



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

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

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

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

Trabajo de titulación previo a la obtención del título de:

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

**Autor:** Paz Méndez, Daniela Alexandra

**Director:** Ulehlova, Eva

IBARRA

2023



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

2023

**Aprobación del director del Trabajo de Titulación**

Loja, 9 de enero, 2023

Licenciatura en Ciencias de la Educación Mención Inglés

Vanessa Lissete Toro Gallardo

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

Ciudad.-

De mi consideración:

Me permito comunicar que, en calidad de director del presente Trabajo de Titulación denominado: The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students realizado por Daniela Alexandra Paz Méndez ha sido orientado y revisado durante su ejecución, así mismo ha sido verificado a través de la herramienta de similitud académica institucional, y cuenta con un porcentaje de coincidencia aceptable. En virtud de ello, y por considerar que el mismo cumple con todos los parámetros establecidos por la Universidad, doy mi aprobación a fin de continuar con el proceso académico correspondiente.

Particular que comunico para los fines pertinentes.

Atentamente,

Director: Eva UlehlovaC

C.I.: 0151332269

Correo electrónico:

### **Declaración de Autoría y Cesión de Derechos**

Yo, Daniela Alexandra Paz Méndez, declaro y acepto en forma expresa lo siguiente:

Ser autor (a) del Trabajo de Titulación denominado: The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students, de la carrera de Ciencias de la Educación Mención Inglés, específicamente de los contenidos comprendidos en: (se debe colocar los nombres de los capítulos elaborados en el Trabajo de Titulación), siendo (nombres y apellidos completos), director (a) del presente trabajo; también declaro que la presente investigación no vulnera derechos de terceros ni utiliza fraudulentamente obras preexistentes. Además, ratifico que las ideas, criterios, opiniones, procedimientos y resultados vertidos en el presente trabajo investigativo, son de mi exclusiva responsabilidad. Eximo expresamente a la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja y a sus representantes legales de posibles reclamos o acciones judiciales o administrativas, en relación a la propiedad intelectual de este trabajo.

Que la presente obra, producto de mis actividades académicas y de investigación, forma parte del patrimonio de la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja, de conformidad con el artículo 20, literal j), de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior; y, artículo 91 del Estatuto Orgánico de la 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”, en tal virtud, cedo a favor de la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja la titularidad de los derechos patrimoniales que me corresponden en calidad de autor/a, de forma incondicional, completa, exclusiva y por todo el tiempo de su vigencia.

La Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja queda facultada para ingresar el presente trabajo al Sistema Nacional de Información de la Educación Superior del Ecuador para su difusión pública, en cumplimiento del artículo 144 de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior.

### **Dedication**

This final project is especially dedicated to my parents, Nelson and Nelly who have always been my support and inspiration in everything that I do, I just want to make them proud of me. I dedicated it to my siblings, Nelson Daniel and Andrea who have encouraged and given me so much love when I have felt lost, and to my godfather Victor and my godmother Angelita who were always disposed to help me in everything I need. To my friends, my ‘cat’ Johanna, Adrian, and Alexis for being my refuge, my safe place, and support when I feel down. And finally, this is dedicated with so much love to my beautiful and adorable niece Marianita, who is my tiny baby, my inspiration, my whole world, she is the only one who makes me feel stronger than I think I am.

## **Acknowledgment**

Firstly, I want to render thanks to UTPL institution for allowing me to be part of its student body and also for helping me to become a responsible and independent woman. Furthermore, I want to thank each tutor, especially my thesis tutor Mgtr. Verónica for being so kind, patient, and respectful, to my thesis director Eva, for guiding me and correcting my mistakes with kindness.

I feel grateful to Educational Unit "El Ángel" because this institution allowed this investigation to be carried out, and above all, so much thank you to Mgtr. Angie Naranjo because she shared her time and students with me, she has helped me in so many ways, she is the best woman and teacher I have ever known, her patience, kindness, charisma, and confidence make her a unique woman, I will never forget all of her teachings.

Furthermore, many thanks to everyone who has been a support for me in this journey called life.

## Contents

Aprobación del director del Trabajo de Titulación.....	II
Declaración de Autoría y Cesión de Derechos.....	III
Dedication.....	IV
Acknowledgment.....	V
Contents.....	VI
Abstract .....	VIII
Resumen.....	1
Introduction .....	2
Chapter One.....	4
Literature Review.....	4
<b>Writing in the EFL context .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>The importance of writing in the EFL students .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Challenges in the EFL context.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>The most common and frequent written errors: morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) on EFL learners.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>The importance of effective feedback .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Written Peer correction.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Written Teacher feedback.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Chapter Two.....	18
Method .....	18
<b>Setting and Participants .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Procedure .....</b>	<b>18</b>
Chapter Three.....	21
Analysis and Discussion.....	21
Conclusions.....	37
Recommendations.....	38
References.....	39
Appendices.....	46

**List of tables**

<b>Table 1 Pre and post-test results .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Table 2 Pre-test and Post-test errors .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Table 3 Teacher and Peer feedback results.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Table 4 Student's perception about teacher and peer feedback .....</b>	<b>36</b>

### **Abstract**

The present study aimed to analyze the effectiveness of teacher feedback and peer correction on the development of EFL high school students writing skills. This research was carried out in a public educational institution in El Ángel, Carchi, Ecuador. The participants were 23 high school students between 16 to 18 years old, they had a B1 English level, 10 were female, and 13 were male. A mixed method was used which involves quantitative and qualitative approaches and the instruments employed to collect the data were a pre-test, a rubric, a checklist, six paragraphs per student, a post-test, and a survey. Regarding the findings, it was discovered that applying teacher feedback had a positive impact on the students writing skills since they managed to significantly reduce their written errors, while peer correction did not bring positive results. In addition, it was shown that morphological errors were the most frequent errors and the lowest frequency belonged to semantic errors. Finally, it was concluded that the learners feel more comfortable when receiving teacher feedback than peer correction.

**Keywords:** peer correction, teacher feedback, writing skills.

## Resumen

Este estudio tuvo como objetivo analizar la efectividad de la retroalimentación del docente y la corrección entre compañeros en el desarrollo de las habilidades de escritura en inglés de los estudiantes de bachillerato. La investigación se realizó en una institución educativa pública de El Ángel, Carchi, Ecuador. Los participantes fueron 23 estudiantes de entre 16 y 18 años, con un nivel de inglés B1, 10 fueron mujeres y 13 varones. Se utilizó un método mixto es decir cuantitativo y cualitativo y los instrumentos para la recolección de datos fueron un pre-test, una rúbrica, una lista de cotejo, seis párrafos por estudiante, un post-test, y una encuesta. Según los hallazgos, la aplicación de la retroalimentación del docente tuvo un impacto positivo en las habilidades de escritura de los estudiantes, ya que lograron reducir significativamente sus errores escritos, mientras que la corrección entre compañeros no trajo resultados positivos. Además, los errores morfológicos fueron los más frecuentes y los menos frecuentes fueron los semánticos. Finalmente, se concluyó que los alumnos se sienten más cómodos cuando reciben retroalimentación del docente que de sus compañeros.

**Palabras clave:** corrección entre compañeros, retroalimentación del docente, habilidades de escritura.

## Introduction

Due to the significance that English has gained throughout the years, it has become essential to learn it as a second or foreign language. Thus, in order to master this language, four main language skills have to be developed by EFL learners (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). From these skills, writing is commonly considered the most challenging one. According to EFL students from all around the world, writing can be frustrating and tedious at first, and that is why many of them tend to postpone or even neglect to focus on developing this skill. Due to the above, it has become a priority to find ways to solve the writing skills deficiency of EFL high school students. For this reason, it has sought to identify which are the most frequent written errors as well as the most effective strategies to reduce them and improve EFL learners' writing skills.

Consequently, the present study focuses on analyzing peer correction and teacher feedback on the improvement of EFL students' writing skills. In order to achieve this objective two research questions were proposed: Which are the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of the morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors? Which type of feedback: Peer correction and teacher feedback do EFL students prefer for writing?

In order to start this research, various previous studies were reviewed with the purpose to acquire more knowledge about this research topic.

A study carried out by Cui et al. (2021) aimed to explore the effectiveness of peer correction compared to teacher feedback before providing training on how to perform written peer correction.

Regarding the findings, the authors concluded that when EFL students are trained on peer feedback they can deliver more meaning-focused feedback than the teacher. In addition, the researchers also resolved that the feedback quality increases after receiving training.

Similarly, another study was conducted by Dayyani and Semiyari (2019) with the purpose of discovering the effects of discourse markers instruction (DMs) and peer and teacher feedback on EFL students' writing scores.

According to the results, the experimental group performed better than the control group after receiving DM's use instruction. Thus, the authors deduced that cooperative learning activities can increase the development of EFL students writing skills.

Additionally, the research work performed by Sultana and Yoko (2021) had the objective of discovering the impact that teacher feedback has on the enhancement of EFL learners' writing skills. In relation to the outcomes, the researchers concluded that EFL students show positive perceptions regarding teacher feedback, and especially they prefer to share and solve their writing problems with their instructor through student-teacher conferences.

This study is made up of three chapters, the first chapter named "Literature review" contains information on specific topics related to the central theme of the present investigation. All the contents displayed in this section were obtained from reliable and updated sources from different authors.

The next section which is entitled "Method", is divided into two parts: setting and participants, and procedure. The first one describes the place and the population selected for this research work. And the procedure part explains in detail how the research process was carried out from the beginning to the end.

Concerning the third chapter which is labeled "Analysis and Discussion", describes, interprets, and examines the results obtained from the instruments applied to the participants in order to give an answer to both research questions. Finally, the conclusions and recommendations reached after completing the analysis of the results are attached at the end of this section.

The principal beneficiaries of the research are the participants who will learn how to write using grammar rules correctly a paragraph structure, to identify written errors by their own and participants' contributions. The investigation is considered a learning process that benefits both parts, participants, and future teachers.

## Chapter One

### Literature Review

In this chapter, reliable information on relevant topics is exposed, which is taken from updated academic journal articles and books. In this section, matters such as writing in the EFL context, its importance and challenges, most common written errors, written corrective feedback, teacher feedback, and peer corrections are covered. In addition, six previous studies are addressed at the end of this chapter.

#### Writing in the EFL context

According to Alshammari (2020), writing is the instrument that allows people to communicate, express their ideas and convey messages on paper. Additionally, this author states that in the EFL context writing skills are essential to communicate in written form and they are also essential for learners to master the target language and be able to clearly express themselves in this language. Nonetheless, the author affirms that these skills are usually considered the most difficult to develop and are usually overlooked by EFL students.

Likewise, Akkaya and Kirmizi (2010) refer to writing as the action which reflects feelings, ideas, thoughts, desires, and plans through letters on paper. In the same way, Rushidi (2012) elucidates that in EFL classrooms, the process of teaching writing begins with the introduction of important linguistic aspects such as the grammar, syntactic and semantic rules of the target language. In addition, the author affirms that this skill apart from helping EFL learners to communicate by writing, also supports them to develop their overall English proficiency level.

Moreover, Leonard (2019) establishes that mastering writing skill allows EFL students to be outstanding in academic and business fields. This is due to the fact that knowing how to write in English permits the students to clearly communicate and create relations with other people from around the world. The aforementioned author concludes that writing really helps to develop abilities that are useful for surviving in the demanding world.

Furthermore, as stated by Rhalmi (2018) the development of EFL students' writing skills is a process that is perceived as tedious and challenging for learners and even for

instructors, hence, the former tend to avoid working on the improvement of these skills. For this reason, the above-mentioned author asserts that in the EFL context it is necessary that the students are highly motivated in order to progress their writing skills since it requires a great amount of persistence, time, and practice.

In line with the information above, Rosas (2022) explains that in the EFL context teachers and curriculum designers are always looking for ways of helping students to improve their writing skills. The author claims that there are many aspects to consider when focusing on enhancing these skills. For instance, students do not only need to understand linguistic aspects but also develop their critical thinking skills in order to convey an understandable message, thus becoming proficient writers.

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

As stated by Nasser (2018) learning how to write in English is crucial for EFL students because it enables them to convey their thoughts, opinions, and feelings understandably in written form. In the same way, the author explains that mastering these skills permits learners to improve their English level and develop their cognitive and critical thinking skills.

Equally, Talosa and Maguddayao (2018) point out that in today's world and especially in the labor field, mastering the four English language skills has become a priority. Therefore, if EFL learners want to access better job opportunities they need to learn how to correctly write in English.

Likewise, Alharbi (2017) highlights that writing in English is a fundamental ability both for academic and professional purposes since mastering EFL writing is a crucial skill in fields such as medicine, economics, technical, and business, among others. In this regard, Zahawi (2021) adds that EFL learners who manage to master writing skills are more likely to succeed and have greater opportunities in the study and work fields compared to those students who are not able to express themselves clearly in written form. For this reason, the author states that it is vital that the development of these skills is included in the EFL

curriculums and that it is considered a requirement since students will greatly benefit from knowing how to correctly write in the English language.

Moreover, Jahin and Idrees (2012) state that many governments around the world do not let go unnoticed the importance and impact of writing in the EFL learning process and consider it a requirement within the syllabus and textbooks. Furthermore, authorities and EFL teachers try to encourage learners for practicing their writing skills because they need to improve them in order to get successful results.

### **Challenges in the EFL context**

Concerning the challenges EFL students face when learning how to write in English, Ouahidi (2021) claims that in their learning first stages, the learners tend to present a substantial number of writing errors which results in frustration and demotivation. In addition, this author reveals that due to the differences in structure and organization between their native language and English, students struggle when they try to translate directly from their L1. Therefore, their first pieces of writing tend to be very difficult to understand.

Similarly, Murshidi (2014) states that writing skills are perceived as the most challenging ones by a great amount of EFL learners, who commonly avoid practicing them. This, according to the author, is due to the fact that this skill requires students to maintain varied and sufficient knowledge of grammatical rules as well as the structure, organization, and lexicon of the target language. Because if they are not able to structure correctly and use the right vocabulary they will not be able to convey a clear message. Achieving this mastery is considered an arduous task for students who, not seeing immediate improvement results, lose interest and motivation in developing this skill.

Additionally, Neumyer (2021) emphasizes that one of the most important obstacles EFL learners present is not being able to express their ideas understandably when they start to learn to write in the target language. Hence, they opt for using direct translation which does not help them on improving their EFL writing accuracy.

Correspondingly, Jusun and Yunus (2016) assert that learning how to write is considered by EFL learners as a demanding task since they need to be able to structure and

organize sentences and clauses correctly as well as join their ideas in a smooth way so that the readers are able to understand the written message. This is perceived as a complex process, which is why many students feel discouraged and start to neglect to practice and develop their English writing skills.

Moreover, Rushidi (2012) affirms that EFL students find developing their writing skills a difficult task that requires too much time and effort, therefore they do not pay as much attention to them. In addition, Sadeghi and Mosalli (2013) clarify that writing is usually thought to be the most complicated skill for foreign language learners to acquire since it can only be learned after introducing grammar rules. In this way, only if learners receive a previous explanation they will be able to create a better piece of writing containing fewer or no errors.

The complexity of writing is also discussed by Hosseini et. al (2013) who explain that most EFL learners present many difficulties when they try to communicate in writing. They further claim that this difficulty is due to their linguistic weakness in English which influences their writing performance.

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

As reported by Pasaribu et al. (2021) written errors are a natural part of the learning of a language, especially when students are learning a second or foreign language they tend to commit a high number of written errors. According to these authors, errors are especially frequent when developing productive skills such as speaking and writing. Additionally, they explain that these errors are due to a lack of grammar knowledge and also due to interference with students' mother tongue.

In line with this information, Farooq and Wahid (2019) state that written errors are failures in the application of the target language rules that EFL learners present when writing in English. They further affirm that these errors are an essential part of the process of learning to write in English since they allow the educators to identify the writing areas where their pupils are having the most problems in order to focus on them.

It is worth mentioning that several authors have concluded that the most common written errors committed by EFL are morphological, semantic, and syntactic. For instance, Rajsombat and Indrambarya (2019) claim that morphological errors are usually found in great quantity in the learners' texts. They further explain that morphology refers to how words are formed and that they are composed of morphemes. In the same way, Parasibuand Dewi (2021) define morphology as the study of the smallest structures in a sentence which are called morphemes. Furthermore, some different types of morphemes can be identified such as words and affixes (suffixes and prefixes).

Among the morphological category, Rajsombat and Indrambarya (2019) mention that omission errors and addition errors are the most common ones. They explain that omission errors consist of overlooking a morpheme which causes the word and the whole sentence to lose sense and that it is grammatically incorrect. On the other hand, addition errors refer to adding an additional morpheme to a word which causes it to be grammatically incorrect.

In addition, Sanders (2016) indicates that another category of written errors that are commonly made by EFL students is the semantic one. The author defines semantics as the coherent use of words and expression of a language, that is, the part of linguistics that seeks that the sentences have meaning and coherence for the reader. This author also clarifies that a semantic error is an alteration of the semantic or meaning rules of any language. In other words, according to Sanders (2016), written errors are produced when a sentence might be syntactically correct but does not make sense due to misuse of vocabulary or wrong application of semantic rules.

The third category of written errors that are usually made by EFL students is the syntactic one. In the words of Lahuerta (2018), syntactic refers to how words are organized within a statement or clause, that is, it is related to sentence construction or structure. In the same way, this author points out that syntactic errors can be related to word order in subject, verb, or object as well as the omission of constituents.

Equally, Atwood (2021) elucidates that syntactic studies how the rules of sentence structure are followed by the writers. This author affirms that there are some basic syntactic

rules that must be followed in order to avoid these errors. The first rule is that a sentence needs to have a subject and a verb to portray a clear idea, the ideas must be separated, or the clauses must be joined using the correct connectors, and there is a certain structure (subject + auxiliary + main verb + object) that must be followed to form sentences in English.

In linguistic world, syntax is known as the rules of study that govern how words are combined and joined to form phrases, clauses, and sentences are considered an essential grammar component. Syntax normally studies the structure of phrases, sentences, and clauses, Murthy (2003) wrote in his book that: a) A group of words that does not make any sense is known as such a phrase. b) A group of words that forms part of a sentence and contains subject and verb is known as a clause. c) The group of words that makes sense form a sentence. Syntax has an important element called conjunctions which are part of speech, this element has the function to connect words, phrases, and clauses and is divided into three parts: coordinate, subordinate, and conjunctive adverbs.

### **Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) on EFL learners**

As reported by Tsao (2021) written corrective feedback is a useful strategy employed by EFL instructors to support their students' writing skill development. The author explains that during this activity, teachers provide corrections on the learners' writing tasks pointing out their errors and writing explanations. In the same way, Richards and Schmidt (2010) define WCF as helpful comments and indications that EFL learners receive on their writing assignments either from the teacher or other people with the purpose of improving their writing accuracy.

In addition, Hyland (2010) indicates that research about WCF has centered on the links between feedback and second language acquisition (SLA) theories. This author further states that linguists and researchers have investigated whether effective WCF produces a positive effect on students' writing proficiency and development.

Moreover, authors such as Fan and Ma (2018) claim that WCF has been the subject of criticism and controversy since there are researchers who have affirmed its effectiveness in reducing EFL learners' written errors while there are others who claim that it does not

provide positive results in the development of writing skills. However, the authors also point out that many other researchers have opted to investigate the different types and forms of providing WCF and which one is effective in different contexts and for different EFL students.

Furthermore, Mamad (2018) expounds that WCF can be classified into three types: direct feedback, where the teacher provides the explicit correction; indirect correction where the educator only highlights an error for students to identify and correct it by themselves; and, coding which as the name implies consists of providing correction by using codes, for example, using letters to indicate the type of written errors (T= Tense or S = Spelling).

Additionally, Cárcamo (2020) exposes other types of WCF widely used by EFL teachers when developing their students' writing skills (metalinguistic, focused, and unfocused feedback). Regarding metalinguistic feedback, the author states that it refers to implicit explanations provided to the learners; focused feedback consists of correcting or pointing out only a certain type of written errors; conversely, unfocused feedback involves detecting a broad number of errors.

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

According to Henderson et al., (2018) feedback is regarded as a component that has the greatest influence on the language learning process. Moreover, they state that its fundamental purpose is to achieve an improvement in terms of the EFL students' academic performance. On the other hand, the author suggests that effective feedback also seeks to motivate students and promote a reinforcement that can be positively appreciated.

Concerning the importance of providing effective feedback, Mamad (2018) asserts that applying this correction strategy greatly benefits students allowing them to improve their English writing accuracy which is useful in order for their success in the academic and professional field. Likewise, this author mentions that effective feedback involves students in their language learning process permitting them to become their own editors. Additionally, the author emphasizes the value of WCF since it is widely accepted and expected by EFL learners since they feel the necessity of improving their writing accuracy to succeed in their academic courses and EFL proficiency exams.

In this regard, Teng et al. (2018) affirm that effective written feedback is indispensable in every EFL writing lesson since it helps students reduce their written errors and improve their English writing. They clarify that this strategy if applied adequately, allows the EFL learners to notice their errors, internalize the correct rules and expand, in this way, their target language knowledge.

Brookhart (2017) mentions that effective feedback is an essential formative tool since EFL students are able to receive useful information and explanations about specific linguistic aspects, which will help them to detect and correct their errors, improving their writing performance. This author claims that it is necessary that feedback is applied promptly, and in a friendly and respectful environment.

Furthermore, Winstone and Carless (2020) analyze the difference between old and new paradigms of feedback and conclude that the most updated feedback is more effective since it involves the students in their own learning helping them to generate their own comments and share their opinions. In addition, according to these authors, the new feedback paradigm has a more social constructivist approach, and it requires that educators have a goal, take action to achieve the goal, and receive goal-related information about actions. If teachers have not cleared the goals or if they fail to pay attention to them, they cannot get helpful feedback.

### **Written Peer correction**

As stated by Novitasari et al. (2018) peer correction refers to learners participating in the correction of their classmates' writings. According to these authors, WPC increases students' autonomy since they are encouraged to reflect upon their own learning. In addition, they claim that during peer correction, collaboration and teamwork are fostered since learners are able to share their knowledge and abilities in order to improve their writing skills. Moreover, they point out that in the process of providing correction between peers, the teacher acts as a guide for the students, losing prominence at this point and transmitting full importance and control to the students.

By the same token, Adhiyanti et al. (2018) describe WPC as an effective strategy used by EFL teachers to work collaboratively as well as enhance their learning autonomy by providing and receiving comments among peers about their pieces of writing. In addition, these authors highlight that this type of feedback fosters an environment of respect and trust within the EFL classroom.

Furthermore, Eggar and Musarokah (2017) claim that peer correction consists of EFL learners exchanging their written assignments with their classmates in order to deliver and receive suggestions and comments on their written errors. The abovementioned authors affirm that this type of WCF brings many benefits when it is applied correctly, and the students have received previous training on how to perform this type of activity.

Additionally, Najogi and Aryuliva (2019) explain that WPC is characterized by encouraging student participation in the EFL writing lessons so that they can share their contributions and provide the respective feedback with the help and advice of the teacher. This activity can also fulfill the role of evaluating students to verify their theoretical knowledge, which can be complemented by the suggestions, observations, and contributions of their peers.

Moreover, Gulnara (2019) asserts that encouraging students to identify the errors in the contributions of their classmates is of great help because they learn both from their friends and their own errors, and they do not repeat them in their subsequent written tasks. In addition, the author indicates that the traditional method in which the teacher is the main character that provides feedback has changed since EFL learners have noticed how beneficial peer correction can be for the development of their writing skills.

As stated by Najogi and Aryuliva (2019) there can be numerous advantages when students perform peer correction. For instance, they feel more comfortable doing this activity with their classmates, and the classroom environment changes, the atmosphere turns friendly and full of participation and cooperation. Another advantage of peer correction is that it allows peers to exchange their ideas with each other and test their knowledge so they can effectively correct peers. During WPC errors become a source of learning, and students'

motivation significantly increases when observing themselves involved in their learning process.

On the contrary, some disadvantages of this type of feedback can be that if the EFL learners do not possess sufficient language knowledge as well as appropriate training they will not be able to carry out valuable feedback (Perdani, 2020). Another negative aspect is related to EFL learners' perception of their students and their own competence or language knowledge in correcting. In other words, most students especially the ones with lower proficiency levels tend to doubt or do not trust their peers and their own correction skills.

Therefore, these students prefer their instructor's feedback because it is clearer and more reliable than their peer feedback (Wahyuni, 2018).

### **Written Teacher feedback**

Trabelsi (2019) defines written teacher feedback as a widely used type of written feedback that consists of an EFL instructor providing suggestions, comments, or explanations of their students' written errors. This author further clarifies that teacher feedback can also be classified into different types such as direct, indirect, focused, and unfocused feedback. Additionally, the author affirms that this type of WCF is the most frequently employed in EFL classrooms since it promises value and reliability and permits that learners receive immediate feedback on their written errors, thus, they can correct them and improve their writing performance.

Moreover, Kleijn (2021) explains teacher feedback based on the premise proposed by Vygotsky which consists of social interaction with a character who has more information or knowledge about a certain area so that feedback can give effective results, in this way students can rely on the instructions given by the teacher to be able to process the information provided during the feedback.

Concerning the importance of this type of WCF, Gentrup et al., (2020) state that the feedback provided by the teacher has been considered one of the most significant instruments in the language-learning process since it seeks to identify and correct the students' language weaknesses and misunderstandings. The authors emphasize that this

type of feedback is essential since it allows teachers to identify and focus on the areas where their pupils are having problems in order to improve their language skills, in this case, their writing skills.

Authors such as Fithriani (2018) indicate that written teacher feedback brings a great number of benefits. For example, EFL students appreciate and accept in a better way the comments offered by their teacher since they feel more confident and secure when receiving feedback from the person they consider as the guide of the class. In this, reference can be made to the principles of hierarchical culture that considers the difference in power that exists between teachers and students. Likewise, Irwin (2017) suggests that EFL learners really value their educators' annotations and corrections and they usually follow their suggestions which helps them reduce their errors improving, in this way, their writing skills.

On the other hand, Sakrak-Ekin and Balgikanli, (2019) indicate that in some cases there can also be some disadvantages when applying teacher feedback, and they are mostly related to the teacher not adapting the corrections, comments, and explanation to the learners' proficiency level. Moreover, another disadvantage is that sometimes teachers do not plan the feedback activities in advance or they are not well trained to perform them.

Some previous studies related to the topic of the current research have been conducted in different parts of the world with diverse EFL learners. Six of the most recent and alike studies are described below in order to obtain useful information to contrast with this research findings.

The research carried out by Cui et al. (2021) aimed to explore the effectiveness of peer correction compared to teacher feedback before providing training on how to perform WPC. The participants of this study were 56 EFL private university students. The research method used during the study was a mixed approach that comprised quantitative and qualitative data. During the process, the participants were divided into two sections which received teacher feedback, untrained peer correction, and trained peer correction in different writing assignments, in other words both groups of students transitioned to untrained peer feedback and to trained feedback in different writing assignments. Regarding the findings,

the authors concluded that when EFL students are trained on peer feedback they can deliver more meaning-focused feedback than the teacher. In addition, the researchers also resolved that the feedback quality increases after receiving training.

Another study was conducted by Dayyani and Semiyari (2019) with the objective of discovering the effects of discourse markers instruction (DMs) and peer and teacher feedback on EFL students' writing scores. The sample population was 60 EFL Iranian intermediate students, all of them were male with ages ranging from 15 to 20 years old and with homogenous English proficiency levels. The study had a true-experimental design where the participants were divided into two groups of 30, one was the experimental group and the other one was the control group. The students in the experimental group received the key DMs including conjunctions, adverbs, and propositional phrases. The instruments employed for this study were a Michigan English Test, pre-test, post-test, treatment, and explicit instruction of discourse markers. According to the results, the experimental group performed better than the control groups after receiving DMs' use instructions. Thus, the authors deduced that cooperative learning activities can increase the development of EFL students writing skills.

The next research work performed by Sultana and Yoko (2021) had the purpose of discovering the impact that teacher feedback has on the enhancement of EFL learners' writing skills. The sample of this study was 90 EFL university students, 58 of them were female and the remaining 32 were male with ages ranging from 19 to 25 years old. Regarding the research method, they applied a mixed approach that is quantitative and qualitative data was collected through instruments such as a semi-structured questionnaire, a survey, and a call. In relation to the outcomes, the researchers concluded that EFL students show positive perceptions regarding teacher feedback, and especially they prefer to share and solve their writing problems with their instructor through student-teacher conferences.

The fourth study led by Al-Saleh (2018) had as its main objective to explore the effect of offering computer-mediated positive WCF on improving students' writing. In addition, the study also sought to analyze the WCF strategies that brought positive results on learners' writing ability. Moreover, another objective was to discover the participants' attitudes toward computer-based WCF. The participants were 24 EFL undergraduate college students who were only female. This was a quasi-experimental study used as research instruments pre- and post-essay writing tests as well as a questionnaire. During the research, the subjects were randomly divided into two groups, the experimental group and the control group, each of them containing 12 students. After applying the WCF through a platform called Showbie the author demonstrated that there was a considerable disparity between the experimental and the control group after applying the pre-test. These results suggested that the implementation of computer-based positive WCF was effective on the learners' writing. Moreover, the researcher also found that the students have a preference for direct WCF while indirect feedback was the least preferred.

Another research carried out by Awada and Diab (2021) proposed that a type of peer correction (face-to-face or written online feedback) is more efficient in the development of the EFL university students' argumentative writing skills. It was an experimental study that used a qualitative approach to answer the research question. The sample population consisted of 122 university students with ages between 20 and 24 years old who were enrolled in an Advanced Writing course at an American university in Lebanon. In this study, the learners were randomly allocated into experimental and control groups. The research collection tools employed throughout this research were the students' drafts, rubrics, qualitative analyses, and posttests. Concerning the findings, the authors discovered that online written peer correction was noticeably more effective than face-to-face peer feedback in developing the argumentative writing skills of EFL university students. Furthermore, they were also able to conclude that online peer correction was more complete since the learners

provided a greater amount of systematic feedback than the students that performed face to face peer review.

Finally, the last study in this section was conducted by Huang et al. (2020) who proposed to investigate the EFL students writing skills when carrying out different types of WPC in collaborative writing tasks. This was also a quasi-experimental mixed approach since the collected data was both qualitative and quantitative. Moreover, the study involved 53 Chinese EFL students who volunteered, nine of them were men and 44 were women.

The participants were divided into the control group with 23 students and the experimental group with 30, one group received online peer correction, and the other, traditional paper-based peer correction. The process of data collection required instruments such as pretest and posttest writing assignments and learners' peer feedback suggestions. The findings of this study pointed out that the experimental group was more effective than the control group, in other words, online peer feedback was more efficient than paper-based feedback.

Likewise, the authors suggested that EFL instructors implement different types of peer correction.

## Chapter Two

### Method

#### Setting and Participants

The current study was carried out in El Ángel, located in Carchi, Ecuador. The study took place in a public educational institution where learners receive and study English as a foreign language. The data was gathered from students in the third senior level. Hence, the main participants were 23 students between the ages of 16 to 18 years old. The group was conformed of 10 female and 13 male students who receive English as a foreign language classes for four hours each week, each hour having a term of 40 minutes. It is important to mention that most of the students have a B1 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).

#### Procedure

The first stage was the elaboration of the literature review which contains information recollected from various writers that support essential topics to related this research. Many studies, books, and web articles were used and implemented in order to provide valuable information with different points of view for making emphasizing the importance of the role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students.

The second stage corresponds to the intervention and implementation of some instruments for the purpose of carrying out the investigation. In order to elaborate this study it was of great importance to use a mixed method that involves quantitative and qualitative approaches. The first instrument which was applied to students is the pre-test, in this part, they had to elaborate a 120 - 150 words narrative paragraph about their experience in taking remote classes during the Covid 19 pandemic, with the objective to analyze the level of writing production that students have.

A rubric was used to assign an appropriate grade to each student's contribution, according to the established parameters. One important aspect of this study is to recognize and classify the most common errors in writing; morphological, semantic, and syntactic.

Additionally, students had to write six paragraphs of different topics according to institution module topics. Three paragraphs were corrected by the teacher and the respective teacher feedback was provided to students, the other three paragraphs were corrected by students and peer correction was applied, to review the last three paragraphs the teacher use the respective rubric and the parameters.

In addition, a checklist was created and used in order to know the quality of the peer correction that was provided by the students. It is worth mentioning that when the peer correction was carried out, the teacher reviewed it in order to complement the due process. The sequential order for writing the six paragraphs was the following: "A 120-150 words narrative paragraph about your experience in taking remote classes during the Covid-19 pandemic" (Pre-test), " An 80-100 words paragraph about your favorite social media. Why do you like it? What do you use it for?" (T F), " A 100-120 words opinion essay about your healthy and unhealthy habits" (P C), "An 80-100 words e-mail to an old friend inviting at your birthday party" (T F), "A list about your future plans" (P C), "A 100-120 word essay about an important person in your life" (T F), "A 100-120 words paragraph about the daily routine of your classmate" (P C) and finally "A 120-150 words narrative paragraph about your experience in taking remote classes during the Covid-19 pandemic" (Post-test).

An important aspect to mention is that some students used a dictionary and a translator as complementary material, the use of the second one made the learning process not honest in totally. Besides, the application of the post-test was carried out to analyze and verify how satisfactory the teaching process was, the post-test was based on the same theme as the pre-test and used the same rubric to qualify.

Finally, a survey was applied to the students to know the perception that they generated according to the teacher and peer feedback for improving writing skills. The survey was applied to a population of 23 people. It was important to carry out a survey to perceive real results that contribute to the study of this research. The survey has 12 questions about teacher feedback and peer correction, and there are three options that participants can select according to their own perspective or experience (Agree, Neutral,

Disagree). The final stage of this research process refers that the data obtained was analyzed and tabulated in order to provide the corresponding conclusions and recommendations.

## Chapter Three

### Analysis and Discussion

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

**Table 1.**

*Pre and post-test results.*

Pre-test	Post-test	Variance
6.96	8.98	2.04

Note: Results of pre-test and post-test and variance.

Pre-test and post-test were carried out with the purpose of being able to know the level of English that the students dominate, in other words, the pre-test was considered as a diagnostic test capable of revealing the knowledge and shortcomings that the students had. On the other hand, the post-test was used to see if the students improved their writing skills and if the feedback was effective.

Based on Table 1, in the pre-test the mean score obtained from participants was 6,96 out of 10 points, meanwhile, in the post-test, the score obtained was 8,98 out of 10 points. A good English level could be perceived by students since they were members of International Baccalaureate, so it means that they used to receive so many hours of English each week because they work with a different curriculum.

According to the pre-test the highest score obtained was 8,5 /10 and the lowest score was 1,5/10 because some students were afraid to write and make mistakes and the pre-test was such a surprise exercise for them. On the other hand, in the post-test success results were obtained since the highest score was 10/10 and the lowest score was 7,5/10. It is important to mention that the participants really were concerned about their grades and made an effort for improving their writing skills.

In general aspects great part of the participants, specifically more than 86% (20 students) were capable to write a paragraph with the words' extension requested. Despite that their contributions contained several types of errors such as: morphological, semantic, syntactic, etc; the purpose of the paragraph was clear and had coherence.

Based on the results of the pre and post-test, a variance of 2.04% could be perceived, that is, there was an improvement if one focuses on the results of the pre-test since this was taken in order to analyze the level of knowledge of students' English in terms of their writing in order to identify their weaknesses and the most frequent errors that their writings reflected. On the other hand, the results obtained in the post-test suggest that the students received the due feedback in a favorable way and learned from their mistakes, that is, a recognizable improvement could be perceived in their final writings.

**Table 2.**

*Pre-test and Post-test errors*

	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Semantic	27	20%	20	16%
Syntactic	14	11%	14	12%
Morphological	91	69%	86	72%

In this analysis, the pre-test found 0,2% of semantic errors, syntactic errors with 0,11% and 0,69% belong to the category of morphological error. Besides, according to the post-test results were found 0,17 % of semantic errors, syntactic errors 0,12%, and morphological errors 0,72%. It is necessary to mention, in general terms, that students wrote fewer words extension in the pre-test than in the post-test. Meanwhile, the post-test showed a higher number of written words, and the number of errors in the post-test decreased.

**Morphological errors analyze**

The obtained results show that morphological errors have a repetitive appearance and the highest percentage than the other errors. Parasibu and Dewi (2021) establish that due to first language interference students can commit errors in writing and defines that the

most common errors in narrative writing that they found belong to omission, addition, misformation, and disordering categories.

Morphological errors were the most repetitive ones in the pre-test, and post-test analysis, the classification of morphological errors is: omission, addition, misformation, and disordering. Based on the previous table the most repetitive morphological error belongs to the omission category with 42% in pre-test and 40% in post-test.

Below are some examples of errors according to the aforementioned classification:

### ***Pre-test***

#### *Omission (38)*

**Incorrect:** Read many book.

**Correct:** Read many books.

#### *Addition (19)*

**Incorrect:** My experience in classes in during Covid-19 pandemic is was bad.

**Correct:** My experience in classes during Covid-19 pandemic was bad.

#### *Misformation (30)*

**Incorrect:** I don't learned.

**Correct:** I didn't learn.

#### *Disordering (4)*

**Incorrect:** Virtual classes I didn't like.

**Correct:** I didn't like virtual classes.

### ***Post-test***

#### *Omission (34)*

**Incorrect:** There were many distraction.

**Correct:** There were many distractions.

#### *Addition (22)*

**Incorrect:** We weren't use to it.

**Correct:** We weren't use it.

#### *Misformation (28)*

**Incorrect:** My mental head was affected.

**Correct:** My mental health was affected.

*Disordering (2)*

**Incorrect:** ‘‘began classes virtual’’

**Correct:** ‘‘virtual classes began’’

*Semantic errors analyze*

According to Sanders (2016) ‘‘ A semantic error is a violation of the rules of the meaning of a natural language or a programming language’’ these kinds of errors are interpreted as opposed to a merely lexical error since first language interference appears to affect and confuse students. Based on semantic errors have a minimal different percentage between pre-test and post-test. According to James (1998) semantic errors are classified in:lexical grammar and collocation. The classification was used in order to analyze this kind of error.

According to the results of the semantic errors, in pre- test lexical grammar, 96% was obtained while in post-test in the same category a 70% of errors were obtained, a 26% decrease could be noticed in this aspect. Moreover, based on the collocation section in the pre-test, 4% was obtained with a frequency of (1), but in the post-test, a result of 30% was obtained with a frequency of (6), in other words, in this part, an increase was obtained if compare pre and post-tests in post-test more of these errors occurred.

Here some examples of semantic errors which were found in pre-test and post-test review are presented:

**Pre-test**

*Lexical grammar*

**Incorrect:** In the actually.

**Correct:** Currently.

**Incorrect:**

‘‘Matterias’’ **Correct:**

‘‘Subjects’’

*Collocation:*

**Incorrect:** ‘‘I like to be in social media’’

**Correct:** ‘‘I like to spend time in social media’’

### **Post-test**

#### *Lexical grammar*

**Incorrect:** ‘‘On the other hard.’’

**Correct:** ‘‘On the other hand’’

#### *Collocation:*

**Incorrect:** ‘‘I didn’t put attention’’

**Correct:** ‘‘I didn’t pay attention’’

As it can be analyzed, in semantic errors the participants related some native words (L1) with the foreign language (L2). They may think that the words in both languages have the same script, for instance in lexical grammar this error was found; "in the actually" the participant related the word L2 "actually" with "actualidad" in L1 because has a similar script, but the meaning is totally different. Despite of this error, the idea could be understood.

Focusing on collocations, the participants may create confusion and they tend to experience (L1) interference and use the wrong words with the purpose to transmit the ideas, such as; "I didn't put attention" in this case the word "put" is not correct in this sentence, in English the correct form is using the verb "pay".

Based on syntactic error results in pre-test and post-test a similar percentage was found, according to linguistic syntax is known as the rules of study that govern how words are combined and joined to form phrases, clauses, and sentences is considered an essential grammar component. This section is classified into three categories: conjunctions, prepositions, and word order.

Syntactic errors analysis.

Murthy (2003) wrote in his book that syntactic errors are classified in this way; conjunction, preposition, and word order. The previous results indicate the frequency of each category that belongs to syntactic errors. The most repetitive errors belong to the

“preposition” category with a result of 64% in pre-test and 50% in post-test namely, there is a 14% of difference between pre and post-test. In the word order, category 29% of errors were obtained from the pre-test while in the post-test 21% of errors were obtained with a decrease of 8%.

According to conjunction existed a 22% difference between pre and post- tests results, counting with a major errors quantity in post-test 29% than pre-test 7%.

Errors found in pre-test and post-test which belong to syntactic aspect:

### **Pre- test**

#### *Conjunctions*

**Incorrect:** “I didn’t know to do my homeworks”

**Correct:** “I didn’t know how to do my homeworks”

#### *Prepositions*

**Incorrect:** “I learned use technology”

**Correct:** “I learned to use technology”

#### *Word order*

**Incorrect:** “class virtual”

**Correct:** “virtual class”

### **Post- test**

#### *Conjunctions*

**Incorrect:** “My experience was negative why my internet connection was slow”

**Correct:** “My experience was negative because my internet connection was slow”

#### *Prepositions*

**Incorrect:** “We are still alive on health”

**Correct:** “We are still alive with health”

#### *Word order*

**Incorrect:** “cell phone own”

**Correct:** “own cellphone”

*Syntactic errors analyze*

Syntactic components are such the smallest and simple that joined together can form a structure a complex sentence. Making a deep analysis of syntactic errors the following were found: "I didn't know to do my homework" which belongs to the conjunction category.

This is a morphological syntactic error since the participant omitted the conjunction "how", so belongs to the omission of morphological errors, too. Another example is about prepositions; "I learned use technology" here the participant omitted the preposition "to" that makes sense and correct structure to the sentence. This error belongs to morphological and syntactic since omits a preposition.

As a final result of this study of pre-test and post-test, a similar percentage was obtained of participants' contributions but, in the post-test, the written extension was longer than the pre-test so, a similar number of errors was found as a result.

**Table 3.**

*Teacher and Peer feedback results*

	Teacher's feedback		Peer's feedback	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Semantic</b>	27	20%	20	16%
<b>Syntactic</b>	14	11%	14	12%
<b>Morphological</b>	91	69%	86	72%

Note: Results of teacher's feedback and peer's feedback

In order to analyze the six contributions provided by students, a scoring rubric was used to analyze the three teacher's feedback paragraphs and a checklist was elaborated by the teacher for participants, so, of this way, they could analyze and give the respective feedback to their peers.

Based on table number two, it can be analyzed and observed that the errors with the highest frequency in the two sections belong to the morphological type with a frequency of (89) in the teacher feedback and (63) in the peer feedback, with a percentage of 59% and 75% respectively, that is, there is a difference of 16% between the two variables. However, in the teacher feedback, more morphological errors were found. The other errors that were

repeated frequently belong to the category of syntactic, with a frequency of (35) in the teacher feedback and (13) in the peer feedback, with a percentage of 25% and 14% respectively, thus indicating a difference of 11 % between these results and concluding that more errors belonging to this category were found in the teacher feedback. On the other hand, analyzing the semantic errors, the following results could be perceived, a frequency of (26) in the teacher feedback and (8) in the peer correction, thus having a result the percentages of 18% and 9% with a difference of 9% according to the percentage, it can be concluded that the largest number of semantic errors were found in the teacher feedback.

It is important to mention that each type of error has its own divisions or classifications, each subdivision was analyzed respectively in order to carry out a more detailed analysis of this study.

Hereunder an analysis of each subdivision will be indicated and an example of each of them will be provided.

#### *Morphological errors analyze*

According to errors that belong to the classification of morphological errors, similarities can be observed in the results since the errors that are frequently repeated belong to the omission subdivision, with a frequency of (48) belonging to teacher feedback and (40) according to the peer correction, with a percentage of 54% and 64% respectively, and a difference of 10% between the two variables, however, it can be analyzed that the highest frequency was obtained in the teacher feedback. According to the errors of addition, a frequency of (17) and (8) was obtained in each variable, and a percentage of 19% and 13%, respectively, with a difference of 6%, was perceived. The errors that belong to the subdivision known as misformation have a similar frequency of (21) and (14) with the respective percentages of 24% and 23% according to the analysis of the teacher and peer feedback, obtaining a difference of 1% between these two variables. Finally, disordering errors were the least repetitive in this analysis since a frequency of (3) and (1) was perceived, with a percentage of 3% and 1%, that is, there was not much difference and it could be considered that this type of errors were the ones that had the least appearance.

**Teacher feedback***Omission (48)*

**Incorrect:** She always been there for me.

**Correct:** She has always been there for me.

*Addition (17)*

**Incorrect:** She always to supporting us in the good and bad times.

**Correct:** She always supports us in the good and bad times.

*Misformation (21)*

**Incorrect:** I wul like to invite you.

**Correct:** I would like to invite you.

*Disordering (3)*

**Incorrect:** ‘‘She is the person most beautiful in the world’’

**Correct:** ‘‘She is the most beautiful person in the world’’

**Peer feedback***Omission (40)*

**Incorrect:** He sleep at 10 o’clock.

**Correct:** He sleeps at 10 o’clock.

*Addition (8)*

**Incorrect:** ‘‘He brushes his theeths’’

**Correct:** ‘‘He brushes his teeth’’

*Misformation (14)*

**Incorrect:** Next, he goes to school. They, pay attention to the class.

**Correct:** Next, he goes to school. Then, pays attention to the class.

*Disordering (1)*

**Incorrect:** I would to like be professional.

**Correct:** I would like to be professional.

The results of this section have a relation to the previous study of Rajsombat and Indrambarya (2019) in which they mention that omission errors and addition errors are the most common ones.

As shown the most common morphological errors in the previous examples the most frequent belong to omission and addition. For example, "He sleep at 10 o'clock." In this case, the participant perhaps tend to forget the simple present grammar rule which consists in add "s", "es" or "ies" at the verb when the sentence refers to a third person (he, she, it). So, the correct form of this sentence is: "He sleeps at 10 o'clock." using "sleeps" because it makes reference to a third person in this case "he". Another example belongs to the addition category; "He brushes his theeths" in the previous sentence, the word "theeths" is not correct since the correct form is "teeth" in this case the participant added a letter "h" and "s" and it was not necessary. According to disordering this example will be analyzed: "She is the person most beautiful in the world" the word order that the participant used is not correct, despite the idea being understood the grammatical order is wrong since in (L2) the superlative adjective in this case "most beautiful" comes before the noun "person", so, the correct form is: "She is the most beautiful person in the world".

### *Semantic errors analyze*

Semantic errors have two divisions, lexical grammar, and collocation. After analyzing these errors, the following results could be perceived; in lexical grammar, a frequency of (21) was obtained in the teacher's feedback and (7) in the peer's feedback with a percentage of 81% and 87% despite the fact that the percentage is higher in the second variable, the higher frequency corresponds to the first variable, that is, teacher's feedback. Focusing on the errors that belong to the category of collocation the following figures were obtained; in the teacher's feedback a frequency of (5) with a percentage of 13% and in the other variable a frequency of (1) with a percentage of 13%, although the percentages are the same, the frequency is different.

### **Teacher's feedback**

*Lexical grammar (21)*

**Incorrect:** ‘‘Preatty’’

**Correct:** ‘‘Pretty’’

**Incorrect:** ‘‘To meet all your goals’’

**Correct:** ‘‘To achieve all your goals’’

*Collocation (5)*

**Incorrect:** ‘‘I make her angry’’

**Correct:** ‘‘I get her angry’’

**Peer’s feedback**

*Lexical grammar (7)*

**Incorrect:** ‘‘ He puts the uniform.’’

**Correct:** ‘‘ He wears the uniform’’

**Incorrect:** ‘‘ Habits are routines that people realize daily.’’

**Correct:** ‘‘ Habits are routines that people carry out daily.’’+

*Collocation (1)*

**Incorrect:** ‘‘Next, she makes her homeworks’’

**Correct:** ‘‘Next, she does her homeworks’’

According to Sanders (2016), this type of error is produced when a sentence might be syntactically correct but does not make sense due to misuse of vocabulary or wrong application of semantic rules. spelling errors.

According to the explanation mentioned above, it can be understood when and why these types of errors occur, the most common reason why semantic errors occur is due to the interference of (L1) in (L2), in this case, the participants tend to relate the words of the target language with words of their mother tongue. For example; ‘‘ Habits are routines that people realize daily.’’ In this case, the participants related the word ‘‘realized’’ in English with ‘‘realizar’’ in Spanish because both words have a similar script.

*Syntactic errors analyze*

According to the results of syntactic errors, it can be analyzed that those errors that belong to conjunction resulted in a frequency of (4) in the teacher's feedback and (2) in the

peer's feedback, with a percentage of 11% and 15% respectively, although the difference based on the frequency is double, in the percentage a difference of 4% is perceived. The preposition errors are the ones that have the highest frequency in the first variable (27) and (4) in the second, that is, almost seven times more, theoretically, according to the results of the table, this type of error is the one that the participants made more times when it comes to semantic errors, finally the word order data indicate as a frequency (4) and a percentage of 11% in the first variable, and in the second variable a frequency of (7) with a percentage of 54%, having as a difference a percentage of 43% thus, demonstrating that more errors of this type were found in the second variable.

### **Teacher's feedback**

#### *Conjunctions (4)*

**Incorrect:** "I will wait you in the party"

**Correct:** "I will wait for you in the party"

#### *Prepositions (27)*

**Incorrect:** "a special person which has no idea that is important"

**Correct:** "a special person who has no idea that is important"

#### *Word order (4)*

**Incorrect:** "My party eighteen"

**Correct:** "My eighteen party"

### **Peer's feedback**

#### *Conjunctions (2)*

**Incorrect:** "He helps her mother washes the dishes"

**Correct:** "He helps her mother and washes the dishes"

#### *Prepositions (4)*

**Incorrect:** "Alex arrives home in the afternoon"

**Correct:** "Alex arrives at home in the afternoon"

#### *Word order (7)*

**Incorrect:** "habits healthy"

**Correct:** ‘‘healthy habits’’

**Incorrect:** ‘‘things interesting’’

**Correct:** ‘Interesting things’’

**Incorrect:** ‘‘activity daily’’

**Correct:** ‘‘daily activity’’

Lahuerta (2018), points out that syntactic errors can be related to word order in subject, verb, or object as well as the omission of constituents. In this case, the participants tend to commit disorder errors and the incorrect application of prepositions which affect the sentence structure even if the message can be understood, the grammar structure is wrong. For example, ‘‘a special person which has no idea that is important’’ the wrong use of prepositions is noticeable since ‘‘which’’ is used for concerning about things and in the sentence it makes reference to a person, in this case the correct option is ‘‘who’’ this preposition is used for people only. Other errors which were much repetitive belong to word order, for example: ‘‘things interesting’’. The participants tend to write using their (L1) structure, but English structure is totally different since in this case, the correct form is ‘‘interesting things’’ because in English the adjective always comes before the noun.

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

**Table 4.**

*Students perception about teacher and peer feedback*

Nº	Questions	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Total
1	I consider it is important to receive peer feedback in written assignments	86,96%	13,4%	0%	100%
2	I consider it is important to receive teacher’s feedback in written assignments.	73,91%	26,09%	0%	100%
3	The feedback delivered by my peer helps me to improve my	47,83%	52,17%	0%	100%

	writing skills.				
<b>4</b>	The feedback delivered by my teacher helps me to improve my writing skills.	100%	0%	0%	100%
<b>5</b>	My peer provides me with feedback through comments, questions or additional information.	17,39%	69,57%	13,04%	100%
<b>6</b>	The teacher provides feedback through comments, questions or additional information	100%	0%	0%	100%
<b>7</b>	The feedback delivered by my classmate is clear and easy to understand.	17,39%	56,25%	26,09%	100%
<b>8</b>	The feedback delivered by the teacher is clear and easy to understand.	73,91%	26,09%	0%	100%
<b>9</b>	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my peer.	78,26%	21,74%	0%	100%
<b>10</b>	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my teacher.	95,65%	4,35%	0%	100%
<b>11</b>	The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve in...				
	Grammar use(Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization and Punctuation)	56,52%	39,13%	4,35%	100%
	Word formation (Spelling)	21,74%	69,57	8,70%	100%
	Vocabulary misuse	17,39%	69,57	13,04%	100%
<b>12</b>	The feedback provided by the teacher has helped me to improve in.....				
	Grammar use(Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization and Punctuation)	95,65%	4,35%	0%	100%
	Word formation (Spelling)	95,65%	4,35%	0%	100%
	Vocabulary misuse	95,65%	4,35%	0%	100%

Note: Results of survey application to participants.

The results show that 86.96% of the participants consider peer correction important, while 13.4% remained neutral in their answers. 73.91% of the participants agreed that it is important to receive the feedback provided by the teacher, while 26.09% remained neutral in their response. On the other hand, 100% of the participants agreed that the feedback

delivered by the teacher helps them to improve their writing skills. While referring to the peer feedback, 47.83% of the participants agreed and 52.17%, which covers more than half of the sample, remained neutral. According to the fifth question, 100% of the students agreed that the teacher provides feedback through comments, questions, or additional information.

While in the sixth question, 17.4% of the students agreed that the peer provides feedback through comments, questions, or additional information and 69.6% remained neutral and 13.04% strongly disagreed. The seventh question "The feedback delivered by my classmate is clear and easy to understand." had the following results; 17.39% of the participants agreed, 56.26% decided to remain neutral and 26.09% disagreed. While in the eighth question, refers to "The feedback delivered by the teacher is clear and easy to understand." 73.91% of the participants agreed and 26.09% indicated the "neutral" option. On the other hand, according to the ninth and tenth questions; 78.26% of the participants felt comfortable receiving the feedback provided by their peers while 21.74% remained neutral. Regarding the feedback provided by the teacher, 95.65% of the students felt comfortable receiving it, and 5.35% remained neutral. According to the eleventh question that refers to peer feedback, 56.52% of the participants agree, 39.13% remain neutral and 4.35% disagree that the feedback provided by their peers helped them in terms of grammar. Use (Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization, and Punctuation). According to Word formation (Spelling) the results were as follows; 21.74% (agree) 69.57% (neutral) and 8.70% (disagree). Finally, the results of the "Vocabulary misuse" category were: 17.39% (agree) 69.57% (neutral) 13.04% (disagree). Analyzing the twelfth and last question we have a result that 95.35% of the participants agree that the feedback provided by the teacher helped them to improve in grammar use (Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization, and Punctuation), Word formation (Spelling) and Vocabulary misuse and the 4.35% of participants selected the neutral option.

The survey results have relation with Harmer contribution (2004) which points out a possible problem that can arise when performing peer correction and tries that the student,

after being corrected or evaluated by his partner, may feel inferior or minimized by his partner. For this reason, in certain cases, students prefer that the teacher be the one who performs the correction and revision with delicacy.

After analyzing all the results that were obtained through the survey, it was discovered that the participants find the feedback provided by the teacher more comfortable and effective than the feedback provided by their peers. Several factors have an influence on the students not feeling comfortable when performing the peer correction since many of them considered that if they pointed out the errors in the contribution of their classmate it could generate problems or rivalries, it is for this reason that many of the students refrained from pointing out the errors, many of them did not feel able to qualify the contribution of their classmates. On the other hand, according to the survey results, learners tend to prefer the feedback provided by the teacher since they perceived a better understanding and clarify their doubts, the previous results have relation to Kleijn's (2021) investigation which is based on the premise proposed by Vygotsky which consists of social interaction with a character who has more information or knowledge about a certain area so that feedback can give effective results, in this way students can rely on the instructions given by the teacher to be able to process the information provided during the feedback. With the purpose of obtaining a great improvement in their writing skills.

## Conclusions

The teacher's feedback had a positive and significant impact on the students since this was evidenced once the respective observations and recommendations were made based on the writings they made. It was confirmed that students who improved their paragraph writing skills were thanks to this type of feedback.

Teacher feedback is the best way for a student to improve since the teacher has knowledge management that a student does not have at the time of giving feedback, allowing the teacher's feedback to be deeper and more meaningful.

Peer correction did not have a positive impact on the students, since most of the students felt afraid and nervous when correcting, and even more so they did not really know how to give feedback to their peers, since students they didn't know how to do it.

During this investigation, it was concluded that in the process of peer correcting, most of the students did not feel comfortable because they believed that their classmates when making the correction, would consider some aspects such as: hostility, friendship, feelings, or personal interests.

Peer correction did not contribute to the improvement of the student's writing skills as these corrections were deficient, without criteria, and with minimal identification of semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors.

The results of the morphological errors showed a higher percentage of repetition than the rest of the errors. These errors belong to the category of omission, where EFL students tend to make these types of errors due to intralinguistic deficiencies. While on the other hand, the errors with the lowest repetition frequency were the semantic errors that refer to the interference of the L1 in the writing process.

## Recommendations

Based on the teacher's feedback, it is recommended that the teacher not only provide comments and observations, but also apply grammar exercises that are also important to develop and assess the student's knowledge.

It is recommended that during the teacher's feedback, the teacher motivates the students and implements new methods that are dynamic so that through this the students can understand more easily.

It is suggested that the teacher instruct and guide the students on how to identify the types of errors and be able to correct themselves so that in this way they can have a clearer idea, and later they can correct their classmates, providing meaningful feedback.

It is advised that before doing the peer correction, students are instructed on how to make a checklist or provided with one, as this tool will be of great help in counting and identifying each error they find.

It is pertinent to recommend the use of a dictionary so that students can create autonomous learning, expand their vocabulary, know the meaning of words, and thus make correct and appropriate use when writing.

Finally, it is recommended that the teacher has the role of the guide during the peer correction so that the student knows what to do if the teacher is guiding and observing this process, and gives advice to the students during this activity, it will allow them to students provide more complete and effective feedback..

## References

- Adhiyanti, A. P., Marhaeni, A. A. I. N., & Kusuma, I. P. I. (2018). The effect of anonymous peer assessment on writing ability of the eleventh grade students at SMK PGRI 1 Singaraja. *Journal of Psychology and Instructions*, 2(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpai.v2i1.13735>
- Akkaya, N., & Kirmizi, F. S. (2010). *Relationship between attitudes to reading and time allotted to*. Turkey: Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 2 (2010) 4742–4746.
- Alharbi, S. H. (2017). Principled eclecticism: Approach and application in teaching writing to ESL/EFL students. *English Language Teaching*, 10(2), 33. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n2p33>
- Al-Saleh, N. A. (2018). The Impact of Positive and Corrective Feedback via Showbie on Saudi Students' English Writing. *Arab World English Journal*, 215, 1–121. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/th.215>
- Alshammari, S. (2020). “Writing to learn or learning to write”. A critical review of “English as a Foreign Language” (EFL) teaching practices in writing in Saudi universities. *Research in Education and Learning Innovation Archives*, 24, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.7203/realia.24.15867>
- Awada, G. M., & Diab, N. M. (2021). Effect of online peer review versus face-to-face peer review on argumentative writing achievement of EFL learners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1912104>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to give effective feedback to your students* (Second Edition ed.). USA: ASCD.

- Cárcamo, B. (2020). Classifying written corrective feedback for research and educational purposes: A typology proposal. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 22(2), 211–222. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v22n2.79924>
- Cui, Y., Schunn, C. D., & Gai, X. (2021). Peer feedback and teacher feedback: A comparative study of revision effectiveness in writing instruction for EFL learners. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1969541>
- Dayyani, M., & Semiyari, S. R. (2019). The impact of teachers vs. peers corrections and the explicit instruction of DMs on Iranian EFL learners' writing scores. *Journal of New Advances in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 177–201.
- Egar, N., & Musarokah, S. (2017). Students' response to the application of group correction of students' written assignment assisted with peer-editing worksheet in teaching cause-effect essay. *A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature*, 17(2), 196–207. <https://doi.org/10.24167/celt.v17i2>
- Fan, N., & Ma, Y. (2018). The role of written corrective feedback in second language writing practice. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(12), 1629–1635. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0812.08>
- Farooq, O., & Wahid, R. (2019). Analyzing syntactic errors in EFL text. *Language in India*, 19(2), 336–348. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333045426>
- Fithriani, R. (2018). *Cultural Influences on Students' Perceptions of Written Feedback in L2 Writing* (Vol. 1). Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning.
- Gentrup, S., Lorenz, G., Cornelia, K., & Irena, K. (2020). Self-fulfilling prophecies in the classroom: Teacher expectations, teacher. *Learning and Instruction*, págs. 3-9.
- Gulnara, A. (30th de November de 2019). An encouraging strategy in peer correction. *World Science*, págs. 12-14.

- Henderson, M., Mahoney, P., Michael, P., Ryan, Tracii, Bound, D., & Molloy, E. (2018). What makes for effective feedback: staff and student perspectives. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(1), 25-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1467877>
- Hosseini, M., Taghizadeh, E. M., Abedin, M. J., & Elham, N. (2013). *In the Importance of EFL Learners' Writing Skill: Is there any Relation between Writing Skill and Content Score of English Essay Test?* International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences.6.
- Huang, H. W., Xu, Y., Bai, Y., & Dusza, D. G. (2020). Effects of paper-based and online asynchronous corrective feedback on EFL writing. *12th International Conference on Education Technology and Computers*, 93–97. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3436756.3437027>
- Hyland, F. (2010). *Future directions in feedback on second language writing: Overview and research agenda* (Vol. 1). International Journal of English Studies.
- Irwin, B. (2017). Written corrective feedback: Student preferences and teacher feedback practices. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(2), 35–58.
- Jahid, J. H., & Idrees, M. (2012). *EFL Major Student Teachers' Writing Proficiency and Attitudes Towards Learning English Reseach study* (Vol. 1). Journal of Taiban University.
- Jusun, K. D., & Yunus, M. M. (2016). The effectiveness of using sentence makers in improving writing performance among pupils in Lubok Antu rural schools. *Education inthe 21th Century: Responding to Current Issues* .
- Lahuerta, A. C. (2018). Study of accuracy and grammatical complexity in EFL writing. *International Journal of English Studies*, 18(1), 71–89. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2018/1/258971>

Leonard, K. (31st de January de 2019). <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/importance-written-communication-business-2936.html>. Obtenido de

<https://smallbusiness.chron.com/importance-written-communication-business-2936.html>

Mamad, A. (2018). The role of written corrective feedback in EFL writing. *Opus et Educatio*, 7(2), 148–154. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.3311/ope.376>

Murshidi, G. al. (2014). UAE university male students' interests impact on reading and writing performance and improvement. *English Language Teaching*, 7(9), 57–63. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n9p57>

Murthy, J. D. (2003). *Contemporary English Grammar for Scholars and Students*. Book Palace. India.

Najogi, J., & Aryuliva, A. (2019). *Using peer correction towards students writing ability in writing analytical exposition text at senior high school*. FBS Universitas Negeri Padang.

Nasser, A. N. A. (2018). Teaching the writing skill to Yemeni EFL learners: The importance and challenge. *South-Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies (SAJMS)*, 3(6). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327966292>

Neumyer, S. (2021). *9 Writers on Why Writing Is So Hard*. Shondaland.

<https://www.shondaland.com/inspire/books/a37726410/writers-on-why-writing-is-so-hard/>

Novitasari, R., Martono, M., & Sarosa, T. (2018). Improving students' ability in writing recount text using peer. *English Educational Journal*, 6, 221-230. <https://doi.org/10.20961/eed.v6i2.35950>

Ouahidi, L. M. (2021). Teaching writing to tertiary EFL large classes: Challenges and prospects. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 4(6), 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt>

- Pasaribu, A. N., Pasaribu, T. K., Hutaaruk, M. N. (2021). Error in students' thesis writing: Syntactical and morphological error analysis. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute- Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 4(4), 8695–8704. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v4i4.2818>
- Parasibu, T. A., & Dewi, N. (2021). *Indonesian EFL Students' Voices on Online Learning*. LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network.
- Perdani, Y. D. (2020). Peer-correction technique in writing class. *English Focus: Journal of English Language Education*, 4(2), 29–41. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.24905/efj.v4i1.81>
- Rajsombat, J., & Indrambarya, K. (2019). Semantic and syntactic errors of using but produced by Thai university students. *PSAKU International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 8(2), 243–251. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3547211>
- Rhalmi, M. (2018, February 2). *How to teach writing skills to ESL and EFL students*. MyEnglishPages MEP.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Routledge
- Rosas, C. (2022). Teaching didactic academic writing in the EFL context. *ACADEMIA Letters*, 5112. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.20935/al5112>
- Rushidi, J. (2012). *Perceptions and Performance: Students' Attitudes towards Academic* (Vol. 2). SEEU Review.
- Sadeghi, K., & Mosalli, Z. (2013). *The effect of task complexity on the quality of EFL learners' argumentative writing*.
- Sakrak-Ekin, G., & Balgikanli, C. (2019). Written corrective feedback: EFL teachers' beliefs and practices. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 19(1), 114–128.

Sanders, V. (23st de December de 2016). *Common Syntax and Semantic Errors*. 1

**CHAPTER OBJECTIVES**• *To understand the fundamental characteristics of syntax and semantic errors*• *To be able to identify specific common syntax and semantic errors.*

Obtenido de <https://silo.tips/download/common-syntax-and-semantic-errors>

Sultana, N., & Yoko, N. T. (2021). Impact of teachers' feedback in improving students' writing skills: A study of tertiary level students in Dhaka. *British Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 3(5), 128–139.

Talosa, A. D., & Maguddayao, R. N. (2018). Evaluation of second language learners' syntactic errors in ESL writing. *TESOL International Journal*, 13(4), 172–181.

Teng, L. S., Sun, P. P., & Xu, L. (2018). Conceptualizing writing self-efficacy in English as a foreign language contexts: Scale validation through structural equation modeling. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(4), 911–942. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.432>

Trabelsi, S. (2019). The perceptions and preferences of the general foundation programme students regarding written corrective feedback in an Omani EFL context. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 10(1), 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.10n.1p.91>

Tsao, J. J. (2021). Effects of EFL learners' L2 writing self-efficacy on engagement with written corrective feedback. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 30(6), 575–584. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00591-9>

Wahyuni, S. (2018). Peer correction on writing quality of college students having different cognitive styles. *INFERENSI: Jurnal Penelitian Sosial Keagamaan*, 12(2), 259–282. <https://doi.org/10.18326/infsl3.v12i2.259-282>

Winstone, N., & Carless, D. (2020). *Designing Effective Feedback Processes in Higher Education*. New York: Routledge.

Zahawi, Q. M. (2021). Peer assessment in EFL writing classes: Investigating Kurdish students' attitudes. *Twejer*, 4(1), 1255–1287. <https://doi.org/10.31918/twejer.2141.29>



**Appendix A: Post-test**

**1) Write a 120-150 words narrative paragraph about your experience in taking remote classes during the Covid-19 pandemic.**

-----

-----

-----

-----

-----

-----

## Appendix C: Rubric

PARAMETERS	EXCELLENT (10 – 7.6)	GOOD (7.5 - 5.1)	FAIR (5 – 2.6)	POOR (2.5 - 0)
<b>SEMANTIC CRITERIA</b> 6	<p>All words (more than 75%) were used correctly in the context of the paragraph. Uses grade appropriate language throughout.</p> <p>Each sentence supported the other and there were smooth transitions between thoughts.</p>	<p>Most of the words (75%) were used correctly in the context of the paragraph. Some use of grade appropriate language.</p> <p>All sentences were complete, but very few were underdeveloped.</p>	<p>Some words (50%) were used correctly in the context of the paragraph. Consistently uses language at a level one grade lower.</p> <p>There were several areas (50%) that were hard to understand.</p>	<p>A few words (less than 25%) were used correctly. In the context of the paragraph. Consistently uses language at a level two grades lower.</p> <p>Sentences (more than 75%) are not complete, and they have no or little development.</p>
<b>SYNTACTIC CRITERIA</b> 8	<p>All words, phrases, and sentences were complete (more than 75%). There were no grammar errors in the sentences.</p> <p>All the sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement, depending on the type of construction.</p>	<p>Most of words, phrases, and sentences were complete (75%). There were a few grammar errors (less than 25%) in the sentences.</p> <p>Most of the sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement;</p>	<p>Some of the words, phrases, and sentences were complete (50%).</p> <p>There were still several sentences (50%) that were underdeveloped.</p> <p>Some sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement;</p>	<p>A few words, phrases, and sentences were complete (less than 25%).</p> <p>There were too many errors (more than 75%) in grammar, usage, or sentence structure, which made it hard to read.</p> <p>A few sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject +</p>

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

			meaning of the writing. Frequent errors made in spelling.	of the writing due to these errors. Numerous errors made in spelling.
--	--	--	--	--

### Appendix D: Student's checklist

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

### Appendix E: 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.			
4	The feedback delivered by my teacher helps me to improve my writing skills.			
5	My peer provides me with feedback through comments, questions or additional information.			
6	The teacher provides feedback through comments, questions or additional information.			
7	The feedback delivered by my classmate is clear and easy to understand.			
8	The feedback delivered by the teacher is clear and easy to understand.			
9	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my peer			
10	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my teacher.			
11	The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve in...			
	Grammar use (Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization and Punctuation)			
	Word formation (Spelling)			

	Vocabulary misuse			
<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			