



**UTPL**

**UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA PARTICULAR DE LOJA**

*La Universidad Católica de Loja*

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

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

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

Trabajo de titulación previo a la obtención del título de:

**Licenciado en Ciencias de la Educación Mención Inglés**

**Autor:** Ramirez Romero, Johana Lisbeth

**Director:** Jaramillo Pontón. Mayra Fernanda, Mgtr

NEW - YORK

2023



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

2023

## Aprobación del director del Trabajo de Titulación

Loja, 4 de septiembre 2022

Magister

Alba Vargas Saritama

Directora de 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 Ramirez Romero, Johana Lisbeth, ha sido orientado y revisado durante su ejecución, así mismo ha sido verificado a través de la herramienta de similitud académica institucional, y cuenta con un porcentaje de coincidencia aceptable. En virtud de ello, y por considerar que el mismo cumple con todos los parámetros establecidos por la Universidad, doy mi aprobación a fin de continuar con el proceso académico correspondiente.

Particular que comunico para los fines pertinentes.

Atentamente,

Director: Mgtr. Jaramillo Pontón. Mayra Fernanda

C.I.: 0704205491

Correo Electrónico: mfjaramillo1@utpl.edu.ec

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

Yo, Ramirez Romero, Johana Lisbeth, declaro y acepto en forma expresa lo siguiente:

Ser autora del Trabajo de Titulación denominado: The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students, de la carrera de Ciencias de la educación: mención Ingles, específicamente de los contenidos comprendidos en: Capítulo 1: Literature Review, Capítulo 2: Method, Capítulo 3: Discussion, analysis and interpretación of results, Conclusiones y Recomendaciones, siendo Mgtr. Jaramillo Pontón Mayra Fernanda, directora del presente trabajo; también declaro que la presente investigación no vulnera derechos de terceros ni utiliza fraudulentamente obras preexistentes. Además, ratifico que las ideas, criterios, opiniones, procedimientos y resultados vertidos en el presente trabajo investigativo, son de mi exclusiva responsabilidad. Eximo expresamente a la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja y a sus representantes legales de posibles reclamos o acciones judiciales o administrativas, en relación a la propiedad intelectual de este trabajo.

Que la presente obra, producto de mis actividades académicas y de investigación, forma parte del patrimonio de la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja, de conformidad con el artículo 20, literal j), de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior; y, artículo 91 del Estatuto Orgánico de la 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.

.....

Autor: Ramirez Romero, Johana Lisbeth

C.I.: 1723475834

Correo electrónico: [jlr Ramirez20@utpl.edu.ec](mailto:jlr Ramirez20@utpl.edu.ec)

## **Dedication**

I would like to dedicate this accomplishment to my parents Juan Ramirez and Norma Romero, who have emotionally supported my pursuit of a professional degree, and to my siblings Joel and Daniela to be my source of motivation and inspiration for all these years. Additionally, I would like to thank each of my college classmates and friends who have traveled this far with me.

From the bottom of my heart, thank you.

### **Acknowledgement**

I would like to thank my instructor, Mgtr. Mayra Jaramillo, who has proven to be an exceptional professional and has been a significant help in achieving this objective. In addition, I would like to thank the Universidad Tecnica Particular de Loja for enabling me to accomplish this long-awaited objective.

## List of contents

Aprobación del director del Trabajo de Titulación .....	II
Declaración de autoría y cesión de derechos .....	III
Dedication.....	V
Acknowledgement .....	VI
List of contents .....	VII
List of tables.....	IX
Abstract .....	1
Resumen.....	2
Introduction .....	3
Chapter One .....	6
Literature Review .....	6
Writing in the EFL context .....	6
<i>The importance of writing in the EFL students.....</i>	7
<i>Challenges in EFL writing.....</i>	8
<i>The most common and frequent written errors: morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors .....</i>	9
Morphological Errors. ....	10
Semantic Errors.....	10
Syntactic Errors.....	11
Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) on EFL learners.....	12
<i>The importance of effective feedback .....</i>	14
Written Peer correction .....	15

<i>Written Teacher feedback</i> .....	16
<b>Chapter Two</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Method</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Setting and Participants</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Procedure</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Chapter Three</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Analysis and Discussion</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Which are the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of the morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors?</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Which type of feedback: Peer correction and teacher feedback do EFL students prefer for writing?</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>Conclusions</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Recommendations</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>40</b>
<b>Annexes</b> .....	¡Error! Marcador no definido.
<b>Apendix A</b> .....	<b>48</b>
<b>Apendix B</b> .....	<b>50</b>
<b>Apendix C</b> .....	<b>51</b>

**List of tables**

<b>Table 1. Pre and post test results .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Table 2. Teacher and Peer feedback results .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Table 3. Students' perception about teacher and peer feedback.....</b>	<b>32</b>

### **Abstract**

The current investigation titled ‘ The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students aimed to analyze the differences between peer and teacher feedback and their efficacy for the improvement of morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors in EFL writing. To achieve this objective, 16 students from second-year senior high schools participated. This entire investigation was carried out online through a mixed method. The technique employed was a survey and the instruments for data collection were pre and post-tests, student writings, and a questionnaire. The results indicate that the implementation of peer correction and teacher feedback was successful because the students' final average increased, indicating that the students' written skills improved. However, teacher feedback was more effective at detecting semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors because the teacher possessed language mastery. In contrast, despite their efforts, the students were unable to match the teacher's accomplishments in terms of error detection and correction. In addition, it was discovered that all students prefer teacher feedback because they perceive their writing skills improved after receiving it.

*Keywords:* peer corrective feedback, teacher corrective feedback, writing skills

## Resumen

Esta investigación titulada 'El rol de la corrección entre pares y la retroalimentación docente en la mejora de las habilidades escritas de los estudiantes de colegio analizó las diferencias entre la retroalimentación entre pares y el maestro y su eficacia para mejorar los errores morfológicos, semánticos y sintácticos. Los participantes fueron 16 estudiantes de segundo de bachillerato. Esta investigación fue realizada en línea utilizando un método mixto. La técnica empleada fue la encuesta y los instrumentos fueron las pruebas previas y posteriores, los escritos de los estudiantes y un cuestionario. Los resultados indican que la implementación de la corrección entre pares y la retroalimentación docente fue exitosa porque el promedio final aumentó. Sin embargo, la retroalimentación docente fue más efectiva para detectar errores semánticos, sintácticos y morfológicos porque el maestro poseía dominio del idioma. En contraste, a pesar de sus esfuerzos, los estudiantes no pudieron igualar los logros del maestro en términos de detección y corrección de errores. Además, se descubrió que todos los estudiantes prefieren la retroalimentación docente porque percibieron que sus habilidades de escritura mejoraron después de recibirla.

*Palabras clave:* habilidades de escritura, retroalimentación correctiva entre pares, retroalimentación correctiva del maestro.

## Introduction

According to Elsner (2018), the four skills of English as a foreign language (EFL), such as reading, writing, listening, and speaking, must be adequately acquired in EFL classrooms in order for students to master the language and communicate effectively. In terms of writing skills, Sandeep (2021) notes that EFL writing is one of the first skills used by teachers to familiarize and integrate students into the new language. However, the same author notes that not all students can master this skill; as a result, their writing compositions are frequently presented incorrectly. Since students' writing difficulties are a palpable reality in education, written corrective feedback has been promoted as a strategy to reduce errors. As a result, the teacher is required to provide written feedback and may even solicit student feedback to reduce the number of errors. In this regard, Khrin (2020) states that EFL written activities promote correct linguistic (lexical, phonetic, and semantic) and grammatical rules. In addition, Al Herz (2020) says EFL writers must master grammar, organization, cohesion, and punctuation. For this reason, students must receive adequate writing feedback after each written activity. Usually, the teacher is in charge. The same author states that a student can replicate the instructor's correction model and provide feedback and information, this process is called peer correction.

Taking into account what has been stated by previous authors, it is important to be aware of the advantages and disadvantages of WCF as determined by various studies. In the following paragraphs, three previous studies related to this topic are described.

First, Farsani and Aghamohammadi (2021) conducted a study to determine EFL students' engagement level while using peer correction and teacher feedback in a writing course. The findings revealed that both types of feedback increased students' willingness to assess and receive corrections.

A second study was conducted by Ahmed (2015) who investigated the effectiveness of written corrective feedback (WCF) on EFL Arab students' use of ten

English prepositions. The results of this study show that WCF increased students' accuracy in using English prepositions, and corrective feedback has both short-term and long-term benefits.

Wihastyanang et al. (2020) conducted a third study in Indonesia to determine the effectiveness of online peer correction and teacher feedback on students' writing performance. The findings revealed that implementing both types of feedback online was less effective in improving students' writing performance because it took more time to implement.

In light of this, the present study aims to analyze the differences between peer and teacher feedback and their efficacy for the improvement of morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors in EFL writing. And in order not to deviate from the stated purpose, the following research questions guided the entire analysis of this investigation: *Which are the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors?* and *Which type of feedback: Peer correction and teacher feedback do EFL students prefer for writing?*

For a better understanding of the information of this study, it contemplates three chapters. The first chapter, *Literature Review*, discusses topics, such as EFL writing skills, their importance, and their challenges. In addition, six past research are described in depth at the conclusion of the chapter to provide comprehension of this topic. The second chapter corresponds to the *Method* and describes the research's setting, participants, methodology, instruments, and procedure. The third chapter contains an *Analysis and Discussion* comparing quantitative and qualitative data to author contributions. Finally, some conclusions and recommendations conclude this chapter.

On the other hand, it is important to note that this study is essential for the directors of the high school where the research was done. This is because the results show the level and quality of the participants' writing and the possible solutions that teachers and principals can use to help students improve their writing skills.

Furthermore, this study will also be helpful for future national and international researchers who want to know what role peer and teacher feedback play in the EFL writing process for high school students. Lastly, it was a very good sign that the students showed a good attitude, making it easier to use the instruments and obtain the results. For this reason, there were no limitations.

## **Chapter one**

### **Literature Review**

This section contains relevant scientific information about the topic of study. In this way, all information about writing in the EFL context, the importance of writing for EFL students, the challenges of writing in EFL, and the most common and frequent writing errors: morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors, have come from reliable sources, such as books and academic journals. This chapter also includes and explains information on written corrective feedback, peer correction, and teacher feedback. Also, six previous studies related to the subject of this study are analyzed at the end of it.

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

During the teaching of English as a foreign language (EFL) and EFL learning. (EFL), according to Marzban and Jalali (2016), writing is one of the four primary language skills that allow EFL students to acquire and master the English language gradually. Furthermore, Menbet (2020) states in the same way that mastery of EFL writing enables students to acquire micro and macro skills, thereby enhancing their overall English proficiency. According to the same author, this is because when EFL students practice writing, they employ a variety of cognitive skills and critical thinking to create a correctly written text.

For Rahim (2019), the development of EFL writing skills requires students to master several linguistic and cognitive aspects, including planning, textualization, and revision, as well as focus, comprehension, and memory. Students can express their thoughts clearly and coherently in the target language if they master this skill. In addition, Nejmaoui (2018) notes that writing in the EFL context improves students' communicative competence and language proficiency, which is the main goal of EFL students.

Moreover, Sani et al. (2017) identify the ability to write as one of the most essential and difficult to acquire. The same authors explain that EFL writing requires

various cognitive skills and the ability to organize ideas and phrases in L2 in order to transmit meaning clearly, coherently, and adequately to the reader. Similarly, Windiyani et al. (2019) note that writing in the English language is a highly productive skill that requires the EFL student to develop specific skills, such as pragmatics, which enables the student to use the English language contextually, and linguistic competence, which is the body of knowledge that enables the learner to comprehend and produce several grammatically correct sentences with coherence and cohesion. This skill has become crucial for students to achieve academic and professional development, enabling them to function in settings where English is widely used (Winiharti, 2017). However, Menbet (2018) states that mastering these skills in the EFL context is difficult because it requires constant language practice. Therefore, teachers and educational authorities are encouraged to incorporate EFL writing courses into their curricula.

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

Concerning the significance of writing skills, Sabria (2016) asserts that EFL writing proficiency is essential because it familiarizes students with the target language and fosters communicative competence, enabling students to function adequately and effectively within the English-speaking community. Similarly, Khrin (2020) states that EFL written activities promote the correct application of linguistic rules (lexical, phonetic, and semantic) and grammatical rules. In addition, Winiharti (2017) notes that the EFL writing skill, along with reading, requires students to understand the historical, social, and cultural context of the target language.

For Putri and Aminatun (2021), writing is essential because it enables students to communicate graphically in a language other than their native tongue. In this way, they learn how to communicate their ideas in a manner that is easily understood. Likewise, Marzban and Jalali (2016) note that writing encourages students to recall and express the information they have learned. As they produce writings using their own words and thoughts, students develop comprehensible output in this manner.

In addition, Soreson (2009) asserts that the development of EFL writing skills is essential because its process includes fundamental steps that foster independent and written learning. These steps include prewriting, writing, revision, and editing. Students plan and make decisions about what and how to write during prewriting. In the writing process, students express their ideas, and this is the most crucial step because it reveals the students' vocabulary level and writing ability. During the revision process, students receive assistance from their teacher, and based on the teacher's revisions; they can improve the content, structure, or organization. In the final stage, correction, both students and teachers examine the spelling, punctuation, grammar, and mechanics of the paper. For this reason, the same author asserts that EFL writing is essential because it requires students to meditate and think critically before writing.

On the other hand, Haiyan and Rilong (2016) highlight that mastery of English writing enables students to access more stable or lucrative employment and professional opportunities. In addition, the same authors emphasize that knowing and mastering a language Franca like English demonstrates a commitment to and interest in the culture of the target language.

### ***Challenges in EFL writing***

According to Putri and Aminatun (2021), the EFL writing skill is difficult to acquire because it is taught in an environment with limited exposure to the target language. Also, Budiharto (2019) indicates that students frequently struggle with writing in their native language, so learning to write in a foreign language is considerably more challenging.

In addition, Nejmaoui (2018) asserts that EFL writing is difficult because students are frequently unfamiliar with the structures of the new language and are limited in their ability to express themselves. Moreover, Benson and Ahmed (2016) highlight that writing in English is difficult for students who lack adequate grammatical command and vocabulary.

For Ayu and Zuraida (2020), an EFL writing learner must deal with the various components of writing, including grammatical structure, vocabulary, mechanics, and punctuation, which frequently confuses them because they are unfamiliar with the English language context. Likewise, the same authors assert that even though students attempt to write in L2, they frequently make errors that compromise the text's meaning and transmission.

Furthermore, Haiyan and Rilong (2016) point out that EFL students frequently fear expressing their ideas in L2 because, lacking the necessary knowledge, they are filled with fear and believe they are incapable of writing a complete thought, which makes learning to write more difficult. Thus, EFL writing is challenging because it frequently requires that students have both developed cognitive skills and sufficient exposure to the language, which is unlikely in the EFL context (Albedaiwi, 2022).

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

According to Maolida and Hidayat (2021), it is natural for students to make various errors that affect writing quality as part of the learning process. During this stage, the same authors point out that these errors allow teachers to identify the aspects of writing with which students are having more difficulties. Consequently, both teachers and students can focus on strengthening these areas, ultimately improving their English writing ability.

Similarly, Aziz et al. (2021) highlight that EFL students frequently commit various writing errors while developing their writing skills. In addition, the same authors affirm that these errors are due to a lack of writing experience, awareness of writing strategies, and command of the grammatical rules of the target language. In this way, Khatter (2019) explains that written errors cannot and should not be avoided because it helps instructors identify students' writing strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, the same author explains that interlingual and intralingual transfer is among the leading causes of errors in written work.

### **Morphological Errors.**

According to Angraeeni (2017), morphology refers to how a misplaced morpheme causes the word to be incorrect. That is, they are created from a word root or lexeme. Regarding morphological errors, the same author states that they occur when a word is poorly structured, incomplete, or incorrect. In this way, Angraeeni (2017) categorizes these errors as inflectional, derivational, and compound-word errors.

Regarding morphological errors, Rahman (2019) adds that the incorrect use of affixes is the most common morphological error, caused primarily by ignorance of word formation. Moreover, Zaid et al. (2017) identify linguistic and intralinguistic factors as additional sources of morphological errors. In addition, the same author categorizes these errors as omission, addition, misinformation, and disorder.

Furthermore, Ramadan (2015) emphasizes the importance of students learning morphological rules to know when and how to use a prefix, suffix, or morpheme. Besides, the same author categorizes morphological errors as inflectional morphemes and derivational morphemes.

For example, Ramadan (2015) in his study discovered morpheme -s omission errors in the first category, such as '*All student*', '*A lot of car*' (p.44). According to the author, these errors result from students' carelessness. Also, the same author indicates that the incorrect use of prefixes causes errors in the use of derivational morphemes. For instance, '*It is unpractical*', '*It is insignificant*'. The correct forms are '*It is impractical*', '*It is insignificant*'. For the author, these errors occur due to mother tongue transference.

### **Semantic Errors.**

According to Budiharto (2019), errors at the semantic level occur when the learners select and place a word incorrectly, which causes confusion because it is not in line with the context of the message they wish to convey. In addition, these errors

result from a lack of vocabulary in the target language and English context knowledge. (Alhameed & Al-Shaikli, 2017)

In addition, Jassim (2016) indicates that students make errors at this level due to unfamiliar words and expressions in the target language. Therefore, they misplace words without considering the context in which they intend to communicate. Based on this, the same author asserts three types of semantic errors: confusion of sense relations, collocation, and stylistic errors.

On the other hand, Rezai and Davarpanah (2019) report that the most common semantic errors are the confusion of sense relations resulting from learners' frequent use of direct translation. Similarly, the same academics assert that students make other types of semantic errors when using false cognates and synonyms because they do not understand the correct meaning of each word.

For instance, Almahameed and Al-Shaikli (2017) discovered semantic errors in the following sentence, *'The bathroom becomes on the left of house'*. In this example, it is observed that the verb *'left'* is a poor choice made by the students due to their literal translation of Arabic into English. Along the same lines, scholars discovered a semantic error in using adjectives due to a lack of English language proficiency. For instance, *'That day was so tired'*.

### **Syntactic Errors.**

Concerning the syntactic level, Anggraeni (2017) explains that syntax is the branch of grammar that investigates the rules and principles governing the combination of syntactic constituents and the formation of higher units, such as phrases and grammatical sentences. Students can correctly construct sentences, clauses, and phrases by mastering syntax.

According to Farooq and Wahid (2019), errors at this level occur when students cannot properly form sentences or statements, taking into account the different linguistic rules that govern the target language, making it difficult to comprehend each other sentences or statements. In a similar vein, Almahameed and Al-Shaikli (2017)

assert that each target-language sentence must contain syntactic units that are grammatically well-structured. For this reason, it is crucial that students understand each rule, structure, and grammatical unit in order to use them correctly in sentences.

In a similar vein, Almahameed and Al-Shaikhli (2017) discovered that the most common errors in the writings of EFL learners were at the syntactic level due to mother tongue interference. The most prevalent errors involved agreement, auxiliary, conjunctions, and word order. The same authors discovered an agreement error in the following sentence, '*The house contain a three rooms.*' As it can be seen, there is no subject-verb agreement in this sentence, and the article 'a' has been added incorrectly. Based on these findings, the authors conclude that they engage in mother tongue transference.

In addition, Anggraeni (2018) classifies syntactic errors according to subject-verb agreement, adverbs, and adjectives. The author emphasizes that these errors occur because students do not comprehend each structure and become confused when writing due to their ignorance. For example, in the sentence, '*Problem arises when he accused of killing...*', there is an error in subject-verb agreement because the sentence structure is in the past tense. Nevertheless, the verb '*arises*' is in the present tense.

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

As part of the writing process, Chong (2022) indicates that written corrective feedback in the EFL context is feedback provided by an agent in students' written work. Generally, the correction is written on each student's work and has the purpose that the students recognize their errors and correct them based on the agent's observations.

Along the same lines, Zhang and Cheng (2021) indicate that the main agent who provides written corrective feedback is generally the language teacher. However, the agent can also be a student, a tutor, or a person who has been trained and is familiar with the learning objectives. In this way, WCF is useful because it allows students to improve their accuracy and correct errors systematically within the writing

process. Furthermore, Zhang et al. (2021) state that WCF is a correction strategy that has been technologically incorporated. That is, the agent could be a previously designed computer program that provides feedback. In this way, the same author emphasizes the importance of WCF in the process of teaching writing in L2.

For Lee (2020), WCF is a correction technique widely used in the EFL context because it identifies linguistic, mechanical, and punctuation errors. Also, the same author emphasizes the value of WCF because its corrections and observations can be applied to future writing pieces. Besides, Polio (2012) says WCF feedback requires implicit and explicit agent knowledge. Implicit knowledge helps correct and detect errors in oral contexts, while explicit knowledge encourages conscious and controlled learning in writing.

On the other hand, Chong (2022) indicates that WCF has been the subject of numerous investigations in the field of education; in fact, the author cites Truscott (1996) who states that WCF is ineffective in improving students' writing skills because it lacks sufficient written information and in some instances omits the correction of certain errors. Also, the same author emphasizes that Ferris (1999) reveals that WCF is effective so long as it is implemented appropriately, taking into consideration the learning styles of the students, the level, and the learning objectives. Based on this, Chong (2022) concludes that it is currently impossible to render a verdict regarding WCF because there are multiple types of feedback, including direct and indirect WCF, focused and unfocused WCF, metalinguistic WCF, computer-generated/mediated WCF, and alternative WCF.

The same author explains that direct feedback provides explicit correction of language errors. According to Chandler (2003), indirect feedback involves the implicit correction of language errors. Moreover, Chandler (2003) indicates that focused feedback provides selective written feedback, whereas unfocused feedback provides comprehensive correction of language errors. In addition, Shintani (2015) indicates that metalinguistic feedback is correct through written explanations based on the nature of

language errors when discussing metalinguistic feedback. Regarding computer-generated/mediated WCF, Li et al. (2015) explain that this form of feedback is facilitated by educational technology.

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

According to Chong (2022), written corrective feedback is a correction strategy with multiple benefits, including error detection and correction, as well as improved written accuracy among students. Therefore, WCF in the EFL context is considered a strategy for enhancing students' writing abilities.

For Lee (2020), WCF is beneficial because it immediately corrects poorly acquired or assimilated information by students. In other words, there are instances in which students do not adequately absorb the input provided by the teacher. The most common of which is that they use the literal translation. Through WCF, the teacher can recognize these patterns and provide clarification in order for the errors not to reoccur.

Moreover, Alvira (2016) points out that effective feedback motivates students and provides written input pertinent to their learning objectives or learning styles. In addition, the same author notes that WCF can be used to improve grammar, punctuation, and mechanics. Also, Han and Hyland (2018) assert that WCF is beneficial for fostering positive emotions in students, such as motivation and a desire to learn English. In other words, since WCF is a qualitative correction strategy rather than a quantitative one, students do not fear making errors; instead, they expect to know the results and corrections of their writing.

For instance, Aghajanloo (2016) determines that WCF is a highly effective instrument for the writing process in the EFL context, as the students' grammatical precision and spelling significantly improve after receiving written correction in several classes. Therefore, it should be an integral part of the curriculum. Likewise, Rummel and Bitchener (2022) claim that WCF is beneficial for enhancing students' linguistic accuracy in the simple past tense. In addition, it promotes motivation in students, who

after each implementation of WCF, demonstrate a desire to present writings with the fewest possible errors.

Chandler (2003) also asserts that EFL instructors must incorporate WCF into every written process to reduce errors and promote the correct acquisition of the target language. Thus, students will increase their vocabulary and become familiar with the context of the target language in each writing process. Thus, written feedback is effective when students improve their writing skills and become their own first critics (Chong, 2022).

### **Written Peer correction**

According to Ramirez and Guillén (2018), peer-written correction, also known as peer feedback, is a valuable tool that incorporates students into the correction process. In other words, the student is the evaluator in this type of feedback. In this way, peer correction promotes student interaction and participation in the writing process.

Likewise, Aghajani and Zoghipour (2018) assert that peer correction is a strategy in which the principal agent is not the teacher. In this instance, the principal agent could be any student involved in the writing process. Therefore, peer correction is a learning tool in which the student is the protagonist. Besides, this tool has altered the perception of traditional teaching, in which the teacher was the sole agent of correction.

Regarding its characteristics, Nur (2021) notes that this type of feedback is characterized by the fact that each student reviews and corrects the writing of their peer. In order for this type of feedback to be effective, both students must share the same learning objective and possess prior knowledge. Similarly, Yanti et al. (2022) indicate that peer correction is an activity that is constantly guided and monitored by the EFL teacher, which is a positive aspect that enables the correction process to produce the desired outcomes. Thus, the teacher participates in the correction process as a learning guide or facilitator.

According to Al Herz (2020), peer correction is beneficial because it allows interaction and collaborative learning between peers within a written activity; thereby, helping students to develop collaborative learning skills and evaluation techniques. In other words, the student can replicate the instructor's correction model and provide feedback and information in the same manner as the instructor.

Another functionality of peer correction is provided by Ha and Nguyen (2021), who refers that this type of feedback can be used as a qualitative evaluation model in which students assume the role of evaluators while also becoming acquainted with the various linguistic characteristics of the target language. In addition, Nur (2021) points out that the primary benefit of this type of feedback is that it helps students develop their critical thinking and decision-making skills, allowing them to learn how to receive and provide appropriate corrections.

However, according to Al Herz (2020), the implementation of peer feedback may not produce the desired outcomes. This occurs when students lack adequate training in the evaluation process. In addition, there is a disadvantage when the teacher is unaware of how the students provide corrections. Additionally, Yanti et al. (2022) note that a disadvantage occurs when both students do not have the same level of writing, meaning that one student may provide more feedback than the other, making only one student the protagonist of learning. For this reason, the same author emphasizes the significance of prior training for both the teacher and the students on how and when to provide feedback.

### ***Written Teacher feedback***

During the EFL writing process, students must master linguistic aspects, such as grammar, organization, cohesion, and punctuation. To accomplish this, students must receive adequate feedback on their writing after each written activity, allowing them to identify their weaknesses and errors. In most cases, the teacher is the agent in charge of the entire process (Al Herz, 2020).

Thus, teacher corrective feedback is the traditional feedback the teacher has provided throughout the EFL writing process over the years. Historically, teacher corrective feedback was widely used as a quantitative evaluation in which each error affected the students' overall average (Carless & Winstone, 2020). Today this concept of teacher feedback has evolved and is widely used as a *qualitative evaluation* to correct and detect errors and instill in students the confidence that making mistakes and having errors during the EFL writing process is normal (Gentrup et al., 2020).

Additionally, Yu and Yang (2021) identify teacher feedback as a correction strategy that encourages students' confidence, primarily because the teacher's comments are consistent with the student's level of English and learning styles. In addition, the instructor can supplement written feedback with oral feedback, thereby enhancing the student's abilities.

According to Cheng and Zhang (2021), the primary characteristic of this type of feedback is that the teacher evaluates and corrects the students' writing based on an evaluation rubric that is consistent with the learning objectives. Furthermore, Gentrup et al. (2020) mention that another feature of teacher feedback is that the teacher generally points, marks, or writes a comment that allows the student to identify the cause of each error. Consequently, each assessment written by the teacher must be clear and precise, with simple writing for the student to understand.

Furthermore, Hakimi (2020) indicates that for teacher feedback to be effective, the teacher must focus on correcting a certain aspect of the language. That is, the correction must have objective and specific aspects to improve. For example, these aspects can be focused on the content or the form of each piece of writing.

Regarding its significance, Carless (2020) indicates that teacher feedback is advantageous for both teachers and students. On the one hand, the teacher can determine the students' writing level, identify errors and their causes, and provide pertinent information based on these findings. On the other hand, students identify their

errors and positively assimilate the corrections to become more aware of their writing in the future.

Concerning the disadvantages, Mao and Crosthwaite (2019) state that when the main agent, in this case, the teacher, lacks proper pedagogical preparation and does not master the language, he or she may misuse this strategy, confusing the students. Additionally, according to De-Kleijn (2021), this strategy is harmful when teachers use it as a quantitative evaluation, which causes students to be upset and afraid of making mistakes because their grades will be affected. As a result, the author emphasizes the importance of the teacher being properly trained and having every intention of improving students' writing quality.

Below, six of the most recent studies related to the topic of the current work are described in the following paragraphs to provide a stronger scientific foundation for this research.

Farsani and Aghamohammadi (2021) conducted a study to determine EFL students' engagement level while using peer correction and teacher feedback in a writing course. There were 26 EFL students among the participants. A case study methodology was used, along with instruments like a semi-structured interview, a narrative inquiry piece, peer feedback, and writing tasks. The findings revealed that both types of feedback increased students' willingness to assess and receive corrections. However, teacher feedback proved to be more accurate because it included comments, suggestions, and additional information that the students had not yet mastered.

Also, Elfiyanto and Fukazawa (2021) carried out a research to determine the effectiveness of WCF and which feedback agent (teacher, peer, or self) is the most effective in improving students' EFL writing skills. ANOVA was used to analyze the quantitative data in a mixed methodology. In order to complete this task, the sample was divided into three groups: the first group, comprised of 60 students, received teacher feedback, the second group, formed of 60 students, received peer feedback;

and the third group, composed of 30 students, received self-feedback. Pre-test and post-test instruments were used. The results revealed that teacher feedback was the most effective because it was implemented immediately based on the students' levels. Peer feedback was found to be effective with students with similar writing ability levels. On the other hand, self-feedback was ineffective because an external agent was required to indicate and point out to the students the source of their errors.

Moreover, Wihastyanang et al. (2020) conducted another research in Indonesia to determine the effectiveness of online peer correction and teacher feedback on students' writing performance. The entire study was conducted virtually, with the Edmodo platform serving as the primary tool. The methodology used was quasi-experimental. The participants comprised 55 EFL university students divided into experimental and control groups. The instruments were a pre-test, writing samples, and a post-test. The findings revealed that implementing both types of feedback online was less effective in improving students' writing performance because it took more time to implement.

The following study was done by Trisnadewi (2021) who investigated the use of peer correction to improve the EFL writing skills of university students. A mixed methodology was used. The participants were 30 third-semester university students. The instruments were observation sheets, written tests, interviews, and questionnaires, which were applied in four phases: planning, execution, observance, and evaluation. The results showed that peer feedback enhanced EFL writing skills.

Furthermore, Hanjani (2015) researched to determine the reactions of EFL students to peer correction and teacher feedback activities. A qualitative methodology was used in this study. Eight EFL students took part in the study. The only instrument used was an interview with open-ended questions about their experiences receiving and providing WCF. A total of eight interviews were conducted and recorded for later analysis. According to the findings, all participants have a positive attitude toward both types of feedback because they believe it has improved their writing skills. However,

they emphasize that the teacher is the ideal person to provide feedback because she is an experienced individual fluent in English. As a result, they were more confident in their corrections.

In this last study, Saiful et al. (2019) analyzed the effects of teacher feedback, peer correction, and Schoology as online feedback on EFL students' writing performance. The methodology employed was quasi-experimental. Seventy EFL students enrolled in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Writing course were the sample and it was divided into three groups. Firstly, written teacher feedback was provided to the first group, the second group of students received peer-written corrections, and Schoology-based online feedback was provided to the third group. The instruments included a writing test and a survey. The findings indicated that all types of feedback were helpful for error detection. In addition, there was no significant variance between online and traditional feedback because the students were already familiar with both types.

## Chapter two

### Method

#### Setting and Participants

This investigation was performed virtually with sixteen students from a private school in the city of Loja. Twelve women and four men between the ages of 14 and 15 years old participated and they had B1 level according to the Common European Framework.

#### Procedure

The entire investigation was conducted virtually through a WhatsApp group that had to be created to maintain communication with the students. Then, schedules and time duration for teacher and peer feedback implementation were established through a Zoom videoconference.

A mixed methodology was employed that contemplates a student survey as a technique. The tools used to gather the data are pre and post-tests, student writings, and a questionnaire. This investigation spanned eight forty-minute classes. The final instruments used were a rubric and checklist, which were used to analyze and evaluate the data obtained from both peer correction and teacher feedback.

In the first virtual class, the pre-test was applied to the students in which they were required to compose a 150-word narrative paragraph on *Your future plans*. Even though, the students were required to have their cameras on while writing. The teacher asked them to take a picture of their writings and send it to the WhatsApp group to review when they completed the activity. Six classes were used for the implementation of both types of feedback. Students were required to complete written assignments on various topics and received teacher or peer feedback after each activity. In this way, three times of teacher feedback were applied. Then, three times of peer feedback were incorporated during three alternating classes. Thus, student received teacher feedback in the second, fourth, and sixth classes. While in the third, fifth, and seventh classes, the students received feedback from their peers. In the last class, class eight,

the post-test was applied to the students on the same characteristics as the pre-test. Therefore, the topic of the post test was *Your future plans* and the required word were 150. The final tool utilized was a survey administered after the procedure to determine the students' perspectives.

For the analysis of the data gathered, the quantitative data was included in three tables to be described, discussed, and analyzed. On the one hand, the first table contains the general averages obtained from the pre- test , post-tests and the statistical variance. The pre-test and post-test averages were determined using a 10-point evaluation rubric that emphasized semantic, syntactic, morphological, and mechanical components. After collecting these data, the final pre-test average was compared to the post-test average, and the variance was then calculated.

In addition, in the second table, the frequency and percentage of errors discovered through each type of feedback were determined. For the analysis of this table, the quantitative data and the errors made by the students in each subcategory of morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors were described; first, the ones found in the teacher feedback; and then, the ones in the peer feedback. Each example was analyzed considering what was incorrect and providing possible reasons for the error. In the checklist instrument, students were required to select from the following Likert scale parameters: *never, rarely, sometimes, often, and always* was used to corroborate if the peer feedback was provided correctly. On the other hand, the results gathered from the questionnaire shown as percentages were located in the third table. Here, a comparative analysis was conducted to determine whether students prefer peer or teacher feedback. All of these data were analyzed, interpreted, and supported by scientific information.

## Chapter Three

### Analysis and Discussion

To answer the research questions of this study, this chapter includes the quantitative data gathered in three tables. An initial analysis includes a comparison between the pre and post-tests general averages and variance. The second table lists the frequency and percentages of the teacher and peer-identified semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors. And, the third table shows and allows to compare the frequency regarding the students' preferences for teacher and peer feedback. Each finding was described, interpreted and supported by scientific information. Finally, the findings lead to establish some conclusions and recommendations.

#### **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
8.73	9.1	0.067

*Note: The average of 30 students' pre- and post-test scores which were rated out of 10*

Table 1 summarizes the students' pre and post-test general averages. The pre-test scores averaged 8.73 out of 10 points while post-test scores averaged 9.1 out of 10 points, with a variance of 0.067. These results indicate that there was no significant improvement in the students' writing quality, as their final score increased by only 0.37 points.

When analyzing the pre-test, which was the first instrument administered, it can be inferred that the students have a high level of English, as only one error was found per written work. In addition, based on the evaluation rubric applied to evaluate this test, the quality of the students' writing falls within the *excellent* range, indicating that

they have a moderate command of the language at the written level, including correct capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.

Regarding the post-test results, it can be seen that the majority of students reduced their errors because they corrected their errors based on peer correction and teacher feedback. For instance, it was discovered that a student on the pretest made the error in the phrase: *I would like to visit the sea*. However, the student rewrote the same sentence correctly on the post-test.: *I would like to visit the beach*. Clearly, the implementation of written corrective feedback was significant in some way. In this regard, Bitchener (2021) indicates that written corrective feedback is a strategy that involves both the agent and the student in the detection and correction of errors and that generally yields positive results because both parties share a common objective.

Nevertheless, it is also necessary to note that punctuation errors did not improve with written corrective feedback. It may be because students placed greater emphasis on correcting words than punctuation. Alternatively, perhaps the implementation period for peer and teacher feedback was so brief that students were unaware that this syntactic aspect was also being corrected. These results concur with the findings of Hikmah (2019), who discovered that students at the syntactic level made punctuation errors, particularly regarding the placement of commas within subordinate conjunction.

Based on the previous results, it is possible to state that the written corrective feedback activities were effective correct since the students improved their EFL writing skills. In addition, there was a reduction of Word form errors. Nevertheless, punctuation errors were not reduced as effectively. Consequently, the slight increase in the final average is explicable.

**Table 2.***Teacher and Peer feedback results*

	Frequency	Teacher's feedback	Frequency	Peer's feedback
<b>Semantic</b>	40	50.64%	6	24%
<b>Syntactic</b>	32	40.50%	14	56%
<b>Morphological</b>	7	8.86%	5	20%

Note: results were taken from the six paragraphs that the sample wrote

*Table 2* contains the total number of errors discovered at the semantic, syntactic, and morphological levels using corrective feedback from the teacher and peer correction. The column corresponding to the teacher is examined first.

A total of 79 errors were found by the teacher. The most common were semantic: 40 (50.64%). Then 32 (40.50%) were syntactic, and the last number of errors were morphological with 7 (8.86%). In this way, these results reveal that the majority of paragraphs did not adequately convey the intended meaning within the English context. In addition, these results suggest that some sentences contained grammatical errors.

Regarding semantic errors, it can be inferred from the students' writing that they have a large L2 vocabulary and met the required 120 words per paragraph. This points out that students can form a sentence in the L2 and add additional information to it. However, it has been noticed that there is a great deal of maternal interference, which causes some sentences to depart from the English context and, in some instances, causes confusion. For example, '*I wish to have a superficial stability*'. The correct form is '*I want to have financial stability*'. There is a structural error in the incorrect sentence that confuses. Therefore, it is semantically incorrect because it is unclear what the student wishes to convey. In addition, a clear instance of maternal interference is observed at the end of the sentence .. '*superficial stability*'. Analyzing the paragraph containing this sentence reveals that the student is describing his future plans. However, he does not know how to express that he desires this economy in the future and thus translates it literally. Another detected error was '*I went on vacation the year*

*before*. The correct form of this sentence is *'I went on vacation the last year'*. In the incorrect sentence, there is a semantically incorrect choice of lexical item because the pupil makes a literal translation in the whole sentence and places the adverb *'before'* based on the literal translation because they lack vocabulary and they are unable to contextualize effectively. For this reason, this sentence is semantically wrong because it moves away from the English context since it misuses the adverb *'before'*.

Another error in which the student made a semantically wrong choice of lexical items was *'I have a good ratings in English subject'*. The proper form is *'I have good grades in the English subject'*. It is evident that the student made a literal translation and inserted *'rating'* instead of *'grade'* in this instance. The same thing happened in the sentence *'I want to have my university degree'*. The correct form is *'I want to have university career'*. Here, the student misplaces *'degree'* for *'career'*. Once again, it can be noted that when the student writes in English, he automatically thinks in Spanish, resulting in a negative mother transference.

Considering the high frequency of semantic errors caused by mother tongue interference, it is necessary to note that the teacher was required to apply direct feedback and provide oral feedback on the errors identified after each written activity. This is done so that each student comprehends the distinction between first language (L1) and second language (L2) contexts. In this regard, Bitchener (2021) indicates that written corrective feedback is frequently supplemented with oral or coded feedback in order for students to comprehend the error's root cause.

It is relevant to consider that in the final class, when teacher feedback was provided, it was detected that there was a decline in semantic errors, particularly the misuse of lexical items. It can be said that teacher feedback was effective in reducing this type of semantic error, but not the underlying cause, maternal interference. However, it is not possible to significantly reduce negative mother-tongue transference in three classes because more time and teacher review are required. This outcome is consistent with Majzoub (2021), who states lack of motivation is the main cause of

linguistic interference, in which students write in their mother tongue. Consequently, due to a lack of vocabulary, grammatical expertise, and morphological and lexical rules, they write in their second language.

In conclusion, teacher feedback effectively demonstrated that students possess a vast vocabulary and can articulate their thoughts. However, they rely too heavily on literal translation, which results in Spanishized text that is out of context with the original English. In this respect, according to Sapkota (2013), teacher feedback is frequently useful for identifying the root causes of written errors, and based on this finding; teachers can consider modifying their instructional strategies.

Concerning the syntactic errors which are in second place in frequency. It is possible to claim that they occurred because students did not structure complete sentences. For instance: *'My family and I went on vacation. I wanted to visit my grandmother. We enjoyed in Galapagos'*. The correct form of this instance is, *'I wanted to visit my grandmother because she lives in Galapagos'*. For this reason, *'my family and I went on vacation and enjoyed ourselves in Galapagos'*. As it can be noticed, the student uses sentence fragments that are separated by a period rather than using conjunctions to join the sentences. This demonstrates that students are unable to coherent sentences and have chosen to use periods properly.

Similarly, this tendency was found in the following sentence, *'First of all, I want to finish my university. My dad is military. I want to be a military like him'*. The correct form for these structures is, *'First of all, I want to finish college to pursue a military career because my dad is in the military and I want to be in the military like him'*. This error demonstrates that students improperly use conjunctions and punctuation because they are restricted from translating their expressions.

Additionally, at the syntactic level, preposition errors caused by a negative mother tongue transference were also identified. For instance, *'My family was sad **for** the pandemic'*. The correct form is, *'My family was sad about the pandemic'*. In this way, the student uses the preposition *'for'* instead of *'about'* in this sentence due to his

or her native language. Again, this error committed demonstrates that the students have learned English using the grammatical translation method, and as a result, they are aware of the correct preposition usage. In the following sentence, a similar instance occurred once again '*I want to graduate of the university*' in which the correct form is '*I want to graduate from university*'. Here, the correct preposition is 'from' because it indicates a person's position or viewpoint.

Moreover, it was noted that students did not use punctuation correctly. In fact, in some instances, there was no punctuation. For instance, '*On my last vacation I visited my grandmother took her to the doctor and helped her buy her medicine it was a wonderful day*'. The correct form is, '*On my last vacation, I visited my grandmother, took her to the doctor, and helped her buy her medicine. It was a wonderful day*'. In these sentences, the student's punctuation and commas are incorrectly placed because he lacks the necessary context for each mark.

Similarly, inappropriate comma usage was found in the following example, '*During pandemics we studied virtually but, it was not the same*'. The correct form is '*During pandemics, we studied virtually, but it was not the same*'. A comma must come before the conjunction 'but' in this sentence. The students' improper use of commas can be attributed to their lack of familiarity with punctuation and their emphasis on the writing of words.

Errors at the syntactic level imply that pupils do not know how to properly organize their ideas in the L2 structures, preventing them from achieving written fluency. As in the semantic errors, it can be affirmed that the negative mother tongue transference was the primary cause of these errors. This may be attributed to a lack of writing habits among students, who, despite being able to write some narrative and descriptive texts competently, have not gotten sufficient feedback to enable them to grow closer to the English environment.

Therefore, it may be argued that instructor feedback was effective for detecting that students commit syntactic errors because they presume that the linguistic

structures, mechanics, and punctuation of their native language are identical to those of English. In addition, teachers' feedback revealed that students' writings from previous activities had not been adequately followed up. In this way, Kurtoglu (2016) indicates that teacher feedback is effective in the improvement of students at the syntactic level because it monitors the progress of each student. According to Sun and Wang (2022), providing students with teacher feedback is a helpful approach to providing and correcting particular errors in students' written work. In addition, it supplies the students with supplementary material that helps them expand their knowledge and cultivate meaningful learning experiences.

Regarding the morphological errors corrected by the teacher through the feedback, the fact that the students made only seven errors indicates that they have almost mastered the use of morphemes, suffixes, and prefixes. However, to analyze these few errors, the findings of Ramadan (2015) are considered, who discovered that carelessness on the part of students who were unaware of this kind of error led to morpheme assisting and omission errors. Based on this, an omission of the apostrophe was identified in the following example, '*I feel good visiting my grand**mothers** house;* and, *I visited Simon Bolivars house in Bogota*'. The correct form is, '*I feel god visiting my grandmother's house.*'; and, '*I visited Simon Bolivar's house in Bogota*'. As it can be observed, both structures are acceptable; however, the students did not realize that they omitted the apostrophe symbol ('). It is possibly because they did not proofread their work.

At the morphological level, the instructor identified omission errors of morphemes caused by carelessness on the part of the students. Additionally, it can be affirmed that the students are not familiar with the use of the apostrophe since in the mother tongue there is no use of this punctuation mark. Regarding morphological errors, the same author states that they occur when a word is poorly structured, incomplete, or incorrect. Based on this, in this study, it is observed that students had difficulty using morphemes appropriately.

Finally, in classes 4 and 6, the teacher used the students' writing to explain errors. Semantics, morphology, and syntax were emphasized. According to the findings, teacher feedback effectively evaluated errors and their causes at all levels. Teacher feedback helped to create dialogue activities and cleared students' doubts after each class.

On the other side, the results displayed in *table 2* related to peer feedback are analyzed as follows. The students identified a total of 25 errors, 56 % of which were syntactic errors. Similarly, 24 % identified semantic errors, followed by 20 % of morphological errors. These results show that students were able to identify errors at all three levels, although the findings revealed that their writing was far from the English context.

An error at syntactic level was found in the following sentence: '*I would like to a police officer, I want to a famous writer, I studying, I going to study abroad*'. As it can be seen in the first two sentences, the student omits the infinitive verb 'be. While in the third and fourth sentences, the student omits the form of the verb 'be (am)'. The evaluating student corrected appropriately. In this way, it can be deduced that the omission of these verbs occurs due to a lack of structure knowledge. However, the student was able to identify such errors. Moreover, as peer feedback was given after the teacher feedback classes, it can be assumed that based on these activities the students were able to detect punctuation errors. For instance: '*After finishing my studies at school I would like to study at the University of Cuenca I want to study medicine then I want to specialize in neurology*'. As it can be seen, the student assumes that capitalization is to be used for punctuation. However, the student who served as the evaluator corrected them and uses proper punctuation. '*After finishing my studies at school, I would like to study at the University of Cuenca. I want to study medicine. Then I want to specialize in Neurology*'. The student who served as the evaluator corrected the punctuation according to the teacher's model, as he understood from teacher feedback that punctuation is also essential in writing. This is a

positive indicator that teacher feedback was beneficial and substantially affected students. Furthermore, it can be inferred that the student found the role of an evaluator to be interesting and adopted it appropriately.

Another example of the same nature is, '*After I finish my senior year of high school one of my goals is to continue my education and earn a degree Spend some time in Mexico with my family where we will both vacation and explore*'. The acting student corrected it as follows, '*After I finish my senior year of high school, one of my goals is to continue my education, earn a degree, and spend some time in Mexico with my family, where we will both vacation and explore*'. The student's ability to detect punctuation errors at the syntactic level suggests that they interacted and learned about punctuation in their L2 language. Furthermore, students limited themselves to seeing punctuation errors at the syntactic level, indicating that they realized and reevaluated the possibility of unconsciously making errors at this level. Consequently, it can be determined that feedback from students at the syntactic level was advantageous. In this way, Froldova (2016) states that peer feedback is a highly effective strategy that allows students to dialogue and interacts on punctuation, mechanics, and vocabulary.

Regarding the semantic errors, the students only detected 7 semantically wrong choices of lexical items. For instance, '*I like science ficcion movies*'. As it can be seen, the student incorrectly writes the noun 'fiction'. The student who acted as evaluator detected these errors and corrected them appropriately. '*I like science fiction movies*'. These errors can be deduced that they occur as a cause of maternal interference since the student writes as he pronounces it. Another example is, '*I would like to have saludabililty habits to reduce my body weight*'. The evaluator corrected, '*I would like to have healthy habits to reduce my body weight*'.

Regarding the morphological errors, the students were only able to detect errors of omission. For example: '*I would like to be a doctor and hav my office near my house to practice my profesion*'. As it can be seen, the student incorrectly writes the verb *have*

and the word *profession*. The student who acted as evaluator detected these errors and corrected them appropriately. *'I would like to be a doctor and have my office near my house to practice my profession'*. Another omission error found was: *'I don't like to read in Englis'*. The proper form is: *I don't like to read in English'*. As can be seen, the students omit letters or morphemes within the words, which indicates that the students still lack knowledge. Therefore, it can be deduced that these errors occurred due to the student's inability to form English words due to their limited vocabulary. Once the errors discovered through peer feedback have been analyzed, it can be argued that the students who acted as evaluators followed the teacher's feedback as a model, and also realized that they were making errors and wished to impart these lessons to their classmates. Due to this, it is possible to conclude that peer feedback effectively detected written errors. In this way, Sun and Wand (2021) stress the fact that the appropriate deployment of peer feedback enables teachers to promptly address the faults that an entire group of students has made.

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

**Table 3.**

*Students' perceptions about teacher and peer feedback*

<b>Nº</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>1</b>	I consider it is important to receive peer feedback in writing assignments.	100	0	0	100
<b>2</b>	I consider it is important to receive teacher feedback in written assignments.	100	0	0	100
<b>3</b>	The feedback delivered by my peer helps me to improve my writing skills.	75	0	25	100
<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.	17.50	0	82.50	100
<b>6</b>	The teacher provides feedback through comments, questions or additional information.	100	0	0	100

7	The feedback delivered by my classmate is clear and easy to understand.	93.75	0	6.25	100
8	The feedback delivered by the teacher is clear and easy to understand.	100	0	0	100
9	I feel comfortable receiving feedback from my peer.	75	0	25	100
10	I feel comfortable receiving feedback from my teacher.	100	0	0	100
11	The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve in...				
	Grammar use (verb agreement, sentence construction, capitalization and punctuation)	82.50	0	17.50	100
	Word formation (Spelling)	93.75	0	6.25	100
	Vocabulary misuse	81.25	0	18.75	100
12	The feedback provided by my teacher has helped me to improve in...				
	Grammar use (verb agreement, sentence construction, capitalization and punctuation)	100	0	0	100
	Word formation (spelling)	93.75	0	6.25	100
	Vocabulary misuse	82.50	0	17.50	100

*Table 3* contains the results obtained from the questionnaire administered to the students. These results seek to know what type of feedback students prefer after receiving feedback from their peers and teacher. Based on this, a result corresponding to peer feedback and an item corresponding to instructor feedback are compared and analyzed.

First of all, 100% of the students *agree* with the statement, '*I consider it is important to receive peer feedback in writing assignments*'. Likewise, 100% of them *agree* with '*I consider it is important to receive peer feedback in writing assignments*'. According to these findings, each student believes receiving feedback from both, the instructor and their classmates, is essential.

It can be concluded from these findings that all students value receiving both types of feedback, whether from their peers or their teacher. This means that implementing both types of feedback was important for all students because teacher feedback allowed them to deepen concepts, correct errors, and improve their writing skills, whereas peer correction allowed them to interact with their classmates and realize they could also

give written feedback. Along the same lines, Zhang and Cheng (2021) indicate that the main agent who provides written corrective feedback is generally the language teacher. However, the agent can also be a student, a tutor, or a person who has been trained and is familiar with the learning objectives.

Regarding statement number three, 75% of the students *agree* with the statement, '*The feedback delivered by my peer helps me to improve my writing skills*' whereas 100% of them *agree* with '*The feedback delivered by my teacher helps me to improve my writing skills*'. According to these results, all students believe they received more support from teacher feedback than from peer feedback because they perceived that their writing abilities were enhanced.

In this way, it can be said that these results suggest that both types of feedback were effective at identifying writing errors. However, teacher feedback was the one that helped them the most because every student has reported and felt that their writing skills have improved considerably. This is because the teacher's corrective feedback was more accurate and effective in correcting and determining why those errors are committed by the students. Consequently, it is worth mention that the teacher interacted with the students via the zoom platform, which fostered greater confidence in terms of the student's level of knowledge and enabled them to develop a deeper understanding of the language and engage with writing structures.

In statement number five, 82.50% of the students *disagree* with '*My peer provides me with feedback through comments questions, or additional information*' while 100% of them *agree* with '*The teacher provides me feedback through comments, questions, or additional information*'. These outcomes indicate that the total number of students consider that the teacher provided them effective feedback by using different resources in their essays, whereas peer feedback did not.

It is supported by the reasons given in the analysis in *table 2* in which it was mentioned that the teacher provided even oral feedback to the students to correct their writing errors. On the contrary, according to the information remarked on the checklist,

peers limited themselves to detecting errors but there is not any additional information or comments that they used to help their classmates on reinforcing writing. As a result of the findings of both statements, it is established that the teacher provided feedback to students in the form of comments and important additional information to help them improve their writing skills. In this regard, Al Herz (2020) states that for teacher feedback to be more effective, the teacher must write appropriate comments based on the students' level and learning objectives.

In the seventh statement, 93.75% of the students *agree* with '*The feedback delivered by my classmate is clear and easy to understand*'. In the same line, in the eighth statement, 100% of them *agree* with '*The feedback delivered by the teacher is clear and easy to understand*'. These results mean that most students understand the corrections of both the teacher and their peers because both kinds of feedback were clear and easy to comprehend.

Considering the results of peer feedback, it can be established that the majority of students comprehended their peer's correction model, hence their assertion that they comprehended their classmates' corrections. Regarding teacher feedback results, all students agree that this form of feedback was more straightforward to comprehend than teacher feedback. In light of these findings, it can be concluded that teacher feedback was easier and clearer to comprehend due to the teacher's provision of additional information and written comments. In this way, Link et al. (2021) claim that language learners trust teachers' knowledge and skills in the target language. In this way, teacher written feedback is the primary way to revise and enhance student compositions because educators give ideas for future work and assist students in discovering their strengths and weaknesses through this feedback.

In the next statement, statement number nine, 75% of students *agree* with '*I feel comfortable receiving feedback from my peer*' and 100% *agree* with '*I feel comfortable receiving feedback from my teacher*'. These results mean that the students

affirm that they felt more comfortable interacting with the teacher than with their students through the feedback both provided them.

This may be due to the fact that the students had more faith in their teacher, who, from the very beginning of the teacher feedback activity, demonstrated a willingness to address the students' concerns. . It is hypothesized that despite having strong friendships with their peers, students feel more supported by a professional's response owing to their impartiality, objectivity, and experience. This agrees with Bitchener (2021) who asserts that students frequently believe in teacher feedback because they believe the agent, in this case, the teacher, is adequately trained to correct them appropriately without causing emotional distress.

In the eleventh question, 82.50% of students *agree* with '*The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve in grammar use*'. Likewise, 93.75% of them *agree* with '*The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve in word formation*'. And, in a similar line, 82.25% agree with '*The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve vocabulary*'. These statistics indicate that most students believed they had improved-

However, question 12 must be tested to provide a more clear implication. 82.50% of students *agree* with '*The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve in grammar use*'. In the same line, 93.75% agree with '*The feedback provided by my teacher has helped me to improve in spelling*'. And 82.50% agree with '*The feedback provided by my teacher has helped me to improve in my vocabulary misuse*'. Like peer feedback, these results mean that the majority of the student felt an improvement as a result of teacher feedback.

Based on the results of the analysis of the last table, it can be noticed that students prefer teacher feedback because they believe that their use of grammar, spelling, and word formation has improved as a result. The instructor was fluent in the target language and provided corrections, suggestions, and additional information to help students assimilate and correct their errors. The fact that the teacher negotiated

some semantic meanings and promoted proper punctuation also influenced. In addition, the teacher expanded the students' vocabulary and encouraged using context-appropriate English words.

Concerning peer correction, it is possible to deduce that students have not progressed much because some students lacked confidence when providing peer correction. Most believed that the teacher's comments were more valuable and effective for evaluating and correcting written works. Nonetheless, this did not prevent some students from correcting the errors they could identify.

## Conclusions

Teacher corrective feedback and peer feedback have been useful because, during each implementation, it has been discovered that the main cause for semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors was the negative mother tongue. This has been beneficial because it has allowed the written errors to be corrected and the students' writing skills to be improved.

Students were able to deepen their knowledge of morphology, semantics, and syntax as a result of the use of both types of feedback, which indicates that students will make fewer errors caused by interference from their mother tongue in later classes.

For the students to understand the cause of each error, the teacher provided oral feedback and interacted with the students after each activity. This implied that the teacher's feedback was immediate and effective in promoting students' autonomous learning.

During the process of implementing peer feedback, the students took on the role of an evaluator comparable to that of the instructor, and they corrected one another using the same symbols as the instructor does. However, they didn't comment on any comments or suggestions as the instructor did.

Students believe that both peer and instructor feedback are necessary for written assignments. However, a large majority preferred teacher feedback because they had more confidence in their teacher, who demonstrated a positive attitude toward resolving student doubts from the very first teacher feedback activity.

Concerning peer correction, it is possible to deduce that students have not progressed much because some students lacked confidence when providing peer correction. Most believed that the teacher's comments were more valuable and effective for evaluating and correcting written works.

## Recommendations

It is strongly suggested that both sorts of feedback must be used to guarantee that students continue generating substantial writing in the target language, so developing their communicative skills.

Before putting any form of feedback into practice, teachers should prepare for it and factor in the necessary amount of time. It will allow students to review their work and catch any errors they may have missed the first time.

Teachers of English must have a working knowledge of the language's fundamental concepts in order to identify errors and interferences in student writing. This is achieved by educational institutions continually training teachers. Therefore, principals and teachers of English must share the objective of enhancing students' written skills in semantic, syntactic, and morphological terms.

Teachers must promote the reading of books or articles that have been written entirely in English, so that students can increase their vocabulary and reduce negative mother tongue interference. This activity would make students know the words and write them correctly, thus reducing morphological errors.

It is essential to emphasize to students the significance of receiving and providing feedback to cultivate all aspects of communication skills, specially writing skills. In order to achieve this, teachers must set aside time for self-evaluation and provide written feedback so that each class's students can develop their writing skills through self-evaluation, peer correction, or teacher feedback.

It would be crucial for teachers to dedicate a few classes to teach students how to provide effective peer feedback. For this, the teacher could provide them with a rubric and explain what and how to qualify. In addition, the instructor can provide a feedback model and instruct students to replicate it until they can make corrections based on their knowledge.

## References

- Al Herz, J. (2020). Developing students' writing skills through teacher and peer correction at university level: An analytical study. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(12), 735-745. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7137.2020.01812.1>
- Albedaiwi, S. (2022). Collaborative writing on a digital platform: Measuring gains of EFL learners in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(1), 760-770. <https://doi.org/4001>
- Almahameed, Y., & Al-Shaikhli, M. (2017). Understanding syntactic and semantic errors in the composition writing of Jordanian EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 6(6), 158. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.6p.158>
- Anggraeni, K. (2018). Morphological and syntactical errors in English essays written by EFL students. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(3), 74-81. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/inference.v1i3.5624>
- Aziz, P., Ahmed, I., & Salim, K. (2021). Analysing writing errors of Kurdish EFL students keywords. *Journal of the University of Garmian*, 8(2), 293-307. <https://doi.org/10.24271/garmian.21080281>
- Bitchener, J. (2021). Written corrective feedback. *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 207-225. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789.011>
- Budiharto, R. A. (2019). Native language interference on target language writings of Indonesian EFL students: An exploratory case study. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 5(1), 107. <https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v5i1.1630>

- Carless, D. (2020). From teacher transmission of information to student feedback literacy: Activating the learner role in feedback processes. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 23(2), 143-153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787420945845>
- Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2020). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372>
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), 267-296. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743(03)00038-9)
- Chong, S. (2022). The role of feedback literacy in written corrective feedback research: From feedback information to feedback ecology. *Cogent Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2022.2082120>
- De-Kleijn, R. A. (2021). Supporting student and teacher feedback literacy: An instructional model for student feedback processes. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1967283>
- Elfiyanto, S., & Fukazawa, S. (2021). Three written corrective feedback sources in improving Indonesian and Japanese students' writing achievement. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(3), 433-450. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14325a>
- Elsner, D. (2018). Institutionalized foreign language learning—Teaching English at different levels. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, 17-37. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-476-04480-8\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-476-04480-8_2)
- Farooq, O., & Wahid, R. (2019). Analyzing syntactic errors in EFL text. *Language in India*, 19(2), 325-354. <https://doi.org/333045426>

- Farsani, M., & Aghamohammadi, N. (2021). Exploring students' engagement with peer-and teacher written feedback in an EFL writing course: A multiple case study of Iranian graduate learners. *Journal of English Mextesol*, 4(5), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.125.12014525>
- Froldova, V. (2016). Paper-pen peer-correction versus Wiki-based peer-correction. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education*, 4(1), 140-153. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jolace-2016-0012>
- Gentrup, S., Lorenz, G., & Kristen, C. (2020). Self-fulfilling prophecies in the classroom: Teacher expectations, teacher feedback, and student achievement. *Learning and Instruction*, 1(3), 66-76. <https://doi.org/10.1225.11552>
- Ha, X., & Nguyen, L. (2021). Targets and sources of corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: Are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697160>
- Haiyan, M., & Rilong, L. (2016). Classroom EFL writing: The alignment-oriented approach. *English Language Teaching*, 9(4), 76-82. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n4p76>
- Hikmah, I. (2019). Errors in English essay writing from a syntactic perspective. *NOTION: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Culture*, 1(2), 48. <https://doi.org/10.12928/notion.v1i2.979>
- Isnawati, I., Sulisty, G., Widiati, U., & Suryati, N. (2019). Impacts of Teacher-Written corrective feedback with Teacher-Student conference on students' revision. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 679-684. [doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12143a](https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12143a)

- Jassim, L. (2016). An analysis of semantic errors in Iraqi EFL learners' writings by lecturer. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(4), 314-328. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/mec2.23>
- Khattar, S. (2019). An analysis of the most common essay writing errors among EFL Saudi female learners (Majmaah University). *Arab World English Journal*, 10(3), 364-381. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no3.26>
- Khrin, I. (2020). Psycholinguistic peculiarities of formation of foreign language communicative competence of students of non-linguistic specialties. *Psihologia. Pedagogia specială. Asistența socială = Psychology, Special Pedagogy, and Social Work*, 61(4), 83-91. <https://doi.org/10.46728/jpspsw.2020.v61.i4.p83-91>
- Kurtoglu, N. (2016). Confirmatory feedback in teacher education. *Englis relevant journal*, 1(3), 364-381. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-52439-3>
- Lee, I. (2020). Utility of focused/comprehensive written corrective feedback research for authentic L2 writing classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 49, 100734. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100734>
- Li, J., Link, S., & Hegelheimer, V. (2015). Rethinking the role of automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback in ESL writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.10.004>
- Link, S., Mehrzad, M., & Rahimi, M. (2020). Impact of automated writing evaluation on teacher feedback, student revision, and writing improvement. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(4), 605-634. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1743323>

- Majzoub, I. (2021). Effect of categorizing EFL Shaqra University students' writing errors on writing improvement. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 26(7), 804-822. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v26i1.5227>
- Maolida, E., & Hidayat, M. (2021). Writing errors based on surface structure taxonomy: A case of Indonesian EFL students' personal letters. *Proceedings International Conference on Education of Suryakencana 2021*, 5(2), 336-344. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35194/cp.v0i0.1369>
- Marzban, A., & Jalali, F. E. (2016). The interrelationship among L1 writing skills, L2 writing skills, and L2 proficiency of Iranian EFL learners at different proficiency levels. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(7), 1364. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0607.05>
- Menbet, A. A. (2018). The use of effective strategies to improve Saudi EFL dyslexic learners' writing skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(12), 1611. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0812.06>
- Nejmaoui, N. (2018). Improving EFL learners' critical thinking skills in argumentative writing. *English Language Teaching*, 12(1), 98. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n1p98>
- Polio, C. (2012). The relevance of second language acquisition theory to the written error correction debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 375-389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.004>
- Putri, N., & Aminatun, D. (2021). Using Facebook to practice writing skill: What do the students think. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning (JELTL)*, 2(1), 45-50. <https://doi.org/2021.10.852/294>
- Rahim, M. (2019). The comparison between auditory learners and visual learners' achievement in writing skills of the students in the English education

- department uin alauddin Makassar. *English Language Teaching for EFL Learners*, 1(1), 49. <https://doi.org/10.24252/elties.v1i1.7418>
- Rahman, I. (2019). Morphological errors analysis on students' synopsis writing. *English Language in Focus (ELIF)*, 1(2), 81. <https://doi.org/10.24853/elif.1.2.81-88>
- Ramadan, S. (2015). Morphological errors made by Jordanian University students. *Romanian Journal of English Studies*, 12(1), 40-49. <https://doi.org/10.1515/rjes-2015-0006>
- Ramadan, S. (2015). Morphological errors made by Jordanian University students. *Romanian Journal of English Studies*, 12(1), 40-49. <https://doi.org/10.1515/rjes-2015-0006>
- Rezai, M., & Davarpanah, F. (2019). An analysis of semantic errors in Iraqi EFL learners' writings. *University of Thi-Qar Journal*, 13(1), 41-47. <https://doi.org/10.32792/utq/utj/vol11/4/11>
- Rummel, S., & Bitchener, J. (2022). The effectiveness of written corrective feedback and the impact Lao learners' beliefs have on uptake. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 66-84. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.38.1.04rum>
- Sabria, O. (2016). Language learning strategies use in teaching the writing skill for EFL Algerian learners. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(3), 479-486. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol7no3.33>
- Sandeep, D. (2021). An immense analysis on problems faced by EFL people while writing technical papers. *WRITING SKILLS FOR ACADEMIC RESEARCH*, 3(2), 90-107. <https://doi.org/10.26524/royal.55.6>
- Sani, S. M., Kurniawati, N., & Nurwanti, D. I. (2017). The use of reflective writing to improve students' writing and critical thinking skills. *The First International*

- Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0007166903310335>
- Sapkota, A. (2013). Developing students' writing skill through peer and teacher correction: An action research. *Journal of NELTA*, 17(2), 70-82. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v17i1-2.8094>
- Shintani, N. (2015). The effects of computer-mediated synchronous and asynchronous direct corrective feedback on writing: A case study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(3), 517-538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2014.993400>
- Sorenson, S. (2009). *Webster's New World student writing handbook*. Webster's New World.
- Sun, H., & Wang, M. (2022). Effects of teacher intervention and type of peer feedback on student writing revision. *Language Teaching Research*, 5(2), 136-142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221080507>
- Trisnadewi, K. (2021). The use of peer-correction to improve student writing skill at STMIK Stikom Indonesia. *Yavana Bhasha: Journal of English Language Education*, 4(1), 73. <https://doi.org/10.25078/yb.v4i1.2213>
- Wihastyanang, W., Kusumaningrum, S., Latief, M., & Cahyono, B. (2020). Impacts of providing online teacher and peer feedback on students' writing performance. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 178-189. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.728157>
- Windiyan, T., Boerieswati, E., Sumantri, M. S., & Iasha, V. (2019). Improve Indonesian language writing skills using educational multimedia games for elementary school students. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Education, Language and Society*. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0009034305970603>

- Winiharti, M. (2017). Strengthening the outlining process to improve EFL students' academic writing competence. *The Tenth Conference on Applied Linguistics and The Second English Language Teaching and Technology Conference in collaboration with The First International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0007165402500253>
- Yanti, A., Hadi, A., & Settiawan, D. (2022). Using self-correction and peer-correction techniques to improve students' writing skills: A comparative study. *Indonesian Journal of Integrated English Language Teaching*, 8(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.24014/ijielt.v8i1.18494>
- Zaid, S., Rashid, R., Azmi, N., & Yusri, S. (2017). Factors affecting the morphological errors in young ESL Learners' writing. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v6-i3/3165>
- Zhang, L., & Cheng, X. (2021). Examining the effects of comprehensive written corrective feedback on L2 EAP students' linguistic performance: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 54, 101043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101043>
- Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., & Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL students' preferences for written corrective feedback: Do error types, language proficiency, and foreign language enjoyment matter? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660564>

## Appendix

### Appendix A

PARAMETERS	EXCELLENT (10 – 7.6)	GOOD (7.5 - 5.1)	FAIR (5 – 2.6)	POOR (2.5 - 0)
<b>SEMANTIC CRITERIA</b>	<p>All words (more than 75%) were used correctly in the context of the paragraph.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	<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. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)</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; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)</p>	<p>Some of the words, phrases, and sentences were complete (50%). There were still several sentences (50%) that were underdeveloped.</p> <p>Some sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)</p>	<p>A few words, phrases, and sentences were complete (less than 25%). There were too many errors (more than 75%) in grammar, usage, or sentence structure, which made it hard to read.</p> <p>A few sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)</p>
<b>MORPHOLOGICAL CRITERIA</b>	<p>Student correctly identified all the affixes that could be used with the root words.</p> <p>The use of word borrowing is correct and word formation is accurate.</p>	<p>Student correctly identified 7 out of 10 affixes that could be used with the root words.</p> <p>The use of word borrowing is partially correct and word formation is accurate.</p>	<p>Student correctly identified 5 out of 10 affixes that could be used with the root words.</p> <p>The use of word borrowing is partially correct and word formation is inappropriate.</p>	<p>Student correctly identified less than 5 out of 10 affixes that could be used with the root words.</p> <p>The use of word borrowing is not correct and word formation is inappropriate.</p>

<p><b>MEC</b> <b>HANICS</b></p>	<p>Capitalization, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes are used appropriately.</p> <p>No errors were made in spelling and part of speech.</p>	<p>Capitalization, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes are used somewhat appropriately.</p> <p>Few errors were made in spelling.</p>	<p>Capitalization, paragraphing, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes were not used very appropriately. These errors make it more difficult to understand the message or meaning of the writing.</p> <p>Frequent errors made in spelling.</p>	<p>Capitalization, paragraphing, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes were not used appropriately (or were not found in writing). These errors make it hard to understand the meaning/message of the writing due to these errors.</p> <p>Numerous errors made in spelling.</p>
-------------------------------------	---	--	--	---

## Appendix B

### Peer's Feedback Checklist

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

## Appendix C

### Students' Survey

N	Questions	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Total
1	I believe that receiving peer feedback on writing assignments is essential.				
2	I believe that receiving teacher feedback on writing assignments is essential.				
3	Peer feedback aids in the development of my writing abilities.				
4	Teacher feedback aids in the development of my writing abilities.				
5	My peer offers me feedback in the form of comments, questions, and additional information.				
6	The teacher offers me feedback in the form of comments, questions, and additional information.				
7	My classmate's comments are straightforward and simple to comprehend.				
8	The teacher's comments are straightforward and simple to comprehend.				
9	I am at ease receiving feedback from a colleague.				
10	I am at ease receiving feedback from my instructor.				
11	The feedback made by a classmate have helped me improve in...				
	Grammar use (verb agreement, sentence construction, capitalization and punctuation)				
	Word formation (Spelling)				
	Vocabulary misuse				
12	The feedback made by my teacher have helped me improve in...				
	Grammar use (verb agreement, sentence construction, capitalization and punctuation)				
	Word formation (spelling)				
	Vocabulary misuse				