discipline of linguistics that consolidates the construction of sentences. In other words, syntax refers to the structure of sentences and how the sentences are built grammatically regardless of the transmission of meaning. Grammar is considered the umbrella of syntax, thus, Alharthi (2021) defines grammar as a set of mechanical rubrics that commands the structure of clauses, sentences, words, and phrases in a determined language. Besides, the author informs that the category of grammar factors include: accidence (inflection of words), and orthography (spellings), but syntax refers to the structure of sentences that are necessary to make an effective and understandable piece of writing.

A study done by Gayo and Widodo (2018) found the following syntactic errors: comparative and superlative adjectives, prepositions and temporal specify, word order, concord, lexis, intensifier, determines and quantifies, interrogative, verbal forms, pronouns, and tense-related forms. These results revealed that most of the errors were the result of the transfer of learning from mother tongue to the target language, the intricacy of the target language, overgeneralization, lack of concentration, inadequate learning, and native language interference. While a study addressed to types of grammatical errors, Hourani (2008) the errors were classified into verb tense and form, passivization, subject-verb agreement, word order, articles, prepositions, auxiliaries, and plurals.

In this sense a study led by Gedion et al. (2016) found that the first frequent errors were associated with verbs, the second ones with spelling, the third ones with sentence fragments and the fourth ones with punctuation. Concluding that these type of errors were the result of mother tongue interference, insufficient grammar and vocabulary knowledge, repetition, redundant lexical choice, bad sentence formation and developmental errors. In terms of punctuation, Alamin and Ahmed (2012) define it as simply a device or making it easy to read and understand written or printed matter. The data obtained from the students, their examination and homework assignments, has shown that Capitalization, the use of comma and semicolon were among others are most common punctuation errors, mention the authors. In this context, the authors have noticed punctuation to be extremely difficult and confusing for many ESL/EFL students.

Regarding sentence fragments, Yuliah et al. (2019) remark that a sentence fragment is a sentence that is missing either its subject or its main verb. Besides, the authors mention that some sentence fragments happen as the effect of simple typographical mistakes or omission of words.

In terms of morphologic errors, Sari et al. (2021) divide them in a) affixation related errors, b) compound related errors, c) failure to use the marker (-er), d) conversion related errors, and e) using of plural in noun phrases. The first one deals with misuse of either prefixes or suffixes. To make more understandable, the authors make a subdivision, such as errors

arising from the wrong use of prefixes e.g. *You are diskind (unkind)*, it is insignificant (insignificant). In this case, the error is produced when students are trying to create new words or give antonyms of specific words; and errors arising from wrong use of suffixes which are subdivided into morphological errors arising as a result of wrong insertion of past tense e.g. *the crow putted the cake down*; and errors made as a result of analogous use of certain suffixes e.g. *the tortoise ran speedly*. The second one, refers to the combinations of at least two free morphemes e.g. *bookshop*. The third one is made when learners try to use of the marker (-er) e.g. *your sister is the cooker of the tea*. The fourth one, in this case, errors are made also in conversion-related in the written responses of the subject e.g. *the crow will feeling hungry*. The last one is occurred when writers are using the noun phrases in the sentence e.g. *the milk powders was put in the glass*.

About omission, Yusuf et al. (2021) emphasize that omission refers to the deviation identified by the absence of words or parts of words in a sentence. Besides, the author mention that this type of errors occurred because students omit some required components in their sentences. Consequently, learners may leave out necessary parts of grammatically correct sentences, for example “my father a teacher” for “my father is a teacher.” The author conclude that omission errors are caused by the interlingual, and intralingual. In the interlingual category, errors committed by students happen because they bring the structural similarities from their native language to bear on the target language. While interlingual transfer is from the native language to the target language, there are also errors caused by mixing between elements in the target language.

Tanpoco et al. (2019) mention that semantic errors are other kind of errors that student make, in their study, they attempted to find out interlanguage transfer errors evident in the written outputs of schools/colleges and their implications to the new educational program. Two types of errors are drawn: a) *I love working out myself* and b) *where all my sacrifices and hardwork will be just a trash*. In this case, it is noticeable that there is literal translation.

Regarding collocation, Ye (2019) defines it term as the combination of words which occur naturally with greater than random frequency. Additionally, collocation is divided in two

aspects such as semantic collocation and grammatical collocation. Additionally, Othman (2017) assures that lexicogrammatical choice errors occur when the learners substitute a word from a particular grammatical category with another grammatical category. Thus, students usually make these type of errors, for example, adjectives are placed instead of nouns, nouns in place of adjectives, adjectives in place adverbs, and adverbs in place of Adjectives.

### **Written corrective feedback (WCF) on EFL learners**

How educators correct learners writing skills have converted an attracted matter to be deliberated. In this context, Bhuana and El Fauziah (2021) claim that the teachers' technique to correct the students' errors production in writing is defined as written corrective feedback. This strategy is provided to guide students and help them to rewrite their writing.

However, for Nassaji and Kartchava (2017) corrective feedback are remarks that make students aware that the production is erroneous in a determinate way. Thus, it implies the way teachers show the student the situation in which his or her work is, whether it is right or wrong. This action helps the student to realize his/her mistake and correct it. Futhermore, corrective feedback is addressed to linguistic, content, organization, and even discourse and pragmatic errors since it can be provided both written or in orally way.

In this context, corrective feedback can be provided both directly through overt correction or indirectly way through strategies that signal the students that their productions have errors. Besides, it can be provided as a repetition form made by students or clarification requests, confirmation checks, and other instruction to help the students to know the failure to understand the message by the interlocutor (Nassaji, 2015).

In line with Nassaji and Kartchava (2017) Karim and Nassaji (2019) agree that WCF may include a wide variety of responses, ranging from implicit, for example, indirect feedback which occurs when the teacher does not provide students with the correct form, and direct feedback that occurs when the teacher provides students the correct form.

In addition, the authors claim that (WCF) is an essential component of second language teaching. Nevertheless, WCF has been investigated by many authors and has been found as an issue of considerable debate in the literature. In this context, some researchers have stressed its importance while others have expressed doubt concerning its effectiveness.

In view that researchers have focussed on the WCF as negative to facilitate the acquisition of the target feature, Budiana and Mahmud (2020) has been focussed on the WCF as a positive element to enhance the quality of a written text. Although it has been a controversy on what kind of feedback is more effective, some investigators, have contended that direct feedback is more effective as it specifies how the error should be modified. Others, however, have argued that indirect feedback is higher to direct feedback as it helps learners become independent students and hence it involves students in problem-solving (Ng & Ishak, 2018; Nusrat et al., 2019). Still, others have claimed that diverse types of corrective feedback contribute to language learning differently, and consequently, the use of feedback should be measured more as a substance of appropriateness than supremacy (Ha & Murray, 2020).

### **The importance of effective feedback**

Providing feedback in the process of writing learning is beneficial since students have to be more concentrated on what is being learned. Besides, feedback does not only offer benefits for students but also for teachers, since it provides information about individual and collective lessons evolution because feedback demonstrates how tutors are teaching. While for students, error correction is an ongoing form of assessment that is more focused than marks or grades. In conclusion, feedback allows students to enhance their learning process (Wahyuni, 2018).

Many studies found the results contradictory in terms of correction. In this vein, Truscott (2007) argues that error correction has to be abandoned in writing courses because it distracts energy and time away from the more creative characteristics of a writing sequencer. In the same way, Zhang and Hyland (2018) found that the corrections are not so important to learners' writing advance. The authors emphasize that the developments made during

modifications are not obvious on the effectiveness of correction for enhancing scholars' writing skill.

In the same way, Ryan and Henderson (2018) claim that feedback is beneficial for students since it allows them to obtain valuable information about how they can improve their future performance and learning strategies. Although, some researchers have found that learners dislike some types of comments, especially when those produce negative emotional responses. In this gap, the authors suggest teachers modify feedback practices in order avoid them to be discouraged, upset, critical, sad, shameful, and angry as a result of the feedback comments.

A study done by Budianto et al. (2020) aimed at finding out the influence of different feedback styles as indirect and direct corrective feedback, they found that the direct corrective feedback (DCF) is more influential than indirect corrective feedback (ICF) since it contributes meaningfully to progress scholars' English as a foreign language writing, unrelatedly of the scholars' level of expertise, this can be low or high. In other words, direct corrective feedback is beneficial for students with low or high ability in the writing process.

Finally, when dealing with writing characteristics locally or globally, feedback is supportive for students to enhance their writing aptitude. Besides, it leads to a significant effect on language use, mechanics, vocabulary, content, and organization. In this context, several researchers have investigated written corrective feedback, concluding that students need corrective feedback to progress the quality of writing. In this respect, without feedback, beginners will not improve language development (Kim et al., 2020).

### **Written peer correction**

According to Wahyuni (2018) peer correction means having other writers read and giving corrections on what other writers have written. In other words, peer correction is the process where scholars have to read and provide corrections, comments, and proposals on the writing quality of other partners. In addition, the author claims that peer correction could be an alternative technique to enhance learners' writing in the classroom. Moreover, students

get language input by applying the peer correction strategy, especially when the class size becomes problematic.

Concerning importance, Giri (2018) points out that peer-feedback is more eloquent than teacher feedback and has positive effects on classroom composition dynamics. Since students are allowed to find their errors and contemplate of the manners or procedures to correct them. Besides, this type of feedback is effective and engages students only when they are given time and opportunity to discovery their own errors and correct them before their teachers check them.

In terms of characteristics, Selvaraja and Aziz (2019) claim that peer feedback allows students to identify the weak and strong points in their draft, learn more about their revision and writing, and hence improve their writing proficiency and convert autonomous apprentices.

For Valero et al. (2019) peer feedback creates opportunities to interact among partners, creates a source of information, and gives them a sense of group cohesion and negotiation of meaning. Moreover, peer feedback generates a real audience in the gap as the reader will let the writer know if the message needs clarification. Finally, interactions and cooperation among students are allowed by using the peer feedback strategy. In addition, Alharthi (2021) mentions that peer feedback helps students acquire experiences. In terms of problem detection, writers distinguish in an effective way the types of writing problems so, they can discover and apply different revision techniques (Patchan & Schunn, 2015).

Concerning Ala et al. (2021) peer feedback has the following advantages: students make a reflection on their works, collaborate among them, help other students reflect on their mistakes, increase communication, and self-and peer assessment. In the same way using peer feedback in the classroom, for example it allows students to feel more relaxed and self-condient when carrying out communicative tasks with their peers instead than their teachers.

However, García et al. (2017) mention that this strategy offers some disadvantages. First of all, they comment that peer feedback lacks remedial power. Second, students avoid negotiation and just focus on job accomplishment. Finally, students discernments of one another may delay the efficiency of peer collaboration. In conclusion, Brown (2017) found that

teachers avoid using peer correction techniques due to inherent difficulties, for example, possible lack of objectivity and students feeling insecurity about peer's level of knowledge.

### **Written teacher feedback**

Cheng and Zhang (2021) define teacher written feedback as the action when tutors provide written feedback on students' text by analyzing the language, content, and organization. Teachers categorize language as local feedback and global feedback. In this sense, Yunus (2020) claims that written teacher feedback is very important since it assists students in the improvement of writing skills. Focusing on five different categories of feedback, such as content, grammar, organization, vocabulary, and spelling. Besides, organization, content, grammar, and vocabulary. In addition, written teacher feedback benefits students learning, as it provides them with a deep insight into their presentation, permitting them to distinguish the facets they require to improve.

Regarding written teacher feedback characteristics, Bhuana and El Fauziah (2021) identify two (direct and indirect). The first one is the phase where teachers identify the errors then, clarify the ideas, and next provide the correct form. In this gap, the authors mention that feedback also is known as metalinguistic; this stage is related to information provided by the teacher about the errors. The second phase is the indirect form, it is the section where teachers do not offer any correction. However, the teacher shows the mistakes and allows the learners to make their corrections.

About the advantages that teacher feedback offers students in their writing skills, Zhan (2016) showed that learners assumed more teacher feedback and made better enhancements in forms and the content of their reviewed drafts as associated with peers' feedback, since, written teacher feedback has a significant role in refining students' writing skills. But, this strategy not only provides an important occasion for individualized or contextualized instruction from teachers but it is also seriously assumed by students.

Regarding disadvantages of teacher feedback, Suryani et al. (2019) mention that if only one type of feedback is used in excess or if the learners are continuously criticized, students will tend to increase their frustration and demotivation; consequently it constitutes a

drawback to progress in students writing. In line with Suryani et al. (2019), Van and Nguyen (2021) claim that students can be discouraged when using too much error rectification. Besides, the author recommends teachers avoid feedback that makes students' ideas contradict because they can feel they are pressured to admit the corrections they make to their written pieces.

### **Previous studies related to the effects of error feedback in second language students**

The following section deals with information related to the role of peer and teacher feedback. A study carried out by Budiana and Mahmud (2020) aimed to investigate the students' affective reactions toward indirect WCF in the process of learning writing. A descriptive qualitative method was used to collect data. Interview and writing assignments were employed as instruments. This type of feedback is suggested under the contemplation that educators are not editors, but facilitators who provide suggestions to support learners' work on their writing. The study found positive affective reactions towards the implementation of Indirect WCF since students believe that this strategy is useful, helpful, motivating, corrective, and informative for them. Besides, indirect WCF helped students gain better excellence in their writing by reducing the number of errors after receiving feedback.

A study led by Bhuana and El Fauziah (2021), attempted to investigate English foreign language students' emotive answer to the teachers' written corrective feedback. To collect the data, a qualitative method was used. Seventy-two students of third grade were taken as sample. A five-point Likert scale questionnaire and a semi-structured interview were used as techniques to gather the information. The researchers found that the teachers' written corrective feedback had undesirable effect to the students' feelings, particularly for the students who had standard and low expertise level in writing; consequently, this strategy also demotivates students. Thus the researchers endorse teachers contemplate numerous possessions before they give some written feedback as it can disturb the scholars' attitude in a negative way.

A study done by Suryani et al. (2019) aimed to investigate the result of peer feedback on students' writing skills and the scholars' observations on the training of peer feedback. The

mix method was used to analyze, compare, and contrast the information. Seventy students from eleventh grade were involved in the present study to gather data. In this context, students were divided into two groups. The first one was provided peer feedback while the other group was provided teacher feedback. A post-test and a semi-structured interview were used as a technique while the post-test was used as the semi-structured interview to know students' perceptions of the peer feedback. The study found that students who were provided peer feedback had better writing skills than those who were given teacher feedback. Besides, the researchers found that students had positive perceptions of writing since peer feedback helps them become less stressed.

A study conducted by Egred (2022) aimed to analyze the differences between peer correction and teacher feedback and their effectiveness in improving morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors. Qualitative and quantitative methods were used to collect the information. Thirty students from their second year of high school were taken as a sample. Class observation and surveys were used as techniques to gather the data. A pre-test, written compositions, a post-test, and questionnaires were used as instruments. The results revealed that the combination of both peer and teacher feedback was effective in helping students reduce semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors. The study also found that students prefer both types of feedback, however hesitate to fully assume their evaluative role during the implementation of peer correction.

A study managed by Wahyuni (2018) aimed at investigating the effect of peer correction on the writing quality of college students' having different cognitive styles. Students' cognitive styles and a Group Embedded Figure Test (GEFT) were used to collect data. Two groups of students were taken as a sample. For one group peer correction was applied while for the other group, self-correction on their writings was applied. Students writing quality, and written tests were used as instruments. To test the hypotheses, and analysis of covariate (ANCOVA) was used. The study found that both types of corrections, peer and self-corrections, and students' cognitive styles, field dependent and field independent, significantly

affect the students' writing quality. However, the types of correction and cognitive styles do not affect students' writing quality at the same time.

A study directed by Nusrat et al. (2019) whose purpose is to investigate the effect of teacher feedback on the written English as Second Language (ESL). In this sense, a mixed method was used to gather information. Ninety students were used as a sample. Three different types of feedback; oral meta-linguistic, also called direct feedback; written indirect feedback, and no feedback) were provided for learners to identify their writing errors, for example, verb tenses, use of articles, and prepositions. A pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed test were used as instruments to collect data. The research found that by using oral meta-linguistic and teacher feedback in the classrooms, students can progress in the writing skills.

## **Chapter two**

### **Method**

#### **Setting and participants**

This study was conducted in a high school urban area located in Azuay province in Ecuador. Twenty-six students were taken into consideration as sample. Students' ages range from 16 to 18 who were enrolled in 2nd grade of high school. The participants were integrated by the English teacher, including 12 females and 14 males. It was noticed that their proficiency in English is really low according to the results obtained in the pre-test. Additionally, the survey was addressed online while the data was collected face-to-face.

#### **Procedure**

In order to fulfill the general objective of the research project, it was necessary to carry out an accurate investigation with the aim of getting genuine results. For this, a mixed-method that included the use of quantitative and qualitative approaches was used to compare, analyze and contrast the data during the whole research process.

About instruments to gather information, a pre-test, a post-test, an online survey to know students' perception about teacher and peer feedback, a rubric to correct semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors and to provide teacher feedback and a checklist to examine peer correction were used in the present study.

Eight paragraphs with a length of 120 to 150 words each, was required from students. In this sense, the first paragraph deals with the pre-test and the last paragraph refers to the post-test. The topic for both pre and post-test was "My future plans" which was provided by the teacher. Regarding the topics for peer correction the following were the ones students worked with: "The importance of communication in society", "Differences between virtual and face to face education", and "Public and private education". While for teacher correction were: "How to take care of the environment", "Teenage brain is equal to an adult brain? Why?" and "What is your wish in life".

The data collected from pre-test was to know about students' level of English knowledge, in which those paragraphs were assigned a mark to be used for analysis and contrast with the post-test. Regarding second, fourth, and sixth paragraphs, students were asked to write a 120 – 150 words paragraph then, those paragraphs were provided teacher feedback in terms of semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors. In all paragraphs, students were provided suggestions and comments to improve their pieces of writing

Nevertheless, third, fifth, and seven paragraphs were used to ask students to provide feedback to their peers. In all paragraphs, students were provided suggestions and comments to improve their pieces of writing. However, students were not able to provide comments or any suggestions, they were limited to make signs, circles, and so on.

Regarding the paragraph number eight, students were asked to write the same topic as the pre-test to know whether they have improved or not their writing skills. At the end of this process, students were asked to answer an online survey including twelve statements to know the students' perceptions regarding peer correction and teacher feedback.

After recollecting information and expanding knowledge, it was necessary to select a group from which the information could be gathered. Then, once the samples were collected, it was necessary to organize the data. For this, the data were tabulated and analyzed meticulously in order to corroborate or contradict the data previously collected. Furthermore this information was necessary to make conclusions and recommendations.

## Chapter three

### Description, interpretation and analysis of results

This section includes the analysis, interpretation, and description of the results gathered during the present study. Three tables were used to compare the data. The first one deals with information related to the pre and post-test. The second table involves information about teacher and peer feedback. And the last one, provides information about students' perception regarding peer and teacher feedback concerning morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors.

**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
5.00	6.50	1.12

Twenty-six students from second-grade of senior high school were asked to write eight paragraphs of 120 -150 words including a pre-test and post-test to contrast the progress of students' pieces of writing. A rubric including morphological, semantic, and syntactic aspects was used to know the most frequent errors among students. Particularly, after the errors were identified, those were provided feedback to avoid students make the same type of errors in the writing of the next paragraphs.

According to the results in table 1, 5.00 out of 10 as the rate found in the pre-test and 6.50 out of 10 in the post-test. While, the variance rate was 1.12. Regarding errors in the pre-test, 178 were found, including: morphologic 68, syntactic 53, and semantic 62. On the other hand, in the post-test, 96 errors were found including: morphological 30, semantic 31, and syntactic 35. The results generated in line with the pre-test and post-test show that students writing performance had an improvement.

Regarding errors in the pre-test, 178 were found, including: morphologic 68, syntactic 53, and semantic 62; based on this results, we can assimilate that students made many type of errors due their lack of grammar; to this context, Pangaribuan and Manik (2018) assures that lack of grammar and limited vocabulary are the challenges students face in the writing skill most frequently.

On the other hand, in the post-test, 96 errors were found including: morphological 30, semantic 31, and syntactic 35. The results generated in line with the pre-test and post-test show that students writing performance had an improvement; the product allows us to note that written corrective feedback is effective to enhance students' writing since it allow students know their failure to understand the message; to this concern, Nassaji (2015) points out that WCF is provided as a repetition form made by teachers or students to clarify requests, confirmation checks, and other instruction to help the students to know the failure to understand the message by the interlocutor.

Regarding the most frequent errors found in the pre-test, those were morphological including omission followed by semantics. Some examples in terms of morphological were:

Omission of inflection -er.

**Incorrect** *“My friend will be the best read.”* **Correct form:** *“My friend will be the best reader.”*

*Omission of inflection -ing*

**Incorrect** *“My father is go to the work”* **Correct form:** *“My father is going to the work”*;

*Omission of verb be,*

**Incorrect** *“He going to study English”* **Correct form:** *“He is going to study English”*

Regarding the most frequent errors in the post-test, those refers to syntactic, including punctuation and fragment sentences. Some example, are the following:

*Punctuation - the comma misuse*

**Incorrect:** *I will go with my mother my sister and my pet.* **Correct form:** *I will go with my mother, my sister. and my pet.* The outcome allows us to know that

Comparing peer correction and teacher feedback, it was noticed that in peer correction strategy students did not were able to make complex comment, correct their students, and

give suggestions instead, they only included signs, circles, and assigned grades to their peers since their lack of knowledge of the language, vocabulary, and practice in the activity did not allow them to go beyond. It happened because this was the first time that students made this type of activity (peer correction) thus they did not have any experience in applying this strategy.

By the contrary, teacher feedback was effective because their level of knowledge in the English language, experience, and content domain made them give effective and opportune feedback. In this context, the teacher provided students direct feedback to enabling learners to notice the gap more efficiently between their current performance and the target feature, as well as indirect feedback to reinforce grammatical knowledge and encourage autonomous learning behavior to prompt deeper cognitive processing and learning; to this regard, Yunus (2020) claims that written teacher feedback is very important since it assists students in the improvement of writing skills.

It was noticed that teacher feedback was effective to improve writing skills because students reduced the amount of errors in the paragraphs they wrote for the post-test. Although, peer correction was poor, they need to be guided to improve this activity. Additionally, students were aware that peer correction is a classroom practice where they can correct each other instead of the teacher as traditionally done. In summary, peer and teacher feedback were effective according to the results obtained in table 1 for students enhance writing skills.

Thus, Peer Correction system have to be employed in classroom since the learning responsibility is shared with learners which shows them that their opinion is valued. In this vein, Giri (2018) points out that peer-feedback is more eloquent than teacher feedback and has positive effects on classroom composition dynamics. Since students are allowed to find their errors and consider the most appropriate ways or procedures to correct them. Besides, this type of feedback is effective and engages students only when they are given time and opportunity to discovery their own errors and correct them before their teachers check them.

On the other hand, students prefer teacher feedback since it is clear, and understandable. Thus, Zhan (2016) showed that learners assumed more teacher feedback

and made better enhancements in forms and the content of their reviewed drafts as associated with peers' feedback, since, written teacher feedback has a significant role in refining students' writing skills. However, this strategy not only provides an important occasion for individualized or contextualized instruction from teachers but it is also seriously assumed by students.

**Table 2**

*Teacher and Peer feedback results*

	Teacher Feedback (%)	Peer Feedback (%)
Semantic errors	32.0	37.0
Syntactic errors	23.0	13.0
Morphological errors	45.0	50.0

Note: Table 2 shows the results obtained from the teacher feedback and peer feedback based on semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors.

As it is noticed on table 2, the errors were classified into three categories, semantic errors, syntactic errors, and morphological errors, which were subdivided into seven subcategories as follows: semantic (Literal translation, collocation, and lexical grammar), syntactic (punctuation and sentence fragments), and morphological (omission) errors.

Regarding teacher feedback, table 2 shows that 32.0% of errors were semantic, 23% syntactic, and 45.0% morphological. Concerning peer feedback table 2 shows that 37% of errors are semantic, 13% are syntactic, and 50% are morphological errors.

Semantic errors: This category include three types of errors: literal translation, collocation, and lexical grammar. In this context, Tanpoco et al. (2019) mention that semantic errors are other kind of errors that student make. They attempted to find out interlanguage transfer errors evident in the written outputs of schools/colleges and their implications to the new educational program.

Regarding collocation, Ye (2019) defines it term as the combination of words which occur naturally with greater than random frequency. Additionally, collocation is divided in two

aspects such as semantic collocation and grammatical collocation. In short, these types of errors are produced by students because of the impact of first language L1 on second language L2 collocation learning and use. In other words, collocation is attributed to the transfer of students' L1.

Finally, Othman (2017) assures that lexicogrammatical errors occur when the learners substitute a word from a particular grammatical category with another grammatical category. Thus, students usually make these types of errors, for example, adjectives are placed instead of nouns, nouns in place of adjectives, adjectives in place of adverbs, and adverbs in place of Adjectives.

About teacher feedback, significantly results were observed among literal translation, collocation, and lexicogrammar. In this sense, the statistics gathered showed 62 semantic errors, 20% errors in literal translation, 30% errors in *collocation*, and 50% errors in lexical grammar. The highest number of errors in terms of *lexicogrammatical* includes the capability to differentiate nouns, adjectives, and adverbs. Some examples are stated bellow:

*Adjective in place of a noun*

**Incorrect:** *My questionable is* **Correct form:** *My question is*

*Nouns in place of adjectives*

**Incorrect:** *My pet is craziness.* **Correct form:** *My pet is crazy*

*Adjectives in place of adverbs*

**Incorrect:** *I read the story correct.* **Correct form:** *I read the story correctly*

*Adverbs in place of adjectives*

**Incorrect:** *My answer was wrongly.* **Correct form:** *My answer was wrong*

Regarding the second most frequent errors occurred in semantic aspect, collocation errors are produced since the L1 interferes into L2. For example:

**Incorrect:** *I will put attention to my English teacher.* **Correct form:** *I will pay attention to my English teacher.*

**Incorrect:** *They need to do an effort to obtain higher grades.* **Correct form:** *They need to make an effort to obtain higher grades.*

Finally, the less common error deals with literal translation since it occurs in the switch from first language to second language. Some examples are stated below:

**Incorrect:** *Not stay in supletoria.* **Correct form:** *I'm not for extra, I have good grades.*

**Incorrect:** *My dog big is very bravo.* **Correct form:** *My big dog is very dangerous.*

On the other hand, it was noticed that peer correction was too hard for students since they found only 2 errors about semantic aspects which deal with lexicogrammar, they were the following:

Adverb in place of adjective

**Incorrect:** *well work.* **Correct form:** *good job*

Noun in place of adjective

**Incorrect:** *the picnic was familiarity.* **Correct form:** *the picnic was familiar.*

Although students were provided instructions how to carry out the peer correction strategy to help them to improve in the peer correction process, students were negative to develop this activity in class. García et al. (2017) mention that this strategy offers some disadvantages. First of all, they comment that peer feedback lacks remedial power. Second, students avoid negotiation and just focus on job accomplishment. Finally, students' discernments of one another may delay the efficiency of peer collaboration. In conclusion, Brown (2017) found that teachers avoid using peer correction techniques due to inherent difficulties, for example, possible lack of objectivity and students feeling insecurity about peer's level of knowledge.

Syntactic errors: in this part, two types of syntax errors were found such as punctuation, fragment sentence, subject-verb agreement, word order, prepositions, and verb tense. In fact, Alqhtani (2018) defines syntax as the discipline of linguistics that consolidates the construction of sentences. In other words, syntax refers to the structure of sentences and how they are built grammatically regardless of the transmission of meaning. In a study led by Gedion et al. (2016) found that the first frequent errors were associated with verbs, the second ones with spelling, the third ones with sentence fragments and the fourth ones with punctuation. In this

study, sentence fragments and punctuation were the most frequent errors found in the students' pieces of writings.

Concerning punctuation, Alamin and Ahmed (2012) define it as simply a device or making it easy to read and understand written or printed matter. Additionally, the authors mention that their examination and homework assignments, has shown that Capitalization, the use of comma and semicolon were among others the most common punctuation errors.

About sentence fragments, Yuliah et al. (2019) remark that a sentence fragment is a sentence that is missing either its subject or its main verb. Besides, the authors mention that some sentence fragments happen as the effect of simple typographical mistakes or omission of words.

The findings shown in table two, syntactic errors were the lowest percentage of the information, including punctuation, fragment sentence, subject-verb agreement, word order, prepositions, and verb tense. Fifty-six errors were found in students' texts. It can be noticed that these types of errors were the result of mother tongue interference, insufficient grammar and vocabulary knowledge, repetition, redundant lexical choice, bad sentence formation, and developmental errors. In this sense, students have to remember that, it is not a complete sentence if it does not contain a finite verb. Some examples are described below:

Punctuation:

*Starting new sentences with lower case letters.*

**Incorrect:** *we will go to the capital to visit my sister.* **Correct form:** *We will go to the capital to visit my sister.*

Not using capital letters for proper nouns

**Incorrect:** *The teacher carlos will be our English teacher.* **Correct form:** *The teacher Carlos will be our English teacher.*

Misuse of comma

**Incorrect:** *I like to eat vegetables to keep healthy and she likes to tea hamburger.* **Correct form:** *I like to eat vegetables to keep healthy, and she likes to tea hamburger.*

Sentence fragments

**Incorrect:** *This will allow me continuing with my studies.* **Correct form:** *This will allow me to continue with my studies.*

**Incorrect:** *Went to the school yesterday.* **Correct form:** *We went to the school yesterday.*

Subject-verb agreement

**Incorrect:** *They pepperoni and it cheese are great on a pizza.* **Correct form:** *Pepperoni and cheese are great on a pizza.*

Word order

**Incorrect:** *My teacher English is a good person.* **Correct form:** *My English teacher is a good person.*

Prepositions

**Incorrect:** *He sat in the chair.* **Correct form:** *He sat on the chair*

Verb tense

Simple present:

**Incorrect:** *She writed every day.* **Correct form:** *She writes every day*

Present progressive:

**Incorrect:** *My teacher is explained the modal verbs.* **Correct form:** *My teacher is explaining the modal verbs.*

As mentioned, by Crompton (2011) articles are the most difficult to master, the reasons behind this are: medium of instruction, traditional method, promotion of rote learning vs creativity --- government sector, and so on. Some examples of the misuse of article errors were “*Make an effort*” instead of “*Make **an effort***”; “*I went to beach*” instead of “*I went **to the beach***”.

Regarding peer correction, it was noticed the poor information provided by them into their pieces of writing since just 5 errors were identified, 0% errors in sentence fragment and 100% errors of punctuation. Through the analysis of the data, it was found that the learners’ failure to understand basic English grammar could be ascribed to intralingual interference, which is associated with developmental sequence of learning English for technical communication (Alamin & Ahmed, 2012).

Not using capital letters for proper nouns

**Incorrect:** *My brother josé lives in quito.* **Correct form:** *My brother José lives in Quito.*

Morphological errors: in this section, 68 errors were found, including omission – omission of inflection ‘s’ – ‘es’ – ‘ing’, and ‘er’. In these terms, omission, Yusuf et a. (2021) emphasize that omission refers to the deviation identified by the absence of words or parts of words in a sentence. Besides, the author mention that this type of errors occurred because students omit some required components in their sentences. Consequently, learners may leave out necessary parts of grammatically correct sentences, for example “my father a teacher” for “my father is a teacher.”

Beides, Yusuf et a. (2021) conclude that omission errors are caused by the interlingual, and intralingual. In the interlingual category, errors committed by students happen because they bring the structural similarities from their native language to bear on the target language. While interlingual transfer is from the native language to the target language, there are also errors caused by mixing between elements in the target language.

The findings shown in table two, morphological errors were the highest percentage of the information, including omission. Sixty-eight divided as follows: 100% errors of omission. It can be noticed that in the present study most of the students face challenges regarding the correct use of omission of inflection of ‘s’ – ‘es’ – ‘ing’- ‘er’, omission of preposition, omission of Be, and omission of article. The author concludes that the causes of these errors are mostly due to intralingual factors rather than interlingual, students have to struggle a lot still when using correct grammar in their writing. Some examples are stated down:

Omission of preposition

**Incorrect:** *My father live in quito.* **Correct form:** *My father lives in Quito.*

Omission of inflection ‘s’ ‘es’

**Incorrect:** *My sister go to the school.* **Correct form:** *My sister goes to the school.*

**Incorrect** *-He play soccer.* **Correct form:** *He plays soccer.*

Omission of ‘Be’

**Incorrect:** *She studying for the English test.* **Correct form:** *She was studying for the English test.*

Omission of article

**Incorrect:** *bought green apple.* **Correct form:** *I bought a green apply.*

In reference to results gathered in peer correction process, it was found that students cannot identify as much errors as teachers. In this case just 5 errors were identified by them. One-hundred per cent of omission article. It is concluded that most of the students are not familiar with the correct use of grammar to give a correct sense to their writings.

Omission of article

**Incorrect:** *We saw the news TV last night.* **Correct form:** *Se saw the news on TV last night.*

**Incorrect:** *I had orange juice.* **Correct form:** *I had an orange juice.* As students can identify as much errors as teacher, Suryani et al. (2019) recommend teachers to apply the peer feedback in their classrooms since this strategy helps students have better writing skills and can identify more types of erros than those students who have not used this strategy.

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

As feedback is considered important to enhance writing skills, Bhuana and El Fauziah (2021) suggest teacher to use this strategy to guide students and help them to rewrite their writing.

In this sense, Eshghinejad (2016) mentions that English as foreign language learners face critical issues in ineffectiveness, writing fluency, spelling and grammatical errors, and vocabulary misuse areas. In this gap, the author thinks that the key to writing fluency is by offering motivation to the English language learners to write as much and as often as possible. Thus, the author suggests tutors increase conducive environments where students can frequently write topics related to their interests but are guided by their educators. When students have finished their writing, it is recommendable, that teachers provide feedback to help learners to improve their tasks.

In this gap, an online survey was addressed to twenty-six students who offered information about twelve statements that allowed to know their perceptions regarding teacher feedback and peer correction, all of them were enrolled in 2nd year of senior high school, including 12 females and 14 males .

**Table 3.**

*Students' perception about teacher and peer feedback*

Nº	Statements	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Total (%)
1	1. I consider it is important to receive peer feedback in written assignments.	0.0	11.5	88.5	100
2	2. I consider it is important to receive teacher feedback in written assignments.	100	0.0	0.0	100
3	3. The feedback delivered by my peer helps me to improve my writing skills.	0.0	7.8	92.2	100
4	4. The feedback delivered by teacher helps me to improve my writing skills.	100	0.0	0.0	100
5	5. My peer provides me with feedback through comments, questions, or additional information.	0.0	7.7	92.3	100
6	6. The teacher provides feedback through comments, questions, or additional information.	96.2	0.0	3.8	100
7	7. The feedback delivered by my classmate is clear and easy to understand.	1.0	6.7	92.3	100
8	8. The feedback delivered by my teacher is clear and easy to understand.	100	0.0	0.0	100
9	9. I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my peer.	0.0	7.7	92.3	100
10	10. I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my teacher.	100	0.0	0.0	100
11	11. The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve in ...				

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

*Note: The data was addressed by an online survey to know the students perception.*

Based on the results obtained from the online survey about the importance of feedback in writing assignments, table 3 shows the following consequences: most of the students found the teacher feedback significant. In specific, 100% of participants agreed teacher feedback is not important in written assignments. While the percentage decreased with regard to peer feedback, 85.5% agreed with this statement, and 11.5% showed neutrality.

The participants have mentioned that teacher feedback is more helpful than the one received from their peers. Zhan (2016) showed that learners assumed more teacher feedback and made better enhancements in forms and the content of their reviewed drafts as associated with peers' feedback, since, written teacher feedback has a significant role in refining students' writing skills. Besides, Yunus (2020) claims that written teacher feedback is very important since it assists students in the improvement of writing skills.

In the same way, students preferred teacher feedback for the improvement of their writing skills, as teachers offer them direct and indirect feedback that allow them to develop their critical thinking and distinguish their errors immediately. Exactly, 100% of the students agreed with this idea. By the contrary, regarding the statement related to whether peer

feedback helps students to improve writing skills, 92.2% of the participants disagreed with this and 7.8% were neutral in their decision.

Consequently, providing feedback in the process of writing learning is beneficial since students have to be more concentrated on what is being learned. Besides, feedback does not only offer benefits for students but also for teachers, since it provides information about individual and collective lessons evolution because feedback demonstrates how tutors are teaching. While for students, error correction is an ongoing form of assessment that is more meaningful than receiving marks or grades. In conclusion, teacher feedback allows students to improve students writing process (Wahyuni, 2018).

However, García et al. (2017) mention that peer feedback strategy offers some disadvantages. First of all, they comment that peer feedback lacks remedial power. Second, students avoid negotiation and just focus on job accomplishment. Finally, students' discernments of one another may delay the efficiency of peer collaboration. In conclusion, Brown (2017) found that teachers avoid using peer correction techniques due to inherent difficulties, for example, possible lack of objectivity and students feeling insecurity about peer's level of knowledge.

Regarding students feelings about teacher feedback using comments, questions, and additional information, table 3 shown that 96.2% of students agreed with this statement since teachers help them in a convenient and timely manner. On the contrary, concerning peer feedback, students distinguished that their partners did not use these strategies correctly. Certainly, 92.3% of the contributors disagreed with the statement, and 7.7% of them were neutrally. In this breach, Storch (2018) highlighted that written comments had a more positive attitude and is more beneficial for students writing than form-related feedback.

Regarding clear and easy to understand feedback, 100% of the students agreed with the correction provided by their teacher. Nevertheless, 92.3% of students disagreed, 6.7% had a neutral position, and just 1% agreed on the statement "feedback provided by peers is clear and understandable".

Based on the evidence above mentioned, a total of students considered the feedback provided by the teacher was more outstanding and comprehensible. This was because of noticeable and simplified instructions provided by the tutor. In effect, written teacher feedback benefits students learning, as it provides them with a deep insight into their presentation, permitting them to distinguish the facets they require to improve their pieces of writings (Yunus, 2020).

Particularly, Brown (2017) found that teachers avoid using peer correction techniques due to inherent difficulties, for example, possible lack of objectivity and students feeling insecurity about peer's level of knowledge.

Furthermore, concerning students' position regarding if they feel comfortable about receiving corrective feedback, 100% of students preferred teacher feedback. On the other hand, 92.3% of the participants disagreed with feeling comfortable receiving peer feedback and 7.7% of them have a neutral position.

Based on the results provided above, it is well noticed that students preferred teacher feedback since they supported students to understand what is to be done and how to improve their performance. In this sense, teachers kept most of the time learning how to teach, improve, and which teaching and learning strategies are more likely to be effective.

In this context, Budiana and Mahmud (2020) has been focused on the feedback as a positive element to enhance the quality of a written text. Thus, direct feedback is more effective as it specifies how the error should be modified. However, Ng and Ishak (2018); and Nusrat et al. (2019) found that, direct feedback helps learners become independent students and hence it involves students in problem-solving. Still, others have claimed that diverse types of corrective feedback contribute to language learning differently, and consequently, the use of feedback should be measured more as a substance of appropriateness than supremacy (Ha and Murray, 2020).

In addition, Wahyuni (2018) claims that peer correction could be an alternative technique to enhance learners' writing in the classroom. Moreover, students get language

input by applying the peer correction strategy, especially when the class size becomes problematic.

Finally, concerning the improvement of grammar, word formation, and vocabulary misuse, students preferred teacher feedback with higher percentages in all three aspects, such as 100% about grammar, 100% concerning word formation, and 100% in reference to vocabulary misuse.

On the contrary, the students have assigned their peers with percentages of 0% in all three aspects above mentioned, such as: 0% in grammar, 0% of word formation, and 0% of vocabulary misuse. It means that a total of students agreed that teacher is the most relevant to the improvement of writing since students considered that the teacher possessed adequate knowledge and mastery to achieve the goal.

In this sense, Yunus (2020) claims that written teacher feedback is very important since it helps students progress on their writings, since they focus on five different categories of feedback, such as content, grammar, organization, vocabulary, and spelling. Besides, organization, content, grammar, and vocabulary. In addition, written teacher feedback benefits students learning, as it provides them with a deep insight into their presentation, permitting them to distinguish the facets they require to improve.

Additionally, in a study done by Storch (2018) they found that after receiving grammar feedback they made progress in grammatical accuracy at a statistically significant level. In short WCF on grammar errors had a greater effect on grammar revisions than general content comments.

However, Egred (2022) found that the combination of both peer and teacher feedback was effective in helping students reduce semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors. The study also found that students prefer both types of feedback, however hesitate to fully assume their evaluative role during the implementation of peer correction.

## Conclusions

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

According to the results obtained in the study, morphological errors are the most frequent ones. Sixty-eight errors were found in students' writings. It was noticed that most of the students face challenges with omission of inflection 's' – 'es' – 'ing', and 'er', omission of preposition, omission of 'Be', and omission of article. It can be concluded that these types of errors occur due to intralingual factors rather than interlingual ones.

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

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

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

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

### **Recommendations**

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

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

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

As syntactic errors occur due to the language transfer and cultural differences between L1 and L2, teacher should find the way to help students to avoid making errors such as punctuation and sentence fragments by providing them with necessary spaces to practice more written exercises.

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

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

## References

- Abdelmohsen, M. M., Abdullah, R., & Azam, Y. (2020). The Development of Writing Module on Enhancing the Writing Skills of Omani General Foundation Program Students. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 19(9), 363-381.
- Afdaleni. (2018). Students' Interest Level in Learning English Grammar. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(4), 61–65.
- Afrin, S. (2016). Writing problems of non-English major undergraduate students in Bangladesh: An observation. *Open journal of social sciences*, 4(3), 104-115. 10.4236/jss.2016.43016.
- Ala, O. G., Yang, H., & Ala, B. K. (2021). Characteristics and comparison of peer-assisted learning interactions among university students in Harbin, China. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 4(1), 100164.
- Alamin, A., & Ahmed, S. (2012). Syntactical and Punctuation Errors: An Analysis of Technical Writing of University Students Science College, Taif University, KSA. *English Language Teaching*, 5(5), 2-8.
- Al-Ani, W. (2017): Alternative education needs in Oman: Accommodating learning diversity and meeting market demand. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*. 22(3), 1-15. doi:10.1080/02673843.2016.1179204
- Alharthi, S. (2021). From Instructed Writing to Free-Writing: A Study of EFL Learners. *SAGE Open*, 11(1), 21582440211007112.
- Alqhtani, M. F. (2018). Investigating syntactic errors among Saudi EFL learners. *Arab World English Journal*, 1–52. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/th.204>
- Anbar, A., & Samad, A. (2022). Error analysis syntactic errors by the students of private and public colleges in writing english paragraph at intermediate level, KOHAT,(KP). *Harf-o-Sukhan*, 6(1), 269-283.

- Anh, D. T. N. (2019). EFL student's writing skills: Challenges and remedies. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 9(6), 74-84.
- Azis, K. (2021). Morphological and syntactical errors analysis on students writing skill at Pamulang University, South Tangerang, Banten. *Lexeme: Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 61-69.
- Bhuana, G. P., & El Fauziah, U. N. (2021). Affective damage from teachers' written corrective feedback. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 6(2), 287-299.
- Budiana, H., & Mahmud, M. (2020). Indirect Written Corrective Feedback (Wcf) In Teaching Writing. *Academic Journal Perspective: Education, Language, and Literature*, 8(1), 60-71.
- Budianto, S., Sulisty, T., Widiastuti, O., Heriyawati, D. F., & Marhaban, S. (2020). Written corrective feedback across different levels of EFL students' academic writing proficiency: *Outcomes and implications. Studies in English Language and Education*, 7(2), 472-485.
- Budiharto, R. A. (2019). Native language interference on target language writings of Indonesian EFL students: An exploratory case study. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 5(1), 107-116. Cambridge University Press.
- Cer, E. (2019). The instruction of writing strategies: The effect of the metacognitive strategy on the writing skills of pupils in secondary education. *SAGE Open*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019842681>
- Cheng, X., & Zhang, L. J. (2021). Teacher written feedback on English as a foreign language learners' writing: Examining native and nonnative English-speaking teachers' practices in feedback provision. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 629921.
- Chorfi, A., Hedjazi, D., Aouag, S., & Boubiche, D. (2022). Problem-based collaborative learning groupware to improve computer programming skills. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 41(1), 139-158.
- Crompton, P. (2011). Article errors in the English writing of advanced L1 Arabic learners: The role of transfer. *Asian EFL Journal*, 50(1), 4-35.

- Demirel, E., & Enginarlar, H. (2016). Effects of combined peer-teacher feedback on second language writing development. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education)*, 31(4), 657-675.
- Derakhshan, A., & Karimian Shirejini, R. (2020). An investigation of the Iranian EFL learners' perceptions towards the most common writing problems. *Sage Open*, 10(2), 2158244020919523.
- Eck, J. E. (2022). *Writing with Sweet Clarity*. Routledge.
- Egred Uquillas, B. M. (2022). *The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students* (Bachelor's thesis).
- Eshghinejad, S. (2016). Retracted Article: EFL students' attitudes toward learning English language: The case study of Kashan University students. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), Article 1236434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2016.1236434>
- García Iriarte, M. (2017). *Peer vs. teacher corrective feedback and its effect on grammar*.
- 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
- Gedion, A., Tati, J. S., & Peter, J. C. (2016). A syntactic errors analysis in the Malaysian ESL learners' written composition. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(6), 96-104.
- Giri, R. A. (2018). CAF: a collaborative approach to providing feedback. Indonesian. *JELT: Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 13(2), 85–114. <https://doi.org/10.25170/ijelt.v13i2.1452>
- Graham, S., & Hall, T. E. (2016). Writing and writing difficulties from primary grades to college. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 39, 3-4.
- Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2020). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 1362168820931897.

- Hafiz, S. M., Omar, A. M. A., & Sher, K. M. (2018). Analysis of syntactic errors in English writing: A case study of Jazan University preparatory year students. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(11), 113-120.
- Harris, L. R., & Brown, G. T.L. (2013). Opportunities to consider when using peer- and selfassessment to improve student learning: Case studies into teachers' implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 36(11), 101-111. Doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2013.07.008
- Hikmah, H. (2020). Analysis of omission and addition errors found in the students' English texts. *ELTICS: Journal of English Language Teaching and English Linguistics*, 5(1).
- Holmeier, M., Grob, R., Nielsen, J. A., Rönnebeck, S., & Ropohl, M. (2018). Written teacher feedback: Aspects of quality, benefits and challenges. *In Transforming Assessment* (pp. 175-208). Springer, Cham.
- Hourani, T. M. Y. (2008). An analysis of the common grammatical errors in the English writing made by 3rd secondary male students in the Eastern Coast of the UAE. <https://bspace.buid.ac.ae/bitstream/1234/225/1/20050055.pdf>.
- Iriarte, M. G., & Alastuey, C. B. (2017). *Peer vs. Teacher corrective feedback and its effect on grammar*. Máster En Formación Del Profesorado De Educación Secundaria. Universidad Pública de Navarra.
- Jessop, T., and C. Tomas. 2017. "The Implications of Programme Assessment Patterns for Student Learning." *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 42 (6):990–9.
- Journal, A. W., Alqhtani, M. F. (2018). Investigating syntactic errors among Saudi EFL learners. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/jhy2n>
- 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.
- Kim, Y., Choi, B., Yun, H., Kim, B., & Choi, S. (2020). Task repetition, synchronous written corrective feedback and the learning of Korean grammar: A classroom-based study. *Language Teaching Research*, 1362168820912354.

- Kuyyogsuy, S. (2019). Promoting Peer Feedback in Developing Students' English Writing Ability in L2 Writing Class. *International Education Studies*, 12(9), 76-90.
- Ling, Y. L. C. (2016). Teaching Writing. In W. A. Renandya, & H. P. Widodo (Eds.), *English Language Teaching Today: Building a Closer Link between Theory and Practice*. (pp. 1-20). New York: Springer International.
- Moses, R. N., & Mohamad, M. (2019). Challenges faced by students and teachers on writing skills in ESL Contexts: A literature review. *Creative Education*, 10(13), 3385-3391.
- 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.
- Nassaji, H. (2015). *International feedback dimension in instructed second language learning*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2017). *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. doi, 10, 9781315621432.
- Nawangasasi, E., & Wijana, I. D. P. (2021). *Errors in the usage of English Prepositions produced by college students in Yogyakarta*. In English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings (Vol. 3, pp. 57-63).
- Ng, L. L., & Ishak, S. N. A. (2018). Instructor's Direct and Indirect Feedback: How do they Impact Learners' Written Performance?. *3L, Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 24(3).
- Nourdad, N., Aghayi, E. T. (2016). A comparative study on the effect of instruction through PowerPoint presentation and whiteboard on EFL learners' essay writing ability. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*.
- Nusrat, A., Ashraf, F., & Narcy-Combes, M. F. (2019). Effect of direct and indirect teacher feedback on accuracy of english writing: A quasi-experimental study among Pakistani undergraduate students. *3L, Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 25(4).
- Othman, A. K. (2017). An Investigation of Interlingual and Intralingual Errors in Written Composition by Saudi EFL Students at the University of Tabuk. *British Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 18(2).

- Owu-Ewie, C., & Williams, M. R. (2017). Grammatical and lexical errors in students' English composition writing: The case of three senior high schools (SHS) in the central region of Ghana. *Sino-us English teaching*, 14(8), 463-482.
- Pangaribuan, T., & Manik, S. (2018). The Effect of Buzz Group Technique and Clustering Technique in Teaching Writing at the First Class of SMA HKBP I Tarutung. *English Language Teaching*, 11(1), 164-178. <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n1p164>
- Patchan, M. M., and C. D. Schunn. 2015. "Understanding the Benefits of Providing Peer Feedback: How Students Respond to Peers' Texts of Varying Quality." *Instructional Science* 43 (5): 591–614. doi:10.1007/s11251-015-9353-x.
- Patoc, L. A. F., & Lasaten, R. C. S. (2019). Grammatical Errors Reflected in the Narrative Compositions of Grade 7 Students: Bases in the Development of a Learning Support Material in English Grammar. *Asian EFL Journal*, 21(2.4), 57–87.
- Phoocharoensil, S. (2014). Exploring learners' developing L2 collocational competence. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(12), 2533-2540. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.12.2533-2540>
- Putri, T. A. (2019). An Analysis of Types and Causes of Translation Errors. *ETNOLINGUAL*, 3(2), 93-103.
- Reski, A. N. (2021). Syntax Errors in English Writing. *Educia Journal*, 1(1), 6–8.
- Rezai, M. J., & Davarpanah, F. (2019). The study of formal and semantic errors of lexis by Persian EFL learners. *International Journal of Cognitive and Language Sciences*, 13(1), 41-47.
- Rushdie, S. (2020). Syntax vs. Semantics: Differences Between Syntas and Semantics. MasterClass Staff.
- Rusinovci, X. (2022). An Amalgamation of the Process and Genre Approaches to Teaching Writing. *International Journal of Social Sciences: Current and Future Research Trends*, 13(1), 73-81.
- Ryan, T., & Henderson, M. (2018). Feeling feedback: students' emotional responses to educator feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(6), 880-892.

- Sari, U. N., Ritonga, H., & Mahmudah, F. (2021). *Morphological Error In Writing Essay At Fifth Semester Of English Education Study Program In Islamic University Of Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi* (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi).
- 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.
- Sermsook, K. et al. (2017). An analysis of errors in written English sentences: A case study of Thai EFL students. *English Language Teaching*, 10 (3). DOI:10.5539/elt.10n3p101
- Setiyorini, T. J., Dewi, P., & Masykuri, E. S. (2020). The Grammatical Error Analysis Found in Students' Composition. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 10(2), 218-233.
- Shousha, A. I., Farrag, N. M., & Althaqafi, A. S. (2020). Analytical Assessment of the Common Writing Errors among Saudi Foundation Year Students: A Comparative Study. *English Language Teaching*, 13(8), 46-62.
- Storch, N. (2018). Written corrective feedback from sociocultural theoretical perspectives: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 51(2), 262-277.
- Sundari, I., & Nery, R. (2021). An Analysis Of Students'grammatical Error In Writing Personal Letter. *Elt Echo: The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context*, 6(2).
- Suryani, R. W., Rozimela, Y., & Anwar, D. (2019). Exploring the effect of peer feedback and the students' perceptions of the feedback on students' writing skill. *International Journal of Secondary Education*, 7(4), 116.
- Talib, T., & Cheung, Y. L. (2017). Collaborative Writing in Classroom Instruction: A Synthesis of Recent Research. *English Teacher*, 46(2).
- Taniş, A., Şensoy, F. H., & Derin, A. T. A. Y. (2020). The effects of L1 use and dialogic instruction on EFL writing. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 1-21.
- Tanpoco, M. R., Rillo, R. M., & Alieto, E. (2019). Filipino to English transfer errors in writing among college students: Implications for the senior high school English curriculum.

- Tanpoco, M., Rillo, R., & Alieto, E. (2019). Filipino to English transfer errors in writing among college students: Implications for the senior high school English curriculum. *Asian EFL*, 26(6.1), 227-246.
- Truscott, J. 2007. "The Effect of Error Correction on Learners' Ability to Write Accurately". *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Vol. 16: 255-272.
- Valero Haro, A., Noroozi, O., Biemans, H. J., & Mulder, M. (2019). The effects of an online learning environment with worked examples and peer feedback on students' argumentative essay writing and domain-specific knowledge acquisition in the field of biotechnology. *Journal of Biological Education*, 53(4), 390-398.
- Van Ha, X., & Nguyen, L. T. (2021). Targets and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned?. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12.
- Wahyuni, S. (2018). Peer Correction On Writing Quality Of College Students Having Different Cognitive Styles. *Inferensi*, 12(2).
- Wichmann, A., Funk, A., & Rummel, N. (2018). Leveraging the potential of peer feedback in an academic writing activity through sense-making support. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 33(1), 165–184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-017-0348-7>
- Ye, Z. (2019). Chinese to English Lexical Transfer Errors in the Writing of Rural Senior High School Students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(6), 645-654.
- Yu, S. (2021). Giving genre-based peer feedback in academic writing: Sources of knowledge and skills, difficulties and challenges. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(1), 36-53.
- Yuliah, S., Widiastuti, A., & Meida, G. R. (2019). The Grammatical and Mechanical Errors of Students in Essay Writing. *Jurnal Bahasa Inggris Terapan*, 5(2), 61-75.
- Yunus, W. N. M. W. M. (2020). Written Corrective Feedback in English Compositions: Teachers' Practices and Students' Expectations. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 3(2), 95-107.

- Yusuf, Y. Q., Mustafa, F., & Iqbal, R. M. (2021). An inquiry into grammatical errors in writing committed by high achieving EFL students. *International journal of language studies*, 15(2).
- Zhan, L. (2016). Written teacher feedback: Student perceptions, teacher perceptions, and actual teacher performance. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 73-84.
- Zhang, Z. V., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 36, 90-102
- Zulfiah, F. (2020). An analysis of syntax errors in descriptive essays. *Etnolingual*, 4(2), 160-173.

## Appendix

### Appendix A: Rubric

PARAMETERS	EXCELLENT (10 – 7.6)	GOOD (7.5 - 5.1)	FAIR (5 – 2.6)	POOR (2.5 - 0)
<b>SEMANTIC CRITERIA</b>	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.
<b>SYNTACTIC CRITERIA</b>	All words, phrases, and sentences were complete (more than 75%). There were no grammar errors in the sentences. All the sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement, depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)	Most of words, phrases, and sentences were complete (75%). There were few grammar errors (less than 25%) in the sentences. Most of the sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)	Some of the words, phrases, and sentences were complete (50%). There were several underdeveloped sentences (50%) that were underdeveloped. Some sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)	A few words, phrases, and sentences were complete (less than 25%). There were too many errors (more than 75%) in grammar, usage, or sentence structure, which made it hard to read. A few sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)
<b>MORPHOLOGICAL CRITERIA</b>	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.
<b>MECHANICS</b>	Capitalization, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes are used appropriately.	Capitalization, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes are used somewhat appropriately.	Capitalization, paragraphing, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes were not used very appropriately. These errors make it more difficult to understand the message or meaning of the writing.	Capitalization, paragraphing, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes were not used appropriately (or were not found in writing). These errors make it hard to

	No errors were made in spelling and part of speech.	Few errors were made in spelling.	Frequent errors made in spelling.	understand the meaning/message of the writing due to these errors.  Numerous errors made in spelling.
--	---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---

### Appendix B: Peer's feedback checklist

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

### Apéndice C: Students' survey

Nº	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.			

<b>4</b>	The feedback delivered by my teacher helps me to improve my writing skills.			
<b>5</b>	My peer provides me with feedback through comments, questions or additional information.			
<b>6</b>	The teacher provides feedback through comments, questions or additional information.			
<b>7</b>	The feedback delivered by my classmate is clear and easy to understand.			
<b>8</b>	The feedback delivered by the teacher is clear and easy to understand.			
<b>9</b>	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my peer.			
<b>10</b>	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my teacher.			
<b>11</b>	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			
<b>12</b>	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			