



People's Democratic Republic of Algeria  
Ministry of Higher Education & Scientific Research  
University of Chadli Ben Djedid



Department of English

## Peer Feedback vs. Teacher Feedback: A Comparative Study of Peer and Teacher Feedback in Enhancing Academic Writing

Dissertation submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfillment of  
the Requirements for the Master Degree in Didactics of English

**Submitted by:**

Ms. Boumaza Malak  
Ms. Diabi Malak

**Supervised by:**

Mr. Benachour Redha

### Board of Examiners

**President:** Mr. Ferache Wahab

**Supervisor:** Mr. Benachour Redha

**Examiner:** Dr. Nasri Fatima Zohra

**MAA**

**MAA**

**MCB**

University of Chadli Bendjedid El\_Taref

University of Chadli Bendjedid El\_Taref

University of Chadli Bendjedid El\_Taref

Academic Year

2025/2026

## ***Dedication***

*At first, I thank Allah Almighty for giving me the strength to finish this work.*

*I dedicate this thesis to myself, for having the courage to begin, the resilience to continue,  
and the faith to never give up despite every challenge faced along the way.*

*To my beloved father, Abd El Hafid — your wisdom, quiet strength, and unwavering  
faith in me have shaped every step of my journey. Your presence has always been my  
greatest reassurance.*

*To my beloved mother, Ghaniya — your tender heart, endless devotion, and sincere  
prayers have carried me through every challenge. Your love will forever be my safe  
place.*

*To my cherished sister — your love, strength, and loyalty have been a constant pillar in  
my life. You stood by me in every moment, and your presence made every challenge  
easier to face.*

*To my dear brothers, Salah and Koussay — thank you for your constant support and  
protective love that reminded me I was never alone. Your gentle hearts, strength, and  
kindness have always been my comfort and my greatest source of encouragement  
throughout this journey.*

*To my cherished aunts, Leila and Bessma — thank you for your affection, prayers, and  
continuous encouragement.*

*To my grandmother, Massaouda — for her boundless love and endless prayers.*

*Finally, to every soul who has loved me sincerely — thank you*

## ***Acknowledgements***

*In the name of Allah, we begin with gratitude and light, for giving us the strength to reach this height.*

*We would like to express our deepest gratitude to our supervisor, Professor Benachour Redha, for his invaluable guidance, encouragement, and constructive feedback throughout the development of this thesis.*

*We also sincerely thank all third-year students in the Department of English who participated in this study for their cooperation and valuable contribution.*

*Our heartfelt thanks are extended to the jury members, Dr. Nasri Fatima Zohra and Mr. Ferache Wahab, for their time, insightful comments, and valuable evaluation of this work.*

*We would not forget to thank every person who offered us any kind of help to complete this research, and every person who supported us and wished us success.*

### Abstract

The role of feedback in academic writing is a central issue in higher education. Peer feedback and teacher feedback are among the most influential strategies shaping students' writing development. This study aims to investigate and compare the effectiveness of peer and teacher feedback in enhancing academic writing skills, and to measure their differential impact on students' accuracy, coherence, and overall proficiency. A single group of 30 third-year students from the Department of English was followed throughout a period of three or four months. The investigation examined the effects of both peer and teacher feedback provided on successive writing tasks. Data were collected through student questionnaires, written tasks, and reflective responses. Results show that teacher feedback significantly improves discourse-level features such as organization and argumentation, while peer feedback fosters autonomy, engagement, and gains in surface-level accuracy. These findings highlight the importance of integrating both feedback types into writing instruction to achieve balanced and sustainable progress in academic writing.

**Key Words:** Peer feedback, teacher feedback, academic writing, feedback effectiveness.

### **List of Abbreviations**

**AI:** Artificial Intelligence

**EFL:** English as a Foreign Language

**ESL:** English as a Second Language

**FL:** Foreign Language

**L2:** Second Language

**SL:** Second Language

**ZPD:** Zone of Proximal Development

## List of Tables

|                                                                                                            |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Table 1:</b> <i>Students' distribution according to academic year.....</i>                              | 33 |
| <b>Table 2:</b> <i>Students' distribution according to self-assessed English proficiency level .....</i>   | 34 |
| <b>Table 3:</b> <i>Frequency of teacher feedback on students' academic writing .....</i>                   | 35 |
| <b>Table 4:</b> <i>Frequency of students' participation in peer feedback activities.....</i>               | 36 |
| <b>Table 5:</b> <i>Students' preferred for type of feedback .....</i>                                      | 37 |
| <b>Table 6:</b> <i>Students' views on aspects where teacher feedback is most useful.....</i>               | 38 |
| <b>Table 7:</b> <i>Students' views on aspects where peer feedback is most useful.....</i>                  | 39 |
| <b>Table 8:</b> <i>Students' perceptions of teacher feedback in improving academic writing skills.....</i> | 40 |
| <b>Table 9:</b> <i>Students' perceptions of peer feedback in improving academic writing skills.....</i>    | 41 |
| <b>Table 10:</b> <i>Students' perceptions of peer feedback as a mean of fostering independence in life</i> | 42 |
| <b>Table 11:</b> <i>Comparative reliability of teacher and peer feedback.....</i>                          | 43 |
| <b>Table 12:</b> <i>Difficulties encountered with peer feedback.....</i>                                   | 44 |
| <b>Table 13:</b> <i>Difficulties encountered with teacher feedback.....</i>                                | 45 |
| <b>Table 14:</b> <i>Type of feedback leading to the greatest improvement in writing .....</i>              | 46 |
| <b>Table 15:</b> <i>Frequency of revising writing after receiving feedback .....</i>                       | 47 |
| <b>Table 16:</b> <i>Most effective way to improve academic writing, according to respondents .....</i>     | 48 |
| <b>Table 17:</b> <i>Students' preferred type of feedback.....</i>                                          | 49 |

## Table of Contents

|                                         |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Dedication .....                        | I                                   |
| Acknowledgements .....                  | III                                 |
| Abstract .....                          | IV                                  |
| List of Abbreviations.....              | IV                                  |
| List of Tables.....                     | V                                   |
| Chapter One .....                       | 9                                   |
| General Introduction .....              | 9                                   |
| Introduction .....                      | 1                                   |
| Background of the Study.....            | 1                                   |
| Statement of the Problem .....          | 3                                   |
| Research Questions .....                | 3                                   |
| Hypotheses .....                        | 4                                   |
| Significance of the Study .....         | <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| Aims of the Study.....                  | <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| Research Methodology.....               | 5                                   |
| Structure of the Dissertation.....      | 5                                   |
| Chapter Two.....                        | 8                                   |
| Review of Literature.....               | 8                                   |
| Definition of Academic Writing.....     | 10                                  |
| The Importance of Academic Writing..... | 11                                  |
| Feedback in Teaching Writing .....      | 13                                  |
| Definition of feedback.....             | 13                                  |

|                                                 |    |
|-------------------------------------------------|----|
| TYPE OF Feedback .....                          | 14 |
| The role of feedback in improving writing ..... | 15 |
| Definition of Teacher feedback .....            | 16 |
| Types of Teacher Feedback.....                  | 17 |
| Advantages of Teacher Feedback.....             | 18 |
| Limitations.....                                | 19 |
| Definition of Peer Feedback.....                | 20 |
| Benefits of Peer Feedback.....                  | 21 |
| Challenges of Peer Feedback.....                | 22 |
| Conclusion.....                                 | 24 |
| Chapter Three .....                             | 25 |
| Methodology .....                               | 25 |
| Introduction .....                              | 27 |
| Methodology .....                               | 27 |
| Conclusion.....                                 | 30 |
| Chapter Four .....                              | 31 |
| Results analysis.....                           | 31 |
| Introduction .....                              | 33 |
| Conclusion.....                                 | 51 |
| Chapter five.....                               | 52 |
| Discussion of the findings.....                 | 52 |

|                                   |    |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Pedagogical Recommendations ..... | 55 |
| For Teachers .....                | 55 |
| For Learners .....                | 56 |
| For Future Researchers .....      | 57 |
| General Conclusion .....          | 59 |
| References .....                  | 64 |
| Resume.....                       |    |

# **Chapter One**

## **General Introduction**

## **Introduction**

Writing is one of the most important skills for university students. It plays a major role in academic success because students are required to complete assignments, reports, and research projects. However, many students face difficulties in developing effective academic writing skills. For this reason, feedback is considered an important tool that helps students improve their writing.

Traditionally, teacher feedback has been the main source of guidance for students because teachers have the necessary knowledge and experience. However, increasing class sizes and heavy workloads often make it difficult for teachers to provide detailed feedback to every student. As a result, many educators have started using peer feedback, where students review and comment on each other's work.

Peer feedback is based on the idea that students can learn from one another through discussion and collaboration. While some researchers believe that students may not have enough experience to provide useful feedback (Ferris, 2003), others argue that reviewing a classmate's work can help students develop their own writing skills. Therefore, this thesis examines and compares peer feedback and teacher feedback in order to determine which method is more effective in improving students' academic writing skills (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

This chapter presents the background of the study, the statement of the problem, the research questions, the objectives of the study, the significance of the study, and the key terms used in the research.

## **Background of the Study**

Academic writing is an important skill for success in higher education. According to Hyland (2019), academic writing allows students to communicate their ideas, organize information, and demonstrate critical thinking. Graham and Perin (2007) found that students with strong writing skills often achieve better academic results. To help students improve their writing, feedback is considered one of the most effective teaching strategies. Hattie and Timperley (2007)

showed that feedback has a strong positive effect on student learning and performance. Several theories explain the importance of feedback in learning. From a Sociocultural perspective, Vygotsky (1978) argued that students learn more effectively when they receive support from someone with greater knowledge or experience. This idea is known as the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). In addition, Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2009) suggested that effective feedback should help students become independent learners by encouraging self-assessment, providing clear information, and promoting communication between teachers and students.

In writing instruction, teacher feedback has traditionally been viewed as the most reliable source of guidance. Ferris (2003) explained that feedback helps students identify mistakes, understand problems, improve their writing, and make necessary revisions. However, teacher feedback may be limited by large class sizes, lack of time, and the possibility that students become too dependent on the teacher.

As a result, peer feedback has become an increasingly popular alternative. In peer feedback activities, students review and comment on each other's writing. Lundstrom and Baker (2009) found that students who gave feedback to their peers improved their own writing skills more than students who only received feedback. This suggests that peer feedback can be a valuable tool for developing writing skills.

Despite the large number of studies on feedback, some questions remain unanswered. Researchers still disagree about the effectiveness of peer feedback and teacher feedback in improving different aspects of academic writing. In addition, more research is needed to understand how factors such as students' writing level may influence the impact of feedback.

Therefore, this thesis aims to examine and compare the effectiveness of teacher feedback and peer feedback in developing students' academic writing skills.

### **Aims of the Study**

The main aim of this study is to compare the effectiveness of peer feedback and teacher

feedback in improving students' academic writing skills. Specifically, the study aims to examine how each type of feedback contributes to the development of surface-level accuracy, such as grammar and vocabulary, as well as discourse-level skills, including coherence and argumentation.

In addition, the study aims to explore students' perceptions of the usefulness, quality, and trustworthiness of both peer and teacher feedback. Through this comparison, the study seeks to identify which feedback type is more effective for specific aspects of academic writing and how learner characteristics and perceptions may influence its effectiveness.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Despite the extensive use of both peer feedback and teacher feedback in academic writing instruction, existing research remains fragmented and inconclusive. Some studies indicate that peer feedback contributes to improvements in higher-order writing skills, such as organization and the development of ideas. In contrast, other studies suggest that teacher feedback is more effective in addressing lower-order concerns, including grammatical accuracy and lexical choice. As a result, there is no clear consensus regarding the relative effectiveness of these two feedback sources in enhancing academic writing.

This lack of consensus presents both a theoretical and a practical gap. Theoretically, the existing literature does not yet provide consistent or well-established evidence comparing the effectiveness of peer and teacher feedback across different dimensions of writing. Practically, this limitation restricts teachers and curriculum developers from relying on clear, research-based guidance when selecting appropriate feedback strategies for academic writing instruction.

Accordingly, this study aims to systematically compare peer feedback and teacher feedback in terms of their effectiveness in improving academic writing. The study further examines their impact on different aspects of writing performance and considers learner characteristics and student perceptions.

### **Research Questions**

This study addresses the following research questions:

1. To what extent does peer feedback differ from teacher feedback in improving students' surface-level accuracy in academic writing?
2. To what extent does teacher feedback differ from peer feedback in improving students' discourse-level coherence and argumentation quality in academic writing?
3. How do students perceive the usefulness, quality, and trustworthiness of peer feedback compared to teacher feedback?

### **Hypotheses**

Based on the stated research questions and the reviewed literature, the following hypotheses are proposed:

1. Teacher feedback is expected to result in greater immediate improvement in discourse-level features such as organization and argumentation.
2. Peer feedback is expected to lead to greater improvement in surface-level accuracy than teacher feedback.
3. Students are expected to report higher levels of trust in teacher feedback, while peer feedback is expected to be associated with higher levels of cognitive engagement.

### **Significance of the Study**

This study is significant because it contributes to the growing body of research on academic writing instruction by systematically comparing peer and teacher feedback. It addresses a gap in the literature by examining the effectiveness of these feedback types in the context of Algerian EFL learners, where limited research has been conducted. The findings are expected to advance theoretical understanding of feedback in writing pedagogy and provide a foundation for future studies in similar instructional settings. By highlighting the relative strengths of peer and teacher feedback, this research adds to the scholarly dialogue on how

feedback practices can best support the development of academic writing skills.

### **Research Methodology**

This study adopts a quantitative approach and uses a structured questionnaire as the primary instrument for data collection. The questionnaire is administered to EFL undergraduate students and is designed to gather data on their perceptions of peer feedback and teacher feedback in academic writing.

The instrument focuses on how each type of feedback is perceived to influence students' writing development, including aspects such as organization, grammatical accuracy, clarity, coherence, and overall writing performance. It also examines students' attitudes toward both feedback types, particularly in terms of usefulness, quality, and trustworthiness.

The collected data are analyzed using statistical methods in order to compare students' perceptions of peer feedback and teacher feedback. This analysis aims to identify which feedback type is perceived as more effective in supporting academic writing development. Overall, this methodology provides a systematic way to understand feedback practices in an EFL academic context from the learners' perspective.

### **Structure of the Dissertation**

The present dissertation follows a traditional five-chapter structure. The first chapter, the Introduction, provides the background of the study and presents the research problem, research questions, and hypotheses. It also outlines the aims and significance of the study, describes the research methodology, and presents an overview of the dissertation structure as well as its limitations.

The second chapter, the Literature Review, is organized into five main sections. The first section discusses academic writing in terms of its definition, importance, and challenges. The second section examines feedback in writing instruction, including its definition, types, and role in improving writing skills. The third section focuses on teacher

feedback, highlighting its definition, forms, advantages, and limitations. The fourth section addresses peer feedback, including its definition, benefits, and challenges. The final section compares peer feedback and teacher feedback by reviewing previous studies on their relative effectiveness.

The third chapter describes the research design, the study population, the data collection instrument (student questionnaires), and the procedures used for data analysis.

The fifth chapter, Discussion of Findings, interprets the results in relation to the literature review and discusses the comparative effectiveness of peer and teacher feedback in improving academic writing.

Finally, the dissertation concludes with a General Conclusion, which summarizes the study, highlights the main findings, discusses its contributions, and offers suggestions for future research.

### **Limitations of the Study**

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged when interpreting the findings. First, during the data collection process, some students showed limited willingness to provide detailed responses in the questionnaire, which may have affected the depth of the data obtained.

Second, the study was conducted with a relatively small sample of 30 third-year EFL students from a single class at Chadli Bendjedid University of El Taref. As a result, the findings cannot be easily generalized to the broader population of Algerian EFL learners.

Third, the study relied exclusively on self-reported questionnaire data to evaluate students' perceptions of peer feedback and teacher feedback. This may introduce a degree of subjectivity and response bias.

In addition, difficulties in accessing certain scholarly sources limited the breadth of the literature review. Finally, the study was restricted to academic writing tasks within one institutional context, which may limit the transferability of the results to other educational

settings.

# **Chapter Two**

## **Review of Literature**

## **Introduction**

This chapter provides an overview of the theoretical and empirical background related to feedback in academic writing. It begins by defining academic writing skills and explaining their importance in higher education. It then discusses the two main types of feedback — teacher feedback and peer feedback — highlighting their respective strengths and limitations as reported in the literature. Finally, the chapter reviews previous studies that have compared these feedback types and identifies the research gap that this study seeks to address.

### **Definition of Academic Writing**

Learning English as a second or foreign language can be challenging because it requires learners to develop a wide range of language skills. Compared with native speakers, ESL/EFL students often face greater difficulties in academic writing due to limited exposure to the language. Academic writing has been defined in different ways by various scholars. According to Bailey (2018), academic writing is a formal and structured type of writing that requires clarity, accuracy, and the effective presentation of ideas. Similarly, Hyland (2004) describes academic writing as a social practice shaped by the conventions and expectations of specific academic disciplines. He emphasizes that writers must communicate knowledge in ways that meet the expectations of their academic community.

Swales and Feak (2012) argue that academic writing is a practical skill that students develop through continuous practice and engagement with academic tasks. Likewise, Leki (1998) stresses the importance of organizing ideas logically and supporting arguments with evidence. Academic writing is therefore more than simply expressing opinions; it requires critical thinking, organization, and the use of credible sources.

According to Labaree (2009), academic writing is a formal and discipline-specific form of communication used by scholars and researchers to share knowledge and research findings. It is characterized by an objective tone, precise language, and a focus on evidence. In addition, Cottrell (2019) describes academic writing as a structured and evidence-based form of communication that emphasizes clarity, critical analysis, and adherence to academic conventions.

### ***The Importance of Academic Writing***

Academic writing plays a crucial role in higher education because it allows students and researchers to communicate ideas, present arguments, and share knowledge. Bailey (2018) states that effective academic writing should be clear, concise, and supported by evidence. Similarly, Booth, Colomb, and Williams (2016) explain that strong academic arguments are based on logical reasoning and reliable evidence rather than personal opinions.

Academic writing also enables students and researchers to participate in academic discussions and contribute new ideas to their fields of study (Cottrell, 2019). Through the use of sources and references, writers connect their work to existing knowledge and help advance research (Hyland, 2019; Swales & Feak, 2012).

Furthermore, academic writing develops important skills such as critical thinking, analysis, and evaluation. According to Wingate (2012), students learn to assess sources, examine different viewpoints, and build evidence-based arguments. Murray and Moore (2006) also emphasize that strong writing skills are essential for both academic success and professional development.

Proper citation and referencing help maintain academic integrity and prevent plagiarism (Lipson, 2018). Therefore, academic writing not only supports learning but also

prepares individuals to contribute responsibly to academic and professional communities

### ***Challenges in Academic Writing***

Despite its importance, academic writing presents many challenges, especially for novice researchers and students who use English as a second or foreign language.

Academic writing requires writers to follow specific conventions, use appropriate language, and present ideas in a clear and organized manner.

One common challenge is the difficulty of expressing complex ideas accurately and effectively. According to Sword (2012), academic writing is often associated with complex language and dense style, which can make writing and communication difficult. Students may struggle to write clearly while maintaining an academic tone.

Another challenge is organizing ideas and developing coherent arguments. Hartley (2008) notes that many students find it difficult to structure their work logically and maintain coherence throughout longer pieces of writing such as research papers and dissertations. Similarly, Coffin et al. (2003) argue that novice writers often face difficulties understanding and applying the conventions of academic genres.

For students writing in English as an additional language, linguistic challenges can be even greater. Canagarajah (2002) explains that non-native English speakers may struggle with language proficiency, academic conventions, and participation in international academic communities. These difficulties can affect their confidence and writing performance.

Despite these challenges, academic writing skills can be developed through regular practice, effective guidance, and continuous engagement with academic conventions. With appropriate support, learners can gradually become more confident and effective academic writers.

### **Feedback in Teaching Writing**

#### ***Definition of feedback***

The concept of feedback has received considerable attention in education research (Boud & Molloy, 2013). According to the Cambridge Dictionary (Cambridge University Press & Assessment, 2026), feedback is information or opinions about a process, activity, or performance that can be used to evaluate or improve it.

In education, feedback is considered an important part of effective learning and teaching. It is more than simply correcting mistakes; it helps learners understand their progress and identify ways to improve their performance (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Feedback can be provided by teachers, peers, or by learners themselves through self-assessment.

Hattie and Timperley (2007) explain that effective feedback should be timely, specific, and actionable. Timely feedback is given soon after a task so that learners can remember and apply the comments. Specific feedback focuses on particular aspects of performance and provides clear examples and suggestions. Actionable feedback offers practical guidance that learners can use to improve future work.

In writing education, feedback is often understood as comments and suggestions on students' written work that help them improve their writing skills (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). More recent research emphasizes that feedback is not only information given to students; it also

requires students to understand and use that information to improve future performance (Carless & Boud, 2018).

Winstone and Carless (2019) call this ability feedback literacy, which means being able to understand, evaluate, and apply feedback effectively. Without this ability, even detailed feedback may have little effect on learning.

Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) also argue that feedback is most effective when it becomes a dialogue between teachers and learners rather than a one-way process. Similarly, Sadler (1989) explains that feedback helps students identify the gap between their current performance and the desired standard, which allows them to improve.

Through this process, feedback supports learning and development by enabling students to recognize their strengths and weaknesses and make meaningful improvements

### ***TYPES OF Feedback***

In EFL/ESL teaching, feedback is used to help students improve their language skills. Ellis (2009) notes that corrective feedback can take different forms depending on the learners and the learning situation.

**Content feedback.** Content feedback focuses on the ideas, meaning, and organization of a piece of writing. It may be given orally or in writing and can be formative or summative. Hattie and Timperley (2007) mention aspects such as relevance, organization, and coherence. Keh (1990) argues that content feedback is most useful during the drafting stage because it allows students to improve their ideas before focusing on grammar and punctuation.

**Form feedback.** Form-focused feedback deals with grammar, spelling, punctuation, vocabulary, and sentence structure. Bitchener (2008) explains that written corrective feedback can improve both short-term performance and long-term language learning. Ellis (2009) identifies several common strategies, including direct correction, indirect correction, and metalinguistic feedback.

**Formative feedback.** Formative feedback is provided during the writing process, for example on drafts or outlines. It guides students while they are working and helps them revise and improve their writing (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Shute, 2008).

**Summative feedback.** Summative feedback is given after a task, assignment, or course has been completed. It usually includes an overall evaluation and may be accompanied by a grade (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

**Corrective, Directive, Interactive, and evaluative feedback.** Corrective feedback directly fixes errors in a student's text. Directive feedback gives clear instructions for revision. Interactive feedback uses questions and comments to encourage discussion and reflection. Evaluative feedback provides a judgment about the quality of the writing, such as whether an argument is strong or unclear. Hyland and Hyland (2006) note that these forms of feedback can be delivered either orally or in writing.

**Oral Feedback.** Oral feedback consists of spoken comments given during or after a task. It allows immediate interaction between learners and feedback providers, making it easier to clarify misunderstandings and discuss improvements (Carless & Boud, 2018). Hattie and Timperley (2007) also suggest that effective feedback can positively influence learning, motivation, and achievement.

**Written Feedback.** Written feedback is one of the most common forms of feedback in academic writing. It provides detailed comments that students can read and review at their own pace. Ferris (2003) explains that written feedback helps students identify errors and improve the quality of their writing. Hyland and Hyland (2006) add that written comments can support revision and long-term writing development.

### **The role of feedback in improving writing**

Writing is an important skill that allows people to express ideas, share information, and communicate

effectively. However, improving writing requires practice, revision, and guidance. Feedback plays a major role in this process because it helps learners identify strengths and weaknesses and improve their work.

Sadler (1989) explains that feedback helps students recognize the difference between their current performance and the desired standard. Carroll (2002) also argues that revising writing based on feedback is essential for improving writing quality.

Ferris (2003) states that continuous corrective feedback can help second-language learners improve grammatical accuracy over time. Carless (2006) further suggests that feedback should be viewed as a dialogue between teachers and students rather than a one-way transfer of information.

Formative feedback can also increase students' motivation by clarifying learning goals and showing how to achieve them (Black & Wiliam, 1998). In addition, feedback supports self-regulated learning because students learn to reflect on comments and use them to improve future work (Boud & Carless, 2018).

Taken together, these perspectives demonstrate that feedback is a key element in writing development, supporting both language improvement and learner autonomy.

### ***Definition of Teacher feedback***

In academic writing, teacher feedback serves as a guide that helps students improve their performance and achieve academic standards. Through written or oral comments, teachers identify strengths, point out weaknesses, and provide suggestions for improvement (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

From a theoretical perspective, teacher feedback is widely recognized as a form of instructional scaffolding. Based on Vygotsky's (1978) socio-constructivist theory, learning occurs within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which refers to the gap between what learners can achieve independently and what they can accomplish with expert

guidance. Through constructive comments and suggestions, teachers support students in developing their writing abilities and reaching higher levels of academic performance.

Because teachers are viewed as experts, students often place greater trust in teacher feedback than in peer feedback (Chang, 2016). However, Lee (2007) argues that excessive dependence on teacher feedback may limit learner autonomy. When students view teachers as the only source of correct knowledge, they may become passive recipients of feedback rather than active participants in the revision process.

Through expert guidance and constructive comments, teacher feedback contributes significantly to the development of students' academic writing abilities.

### ***Types of Teacher Feedback***

Feedback plays a central role in academic writing, serving as a bridge between student performance and future improvement. According to Boud (2002), effective feedback should be delivered in a neutral and objective way, focusing on factual observations rather than personal judgments. Such feedback should be constructive, guiding learners toward improvement rather than focusing solely on past shortcomings.

Teacher feedback is essential for academic writing progress, encouraging learners toward improved language accuracy and content quality through various types such as corrective and rubric-based feedback. This framework helps researchers analyze its impact and compare it to peer feedback.

**Direct Feedback.** Direct feedback occurs when the instructor explicitly provides the correct form of an error. It is particularly effective for beginners who are unable to self-correct or are unaware of the correct structure (Eslami, 2014). Teachers highlight students' mistakes (grammar, spelling, structure) and write the correct forms directly above them (Husniah et al., 2017). However, this approach may discourage learners from independently identifying correct answers and limit opportunities for self-correction, as it prioritizes teacher-led correction (Shahab & Saeed, 2024).

**Indirect Feedback.** Rather than directly correcting errors, teachers indicate them and

prompt students to self-correct. This method is known as indirect corrective feedback. According to Ellis (2009), teachers may underline mistakes, insert carets for missing elements, or place an “X” in the margin to indicate an error, leaving students to locate and correct it themselves. Hosseiny (2014) states that indirect written corrective feedback is shaped by teachers’ delivery approaches (in-class or out-of-class), while maintaining the same core objective of encouraging learner autonomy.

**Metalinguistic Feedback.** In metalinguistic corrective feedback, instructors provide linguistic clues that explain the nature of students’ errors (Ellis, 2009). This type of feedback promotes language awareness and self-correction. Ferris (2006) confirms its effectiveness in encouraging student writers to engage more deeply in revision processes.

**Rubric-based Feedback.** Rubric-based feedback relies on scoring guides that clarify learning objectives and standardize evaluation. By helping students understand assessment criteria more clearly, this systematic approach improves self-assessment skills. Sáiz-Manzanares et al. (2017) demonstrate that rubrics enhance transparency and learning in higher education contexts.

**Electronic Feedback.** Teachers can deliver feedback using digital tools such as tracked changes, audio or video comments, and Google Docs annotations. Hyland (2010) identifies electronic feedback as a major development in L2 writing pedagogy, highlighting its potential to support multimodal and interactive learning experiences.

### ***Advantages of Teacher Feedback***

Teacher feedback is often more accurate and reliable than peer feedback, making it highly effective for academic writing development. One of its main strengths is its accuracy and dependability. Instructor feedback is considered trustworthy because it is provided by professionals in language and academic writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

Learners generally perceive teacher feedback as a reliable guide that helps them improve their work and achieve academic goals. Feedback is most valuable when it provides specific, actionable

recommendations that allow learners to make measurable progress (Brooks et al., 2024).

Another advantage is its breadth and depth. Teachers are able to address both higher-order concerns such as structure, coherence, and argument development, as well as lower-order concerns including grammar, spelling, and punctuation (Ferris, 2014).

Within Vygotsky's (1978) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), teacher feedback provides effective scaffolding. Drawing on their expertise, teachers can identify the gap between independent performance and guided performance, and provide targeted support to bridge it (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

Furthermore, teacher feedback enhances students' motivation and confidence. Studies show that constructive feedback increases learners' willingness to revise and improves their attitudes toward writing (Lee, 2007). Teacher comments also reduce confusion, as students tend to see instructor feedback as reliable and authoritative. Lee (2017) notes that students generally prefer teacher feedback over peer feedback because it provides clearer guidance for revision. Ultimately, teacher feedback functions as a formative assessment tool, helping students monitor their progress and improve.

continuously. The gap between current performance and learning goals is reduced through formative feedback, which Black and Wiliam (1998) consider essential to learning.

### **Limitations**

Despite its importance, teacher feedback has several limitations. Research identifies subjectivity and bias as key issues. Even when teachers aim to remain objective, as Boud (2002) suggests, personal perspectives may still influence evaluations.

Another limitation is time constraints. Due to large class sizes and heavy workloads, teachers may provide brief or vague feedback that does not fully support student improvement (Konold & Miller, 2004).

The effectiveness of feedback also depends on students' engagement. Learners may lack the metacognitive skills needed to apply feedback, ignore it, or feel discouraged by overly critical

comments (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

Delayed feedback is another issue. Gibbs and Simpson (2005) argue that feedback given weeks after submission loses effectiveness because students have already moved on to new tasks.

Additionally, teacher feedback is often a one-way process, with limited opportunity for dialogue or clarification (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006).

Finally, some teachers lack formal training in feedback delivery. Without proper preparation, feedback may become unclear, overly critical, or unhelpful, which can hinder rather than support student development (Sadler, 2010).

### ***Definition of Peer Feedback***

In English as a Second Language (ESL) writing classes, peer feedback is no longer just an extra activity. It has become an important part of learning, along with teacher feedback, and it helps students improve their writing skills (Chen, 2021).

Peer feedback is a process where students read each other's work and give comments or suggestions to help improve it. Hattie and Timperley (2007) explain that feedback can come from different sources, including peers, and it helps learners understand their performance and find areas to improve. In writing, Liu and Hansen (2002) describe peer feedback as an interactive process where students read their classmates' texts and give comments and suggestions to improve them.

Falchikov (2001) also explains that peer feedback is when students give constructive comments to each other, which supports learning and academic development. Good peer feedback should show strengths, identify problems, and give clear suggestions, not just general praise or criticism (Nicol, Thomson, & Breslin, 2014). Sunzuma et al. (2022) add that the effectiveness of peer feedback depends on the context, including culture, institution, and student preparation.

Peer feedback allows students of the same level to evaluate each other's work in terms of structure, content, and quality (Falchikov & Goldfinch, 2000). According to Vygotsky (1978), learning happens through interaction between learners.

Peer feedback has two main roles. First, it has a social role because it helps students work together

and reduces dependence on the teacher. Second, it has a cognitive role because it helps students understand assessment criteria and improve their writing.

Research shows that giving feedback is also useful for the student who gives it, because it helps them think more carefully about writing (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009).

Double et al. (2020) also show that peer feedback becomes more effective when it is supported by rubrics, training, and anonymity.

### ***Benefits of Peer Feedback***

**Academic performance and achievement.** Engagement in peer feedback activities has repeatedly been shown to contribute to improved academic performance. Simonsmeier et al. (2020) demonstrated that peer review fosters both cognitive and affective development, which leads to better academic achievement and a more positive self-image. Through this reciprocal process, students refine their work and develop a clearer understanding of quality standards, which ultimately improves their performance.

**Development of critical thinking.** Falchikov (2001) explains that peer feedback helps students develop critical thinking skills. When students evaluate others' work, they learn to analyze ideas more deeply and express their thoughts more clearly.

**Self- assessment and self-regulated learning.** Peer feedback also helps students become more independent learners. According to Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006), students develop a better understanding of writing standards through peer review. This helps them identify their own mistakes and improve their work without always depending on the teacher.

**Collaboration and communication skills.** Peer feedback improves communication and teamwork. Students learn how to give and receive comments in a respectful way. This process also helps them develop empathy and better communication skills. Falchikov (2001) adds that peer feedback creates a supportive classroom environment where students help each other learn

**Preparation for professional contexts.** Finally, peer feedback prepares students for future academic and professional life. It helps them learn how to accept criticism and work with others. Falchikov (2001) explains that these skills are important for lifelong learning and future careers.

### ***Challenges of Peer Feedback***

Although peer feedback has many benefits, it also has some challenges.

**Variability in feedback quality.** One main problem is that the quality of feedback is not always consistent. Some students may give unclear or incorrect comments because they lack experience (Liu & Hansen, 2002; Min, 2006). Falchikov (2001) also notes that students sometimes give very positive feedback to avoid conflict, which reduces the quality of evaluation. Cho and MacArthur (2010) add that peer feedback is often less clear and less useful than teacher feedback. Social and interpersonal concerns. Social factors can also affect peer feedback. Some students think peer assessment is unfair or not reliable (Hanrahan & Isaacs, 2001). In some cultures, students avoid criticizing others to maintain good relationships (Yu & Hu, 2017).

**Lack of training and preparation.** Another challenge is the lack of training. Without clear instructions, students may not know how to give good feedback. Hyland (2003) stresses the importance of using clear criteria. Gielen et al. (2010) and Sluijsmans et al. (2002) show that training improves the quality of peer feedback.

**Increased cognitive loads.** Peers, students may give only simple or weak comments.

Lundstrom and Baker (2009) also note that students may struggle when they have to write, revise, and feedback can also be difficult because it requires a lot of thinking. Students must read, understand, and evaluate another text at the same time (Min, 2006). Van Zundert et al. (2010) explain that without clear structure evaluate at the same time.

**Motivation and acceptance issues.** Finally, some students are not comfortable giving criticism. Wei and Liu (2024) explain that students may avoid giving negative comments because they do not want to hurt others' feelings. Cheng and Warren (2005) also note that cultural

background can affect students' willingness to participate. Some students also do not fully understand the importance of peer feedback in learning (Macfarlane-Dick, 2006).

### **Teacher Feedback vs Peer Feedback: A Comparative perspective**

A large number of recent studies have explored the differences between teacher feedback and peer feedback, which are two of the most commonly used methods in education. Both aim to improve the writing skills of second and foreign language learners. However, they differ in the source of feedback, the level of effectiveness, and the type of impact they have on students. Each method has strengths that support learning, as well as some limitations.

Hyland and Hyland (2006) highlight the importance of teacher feedback because of its high accuracy, authority, and detailed corrective input, which can be provided through direct, indirect, or metalinguistic feedback. Bitchener and Ferris (2012) argue that teacher corrective feedback is important for improving accurate language use and supporting long-term grammar development. Shintani, Ellis, and Suzuki (2014) also confirm that teacher feedback improves learners' writing accuracy, showing its effectiveness in language learning.

In contrast, peer feedback is valued for promoting collaboration, learner independence, and active participation in writing. Zhu (2001) explains that peers provide descriptive, evaluative, and suggestive comments that help students revise their work. Liu and Hansen (2002) also emphasize that peer feedback develops responsibility and reflection in learners. Nelson and Murphy (1993) found that although peer feedback is less authoritative than teacher feedback, it still encourages students to revise their writing by reconsidering content and organization. Hu (2005) adds that peer feedback encourages interaction between learners, but its effectiveness depends on the cultural and classroom context.

Comparative studies show that peer feedback helps develop critical thinking, negotiation of meaning, and learner autonomy, while teacher feedback ensures accuracy through expert guidance. According to Noroozi, Banihashem, and Drachsler (2024), combining peer feedback with teacher or technological feedback creates a more balanced approach that includes both

reliability and collaboration.

In conclusion, peer feedback promotes discussion, independence, and deeper learning, while teacher feedback provides accuracy and authority. Therefore, both types of feedback should be seen as complementary rather than opposite.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, this chapter explains that both teacher feedback and peer feedback help improve academic writing skills, but in different ways. Teacher feedback focuses more on accuracy and important writing problems, while peer feedback encourages discussion, cooperation, and deeper understanding of writing. Research shows that neither type of feedback is better in all situations. A combination of both is often the most effective approach. However, the effectiveness of each type depends on the learning context and students' needs. In the next chapter, the research methodology will be presented and explained.

## **Chapter Three**

### **Methodology**

**Introduction**

This chapter outlines the methods used in the study. A quantitative descriptive approach was adopted to collect and analyze numerical data that describe students' perceptions of peer and teacher feedback in academic writing. The chapter presents the research design, the participants, and the instrument employed, as well as the procedures followed for data analysis.

**Methodology**

In this study, a quantitative descriptive method was used to collect and analyze students' perceptions of peer and teacher feedback in academic writing. This method was chosen because it describes students' opinions without changing any variables. It also

allows the results to be shown using numbers such as frequencies and percentages. This approach is suitable for understanding how students experience and evaluate feedback in their writing classes.

The study was conducted at Chadli Bendjedid El Taref University, with a sample of 30 third-year English students. These students were selected because they already have basic academic writing skills and regularly receive both peer and teacher feedback in their assignments. This makes them appropriate participants for the study, as they can provide relevant information about feedback practices in their academic context.

### **Description of Students' Questionnaire**

The students' questionnaire focused on learners' perceptions of how peer and teacher feedback influence their academic writing. It aimed to collect students' opinions about the usefulness of feedback, the challenges they face, and how each type helps improve their writing skills. The questionnaire included 19 questions divided into seven sections. It contained multiple-choice questions, Likert scale statements, and open-ended questions. All responses were anonymous to ensure honesty and reliability.

#### ***Section 1: Background information (2questions)***

This section collected basic information such as students' academic year and their self-assessed level of English. These questions were included to help interpret responses based on students' level and experience. Third-year students are expected to have more exposure to academic writing and feedback, while language level may influence how students understand and use feedback.

### ***Section 2: Feedback Experience (2 questions)***

This section examined how often students receive teacher feedback and participate in peer feedback activities. The frequency of feedback is important because it influences students' opinions and attitudes. Regular exposure may help students become more familiar with feedback practices, while limited exposure may reduce its impact. This section also shows how integrated feedback is in writing classes.

### ***Section 3: Perceptions of Feedback (3 questions)***

This part explored students' views on the usefulness of feedback. Students indicated which type of feedback they find more helpful and in which areas. Teacher feedback was linked to grammar, organization, content, and academic style, while peer feedback was linked to idea sharing, clarity, and identifying mistakes. This section helps compare the strengths of both types of feedback.

### ***Section 4: Attitude toward Feedback (3 questions)***

This section used Likert scale statements to measure students' attitudes. Students showed their level of agreement with statements about teacher and peer feedback. This section is important because attitudes influence how students respond to feedback and whether they apply it in their writing.

### ***Section 5: Challenges (2 questions)***

This section explored the difficulties students face with feedback. For peer feedback, problems include lack of trust, low language level, or unclear comments. For teacher feedback, difficulties include being too general, too strict, or limited because of time. This section helps identify the limits of both feedback types.

***Section 6: Effectiveness (2questions)***

This section focused on how effective students find feedback in improving their writing. Students indicated which type of feedback helps them more and how often they revise their work after receiving feedback. Revision is important because it shows whether students actually use the feedback to improve their writing.

***Section 7: Students' Opinions (2questions)***

This final section allowed students to give their personal opinions. They were asked about their preference between peer and teacher feedback, reasons for their choice, and suggestions for improvement. They were also asked what they think is the best way to improve academic writing. This section adds deeper insight into students' real experiences.

**Conclusion**

This chapter presented the methodology used in this study. It described the research design, the participants (third-year EFL students), and the questionnaire used to collect the data.

It also explained the seven sections of the questionnaire, which covered students' background, feedback experience, perceptions, attitudes, challenges, effectiveness, and opinions. These sections helped to collect detailed information about students' views on peer and teacher feedback.

In general, this methodology provides a clear basis for analyzing how peer and teacher feedback influence students' academic writing skills. The next chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of the collected data.

# **Chapter Four**

## **Results**

## Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the questionnaire conducted with third-year EFL students at Chadli Bendjedid University in El Taref. The aim is to analyze their experiences, perceptions, attitudes, and challenges regarding peer and teacher feedback in academic writing. The data are organized according to the seven sections of the questionnaire, and combine quantitative findings from closed-ended questions with qualitative insights from open-ended responses. This analysis provides a basis for understanding how feedback practices influence students' writing development.

### Section 1: Background Information

**Q1.** What is your current academic year?

**Table 1:** *Students' distribution according to academic year*

|                      | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 <sup>st</sup> year | 0         | 0%         |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> year | 0         | 0%         |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> year | 30        | 100%       |
| Master 1             | 0         | 0%         |
| Master 2             | 0         | 0%         |

As shown in Table 1, all respondents (100%) are third-year students, with no representation from other academic levels. This ensures consistency in the sample, as all participants are at the same academic stage and have similar exposure to academic writing and feedback. However, this limits comparison with other academic levels. Therefore, the findings reflect only third-year students' perspectives.

## Section 1: Background Information

**Q2.** How would you rate your English proficiency level?

**Table 2:** *Students' distribution according to self-assessed English proficiency level*

|              | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Beginner     | 0         | 0%         |
| Intermediate | 23        | 76.7%      |
| Advanced     | 7         | 23.3%      |

The data show that the majority of students (76.7%) rate themselves as intermediate in English proficiency. This indicates that most participants have developed a functional command of the language but may still face challenges in advanced academic writing, making feedback particularly important for their progress. A smaller percentage (23.3%) identify as advanced, suggesting stronger linguistic competence and greater confidence in handling complex writing tasks. Interestingly, no respondents classified themselves as beginners (0%), which reflects the academic level of the sample, as third-year students are expected to have surpassed the beginner stage. These results indicate that the analysis will mainly reflect intermediate learners' perspectives, complemented by insights from advanced students.

## Section 2: Feedback Experience

**Q3.** How often do you receive teacher feedback on your academic writing?

**Table 3:** *Frequency of teacher feedback on students' academic writing*

|           | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Always    | 5         | 16.7%      |
| Often     | 7         | 23.3%      |
| Sometimes | 16        | 53.3%      |
| Rarely    | 2         | 6.7%       |
| Never     | 0         | 0%         |

The results presented in Table 3 indicate that more than half of the students (53.3%) reported receiving teacher feedback sometimes, suggesting that feedback is provided but not consistently across all writing tasks. A smaller proportion (23.3%) stated they receive feedback often, while (16.7%) reported receiving it always, showing that only a minority benefits from regular and systematic teacher input. Additionally, (6.7%) of students indicated that they receive feedback rarely, and none reported receiving it never. These findings reveal that teacher feedback is generally available, but its frequency varies considerably, being intermittent rather than continuous.

## Section 2: Feedback Experience

**Q4.** How often do you participate in peer feedback activities?

**Table 4:** *Frequency of students' participation in peer feedback activities*

|           | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Always    | 3         | 10%        |
| Often     | 15        | 50%        |
| Sometimes | 12        | 40%        |
| Rarely    | 0         | 0%         |
| Never     | 0         | 0%         |

According to Table 4, peer feedback appears to be a well-established practice among the students. Half of the respondents (50%) engage in these activities often, while (40%) participate sometimes, reflecting a moderate but steady involvement. A smaller group (10%) stated they participate always, which points to a consistent commitment to peer review. Notably, none of the respondents selected rarely or never, suggesting that peer feedback is strongly incorporated into their academic routines. Overall, the results highlight that while levels of engagement differ, peer feedback remains a regular and valued component of students' writing development.

### Section 3: Perceptions of Feedback

**Q5.** Which type of feedback do you find more helpful?

**Table 5:** *Students' preferred for type of feedback*

|                  | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------|-----------|------------|
| Teacher feedback | 10        | 33.3%      |
| Peer feedback    | 4         | 13.3%      |
| Both equally     | 16        | 53.3%      |

When examining Table 5, it becomes evident that a majority of students (53.3%) find both teacher and peer feedback equally helpful. About one third of the participants (33.3%) prefer teacher feedback, emphasizing the value they place on instructors' expertise and guidance in improving academic writing. Only (13.3%) favor peer feedback alone, which indicates that while peer review is useful, it is less frequently regarded as sufficient on its own.

### Section 3: Perceptions of Feedback

**Q6.** For which aspects is teacher feedback most useful?

**Table 6:** *Students' views on aspects where teacher feedback is most useful*

|                               | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Grammar and accuracy          | 9         | 30%        |
| Organization and structure    | 5         | 16.7%      |
| Content and ideas             | 4         | 13.3%      |
| Academic style and vocabulary | 12        | 40%        |
| Referencing and citation      | 0         | 0%         |

The analysis of Table 6 presents a clear hierarchy in students' perceptions of teacher feedback. The most frequently chosen aspect is academic style and vocabulary (40%), which underscores the importance students place on teachers' guidance in refining scholarly language and ensuring conformity with academic conventions. This emphasis suggests that learners see instructors as essential in helping them achieve precision and fluency in academic expression. A considerable group (30%) illustrate grammar and accuracy, reflecting the expectation that teachers provide authoritative correction in areas where precision is critical. Smaller groups point to organization and structure (16.7%) and content and ideas (13.3%), including that while these areas are valued, they are not regarded as the primary domains of teacher intervention. Finally, the absence of responses for referencing and citation (0%) is noteworthy. It may imply that students rely on external resources such as citation manuals, online tools, or institutional guidelines rather than teacher for this aspect.

### Section 3 : Perceptions of Feedback

**Q7.** For which aspects is peer feedback most useful?

**Table 7:** Students' views on aspects where peer feedback is most useful

|                                | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Generating ideas               | 5         | 16.7%      |
| Improving clarity              | 3         | 10%        |
| Identifying mistakes           | 11        | 36.7%      |
| Getting different Perspectives | 7         | 23.3%      |
| Improving organization         | 4         | 13.3%      |

The breakdown in Table 7 shows that 16.7% of students find peer feedback most useful for generating ideas, followed by (10%) who see it as beneficial for improving clarity. A significant portion (36.7%) find peer input most valuable in identifying mistakes, which is the highest category. Another (23.3%) highlight getting different perspectives as a key benefit, and (13.3%) note improving organization. Finally, these results illustrate the variety of ways in which peers are seen as helpful across different aspects of academic writing.

#### Section 4: Attitudes

**Q8.** *Teacher feedback helps me improve my academic writing skills?*

**Table 8:** *Students' perceptions of teacher feedback in improving academic writing skills*

|                   | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Strongly agree    | 5         | 16.7%      |
| Agree             | 19        | 63.3%      |
| Neutral           | 5         | 16.7%      |
| Disagree          | 1         | 3.3%       |
| Strongly disagree | 0         | 0%         |

The data in Table 8 shows that a clear majority of students (63.3%) agree that teacher feedback helps them improve their academic writing skills, while an additional (16.7%) strongly agree, reinforcing the positive impact of teacher guidance. A smaller portion (16.7%) remain neutral, suggesting mixed or uncertain experiences. Only one student (3.3%) expressed disagreement, and none strongly disagreed. Ultimately, the findings convey strong collective trust in teacher feedback as an essential mechanism for developing students' academic writing competence.

#### Section 4: Attitudes

**Q9.** Peer feedback helps me improve my academic writing skills?

**Table 9:** *Students' perceptions of peer feedback in improving academic writing skills*

|                   | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Strongly agree    | 3         | 10%        |
| Agree             | 22        | 73.3%      |
| Neutral           | 4         | 13.3%      |
| Disagree          | 1         | 3.3%       |
| Strongly disagree | 0         | 0%         |

The distribution in Table 9 indicates that peer feedback is widely valued, with nearly three-quarters of students (73.3%) agreeing that it helps them enhance their academic writing skills. Only a minority (10%) strongly agreed, further reinforcing this positive view. Neutral responses account for (13.3%), suggesting that some students remain uncertain about its effectiveness. Only one respondent (3.3%) expressed disagreement, and none strongly disagreed.

#### Section 4 : Attitudes

**Q10.** feedback helps me become more independent in writing?

**Table 10:** *Students' perceptions of peer feedback as a mean of fostering independence in life*

|                   | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Strongly agree    | 2         | 6.7%       |
| Agree             | 13        | 43.3%      |
| Neutral           | 11        | 36.7%      |
| Disagree          | 4         | 13.3%      |
| Strongly disagree | 0         | 0%         |

Looking at Table 10, nearly half of the students (43.3%) agreed that peer feedback supports their independence, with a smaller proportion (6.7%) strongly affirming this view. A notable share of respondents (36.7%) remained neutral, indicating uncertainty about the extent of its impact. In contrast, (13.3%) disagreed, and none expressed strong disagreement.

#### Section 4 : Attitudes

**Q11.**Teacher feedback is more reliable than peer feedback?

**Table 11:** *Comparative reliability of teacher and peer feedback*

|                   | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Strongly agree    | 8         | 26.7%      |
| Agree             | 9         | 30%        |
| Neutral           | 9         | 30%        |
| Disagree          | 4         | 13.3%      |
| Strongly disagree | 0         | 0%         |

The data in Table 11 shows that (26.7%) of students strongly agree and (30%) agree that teacher feedback is more reliable than peer feedback, meaning that over half of the respondents place greater confidence in teacher input. Neutral responses are equally prominent at (30%), which highlights a considerable group of students who remain undecided or view both forms of feedback as having comparable value. A smaller proportion (13.3%) disagreed, suggesting that while teacher feedback is often perceived as authoritative, some students question its superiority. Importantly, no respondents strongly disagreed, reinforcing the general tendency to regard teacher feedback as a dependable source of guidance.

## Section 5: challenges

**Q12.** What difficulties do you encounter with peer feedback?

**Table 12:** *Difficulties encountered with peer feedback*

|                                     | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Lack of trust in peers' corrections | 7         | 23.3%      |
| Peers' limited language proficiency | 9         | 30%        |
| Unclear or incorrect feedback       | 8         | 26.7%      |
| Lack of seriousness                 | 6         | 20%        |

As presented in Table 12, the most common difficulty students encounter with peer feedback is peers' limited language proficiency (30%), which raises concerns about the accuracy and reliability of corrections. Unclear or incorrect feedback is also a significant issue, reported by (26.7%) of respondents, suggesting that even when peers provide input, its clarity and precision may be lacking. A notable proportion (23.3%) expressed a lack of trust in peers' corrections, reflecting doubts about the dependability of peer review.

Finally, (20%) highlighted lack of seriousness, indicating that some students perceive peer feedback as not being taken seriously enough to be effective. Collectively, these findings reveal that peer feedback is hindered by challenges related to language ability, trust, clarity, and commitment, which limit its overall effectiveness in academic contexts.

## Section 5 : Challenges

**Q13.** What difficulties do you encounter with teacher feedback?

**Table 13:** *Difficulties encountered with teacher feedback*

|                                          | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Too general or unclear                   | 8         | 26.7%      |
| Too strict or critical                   | 10        | 33.3%      |
| Difficult to understand                  | 4         | 13.3%      |
| Limited feedback due to time constraints | 8         | 26.7%      |

The data in Table 13 reveals several recurring challenges in teacher feedback. First, (26.7%) of respondents reported that feedback was too general or unclear, which reduces its usefulness for guiding specific revisions and may leave students uncertain about how to improve their work. The largest proportion, (33.3%), felt that teacher comments were too strict or critical. While constructive criticism is essential, excessive severity can discourage students and negatively affect their confidence in academic writing. A smaller group, (13.3%), indicated that feedback was difficult to understand, pointing to issues of clarity, language, or technical phrasing that may hinder comprehension. Finally, (26.7%) highlighted time constraints as a limiting factor, suggesting that teachers may not always provide sufficiently detailed or individualized feedback due to workload pressures. Taken together, these findings emphasize that although teacher feedback is a central mechanism for improving writing, its effectiveness depends on clarity, tone, and the availability of time to deliver meaningful guidance.

## Section 6: Effectiveness

**Q14.** Which type of feedback leads to greater improvement in your writing?

**Table 14:** *Type of feedback leading to the greatest improvement in writing*

|                  | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------|-----------|------------|
| Teacher feedback | 9         | 30%        |
| Peer feedback    | 4         | 13.3%      |
| Both equally     | 14        | 46.7%      |
| Not sure         | 3         | 10%        |

Table 14 explores which type of feedback—teacher, peer, or both—is perceived as leading to the greatest improvement in writing. A significant proportion (46.7%) indicated that a combination of both teacher and peer feedback results in the greatest improvement. This suggests that each type of feedback offers useful benefits that complement each other. A smaller group (30%) found teacher feedback alone to be the most effective, likely valuing the expertise and authority of instructors in providing clear and structured guidance. In contrast, only (13.3%) viewed peer feedback as the main driver of improvement, which may reflect the idea that while peers offer relatable and accessible insights, their feedback is sometimes seen as less authoritative. Lastly, (10%) of respondents were unsure, indicating that the effectiveness of feedback can vary depending on individual experiences and contexts. Overall, these results highlight the importance of a balanced approach. Combining teacher and peer feedback may provide a more complete perspective, using the strengths of both sources to support improvement in writing.

## Section 6: Effectiveness

**Q15.** After receiving feedback, how often do you revise your writing?

**Table 15:** *Frequency of revising writing after receiving feedback*

|           | Count | Percentage |
|-----------|-------|------------|
| Always    | 7     | 23.3%      |
| Often     | 10    | 33.3%      |
| Sometimes | 10    | 33.3%      |
| Rarely    | 3     | 10%        |
| Never     | 0     | 0%         |

In examining how often students revise their writing after receiving feedback, Table 15 reveals different revision habits. Notably, a combined (66.6%) of respondents reported revising their work either "often" or "sometimes," indicating that feedback plays an important role in the writing process for many students. A smaller group (23.3%) reported that they "always" revise their work after receiving feedback, demonstrating a high level of engagement and commitment to improving their writing. In contrast, (10%) of students indicated that they "rarely" revise their writing, suggesting that there may be barriers, such as time constraints or the perceived effectiveness of feedback, that limit their participation in the revision process. Overall, the findings suggest that while most students revise their work at least occasionally, the frequency of revision varies according to individual approaches and the type or quality of feedback received.

## Section 7: Opinion

**Q16.** In your opinion, what is the most effective way to improve academic writing?

**Table 16:** *Most effective way to improve academic writing, according to respondents*

|                                | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Only teacher feedback          | 4         | 13.3%      |
| Only peer feedback             | 1         | 3.3%       |
| A combination of both          | 22        | 73.3%      |
| Self-practice without feedback | 3         | 10%        |

As shown in Table 16, a substantial majority of respondents (73.3%) believe that a combination of both teacher and peer feedback is the most effective way to improve academic writing. This preference highlights the complementary strengths of each feedback type: teacher feedback is often valued for its authoritative guidance, while peer feedback can offer relatable perspectives and collaborative learning opportunities. By contrast, only (13.3%) felt that teacher feedback alone was the most effective, and a mere (3.3%) favored peer feedback alone. This indicates that singular sources of feedback may not provide the same holistic benefits. A small group (10%) preferred self-practice without any feedback. While this approach fosters independence, it may lack the external perspectives that enrich the revision process. In summary, the findings reinforce the idea that a blended model—incorporating both teacher and peer feedback—is considered the most effective strategy for enhancing academic writing.

## Section 7 : Opinion

**Q17.** Which type of feedback (peer feedback or teacher) do you prefer, and why?

**Table 17:** *Students' preferred type of feedback*

|         | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Teacher | 12        | 40%        |
| Peer    | 7         | 23.3%      |
| Both    | 11        | 36.7%      |

The analysis of responses to Question 17 demonstrates a clear diversity of student preferences regarding the type of feedback they consider most effective in improving their academic writing. Out of the thirty participants, twelve students (40%) indicated a preference for teacher feedback, underscoring the teacher's professional expertise, seriousness, and ability to provide accurate corrections in grammar and vocabulary. These students emphasized that teacher input is more reliable and academically rigorous, often describing it as essential for ensuring clarity and precision in their work. In contrast, seven respondents (23.3%) favored peer feedback, highlighting the value of shared perspectives, relatability, and collaborative learning. They noted that peers often understand the challenges faced by fellow students and can provide feedback that is easier to interpret and apply. Interestingly, eleven students (36.7%) expressed a preference for both teacher and peer feedback, suggesting that the combination offers a balanced approach: teacher feedback guarantees accuracy and professionalism, while peer feedback fosters mutual improvement, active participation, and a sense of shared responsibility. This distribution of preferences illustrates that while teacher feedback remains the dominant choice, there is significant recognition of the complementary role that peer feedback can play, pointing toward the potential benefits of integrating both authoritative and collaborative approaches in academic writing pedagogy.

**Q18. What difficulties did you face when using peer feedback?**

Students reported various challenges when participating in peer feedback activities. A common issue was that comments often lacked depth and detail, with many students noting that the feedback they received was incomplete or insufficient to support meaningful improvement. Another key concern involved trust and accuracy, as students questioned the reliability of peer corrections and pointed to instances of errors or misleading advice.

Additionally, some participants described peer feedback as overly critical or vague, making it difficult to interpret and apply. Problems related to honesty and commitment also emerged, with students indicating that peers were not always serious about the process or did not provide genuine evaluations. Finally, hesitation and confusion were mentioned, reflecting a lack of confidence among students when both giving and receiving feedback.

Overall, these findings suggest that peer feedback is limited by issues of reliability, clarity, and commitment, which may reduce its effectiveness unless appropriate training and guidance are provided.

**Q19. What suggestions do you have to improve peer feedback activities?**

Students proposed several improvements to strengthen peer feedback. First, they emphasized the need for structured training and organized practice sessions to ensure that peers can provide constructive and reliable comments. Second, they highlighted the importance of active teacher oversight, not only to supervise the process but also to intervene when necessary to ensure accuracy. Third, they recommended more collaborative models, including group work and knowledge sharing, to enhance engagement and effectiveness. Finally, they pointed to the potential of technology, particularly AI-based writing tools, to verify accuracy and support peer review. Taken together, these suggestions underline the value of peer feedback while calling for stronger organization, meaningful teacher guidance, and innovative approaches to enhance its quality and impact.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter presented and analyzed the data collected through the questionnaire. It examined students' experiences, perceptions, attitudes, and challenges related to peer and teacher feedback in academic writing. The results showed clear patterns in how students receive and use feedback, as well as differences in how effective they consider each type of feedback to be. The analysis also identified the main challenges students face and summarized their suggestions for improvement. Overall, the findings show that both teacher and peer feedback play important but different roles in improving academic writing skills. The next chapter discusses these findings in relation to the literature reviewed in Chapter Two.

## **Chapter five**

### **Discussion of the findings**

## **Introduction**

The present chapter is devoted to the discussion of the findings presented in the previous chapter. It provides an interpretation of the results obtained from the questionnaire administered to third-year EFL students at Chadli Bendjedid University in El Taref. The discussion is carried out in relation to the objectives of the study, the research questions, and the proposed hypotheses.

The findings are discussed according to the three research questions. The first section focuses on the role of teacher and peer feedback in improving writing accuracy. The second section examines their contribution to coherence and argumentation in academic writing. The third section discusses students' perceptions of the usefulness, trustworthiness, and effectiveness of both types of feedback. Throughout the discussion, the findings are related to the literature reviewed in Chapter Two.

## **The discussion of the findings**

The findings of this study reveal that teacher feedback was most often associated with improvements in grammatical accuracy and structural clarity. For example, a majority of students identified grammar and accuracy as the main strength of teacher feedback (Q6), while a smaller group emphasized its role in organization and structure. Peer feedback, in contrast, was valued for encouraging independence, collaboration, and confidence, with some students highlighting its importance in providing different perspectives (Q7). These results suggest that teacher feedback is particularly important for improving surface-level accuracy, whereas peer feedback contributes more to idea development and student engagement. This finding is consistent with Gonzalez-Torres and Sarango (2023), who reported that teacher feedback plays an important role in improving language accuracy among EFL learners.

Reliability and trust also emerged strongly in the data, directly addressing the question of whether peer feedback can match teacher feedback in improving surface-level accuracy. A large majority of students agreed that teacher feedback is more reliable than peer feedback (Q8), and the open-ended responses reinforced this perception, as several students reported that peer comments

were sometimes limited or lacked sufficient detail. These findings support the hypothesis that teacher feedback is more effective in this area and are consistent with Hyland and Hyland (2006), who argued that while peer feedback encourages autonomy and reflection, teacher feedback remains essential for achieving clarity and accuracy in writing.

When considering discourse-level coherence and argumentation, the study revealed a more balanced picture. A minority of respondents highlighted peer feedback as a source of different perspectives (Q7), encouraging reflection and idea development.

Teacher feedback, however, was also recognized for guiding organization and structure, with a smaller proportion of students emphasizing its role in improving these aspects (Q6). Peer feedback appeared to stimulate creativity and engagement, while teacher feedback helped students maintain coherence and follow academic writing conventions. This finding is consistent with Liu and Carless (2006), who suggest that peer feedback encourages students to think more deeply and collaborate effectively, whereas teacher feedback helps ensure alignment with academic standards.

Students' perceptions of usefulness and trust further illustrate the complementary nature of both feedback types. When asked which type of feedback was more helpful, a majority said both equally (Q8), while a considerable number preferred teacher feedback, and a smaller group preferred peer feedback. Trust was clearly higher for teacher feedback, with a large majority rating it as more reliable (Q9). At the same time, peer feedback was valued for promoting independence, with a majority of students agreeing that it helps them become more autonomous writers (Q10). More than half of the participants also believed that combining teacher and peer feedback provides the most effective way to improve academic writing (Q11). These findings directly address the research question on perceptions of usefulness, trust, and effectiveness.

Qualitative responses provide further insight into these perceptions. Students reported difficulties with peer feedback, including lack of trust, limited language proficiency, unclear or overly critical comments, and lack of seriousness. Some also mentioned hesitation and confusion, showing limited confidence in giving and receiving feedback. When asked how peer feedback could be improved, students suggested structured training, teacher guidance, collaborative activities, and the use of technology such as AI-based writing tools.

The findings validate the proposed hypotheses. Teacher feedback was found to be more effective in improving surface-level accuracy, confirming Hypothesis 1. Peer feedback contributed more to collaboration, independence, and idea development, supporting Hypothesis 2. Students reported higher trust in teacher feedback but greater cognitive engagement with peer feedback, which confirms Hypothesis 3.

These results directly answer the research question by showing that both feedback types are complementary rather than competitive. Teacher feedback ensures accuracy and adherence to academic standards, while peer feedback enhances engagement and idea development. Most students indicated that combining both types of feedback is the most effective way to improve academic writing.

### **Pedagogical Recommendations**

To enhance the integration of peer and teacher feedback in academic writing instruction, the following recommendations are proposed based on student perceptions, questionnaire findings, and theoretical frameworks. These suggestions aim to improve writing accuracy, foster learner autonomy, and guide future inquiry.

#### ***For Teachers***

Teachers are the primary mediators in shaping how feedback is perceived and applied. Their role extends beyond correcting errors to cultivating reflective, autonomous writers.

**Balance corrective and motivational feedback.** Teacher feedback should not be limited to pointing out grammatical or structural errors. It must also include motivational elements that

encourage learners to persist in revising their work. For example, alongside correcting verb tense errors, teachers might highlight the strength of the student's argument, reinforcing confidence while ensuring accuracy.

**Train students in peer review.** Peer feedback is most effective when learners are trained in how to provide constructive comments. Teachers should introduce rubrics, demonstrate model peer reviews, and facilitate practice sessions where students critique sample texts. This scaffolding ensures that peer comments move beyond surface-level praise or vague suggestions to more substantive engagement with content and organization.

**Encourage reflective comparison.** Teachers should design activities where students compare teacher corrections with peer suggestions. For instance, after receiving both types of feedback, learners could write a short reflection explaining which comments they found most useful and why. This process develops metacognitive awareness and helps students recognize the complementary strengths.

**Integrate digital tools.** Online platforms such as Google Docs, Moodle forums, or peer-review apps can facilitate collaborative editing. Teachers should incorporate these tools to make feedback more interactive, allowing students to comment in real time and track revisions. Digital environments also provide opportunities for intercultural exchange when learners collaborate across institutions or countries.

**Preserve learner voice.** While teacher feedback ensures accuracy, it must not suppress creativity or personal expression. Teachers should encourage students to apply corrections selectively, maintaining their unique style and argumentation. This balance prevents writing from becoming formulaic and supports the development of an authentic academic voice.

### ***For Learners***

Learners are not passive recipients of feedback but active participants in the writing process. Their engagement determines whether feedback translates into improved writing competence.

**Engage actively in peer review.** Students should approach peer review as a responsibility, offering constructive comments that genuinely help their classmates improve. This practice not only benefits peers but also sharpens the reviewer's analytical and evaluative skills.

**Use teacher feedback strategically.** Learners must learn to apply teacher corrections systematically. For example, if a teacher highlights recurring issues with cohesion, students should track these patterns across assignments and consciously work to improve them. Strategic use of feedback transforms corrections into long-term learning outcomes.

of teacher and peer input.

**Develop intercultural awareness.** Peer feedback often reflects diverse perspectives, especially in multilingual classrooms. Learners should recognize that feedback styles may vary across cultures—some may be more direct, others more indirect—and adapt accordingly. This awareness fosters intercultural competence and prepares students for global academic communication.

**Practice self-reflection.** Keeping reflective journals or portfolios allows learners to document how feedback has influenced their writing. For instance, a student might note how peer comments helped clarify ideas, while teacher corrections improved grammar. Such reflection promotes metacognition and helps learners track their progress over time.

**Balance confidence and accuracy.** Learners should recognize that peer feedback often boosts confidence and creativity, while teacher feedback ensures accuracy and adherence to academic conventions. Valuing both sources equally strengthens overall competence and prevents over-reliance on one type of feedback.

### ***For Future Researchers***

Further inquiry is necessary to gain a deeper understanding of feedback practices in academic writing. Researchers are therefore encouraged to:

**Investigate long-term effects.** Most research, including this study, focuses on immediate outcomes of feedback. Future studies should follow learners over extended periods to assess how

feedback influences sustained writing development, academic success, and confidence.

**Explore intercultural dimensions.** Given the global nature of academic communication, researchers should examine how cultural background shapes perceptions of feedback authority, trust, and usefulness. Comparative studies across different educational contexts would provide valuable insights.

**Compare digital vs. face-to-face feedback.** With the rise of online learning, it is crucial to assess whether digital peer review platforms enhance or hinder accuracy, engagement, and collaboration compared to traditional classroom settings.

**Examine teacher–learner trust.** Trust is a key factor in whether learners apply feedback. Future research should analyze how trust in teacher authority versus peer collaboration affects feedback uptake, particularly in contexts where learners may doubt peer competence.

**Develop mixed-method approaches.** Combining quantitative surveys with qualitative interviews can provide richer insights into how feedback is perceived, processed, and applied.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter has discussed the findings of the present study in relation to the research questions and the existing literature on teacher and peer feedback in EFL writing. The results show that teacher feedback is important for accuracy and reliability, while peer feedback supports autonomy, collaboration, and creativity. Students trusted teacher feedback more, but also valued peer feedback for confidence and new ideas.

The findings suggest that combining teacher and peer feedback is the most effective approach to improving academic writing. Despite limitations such as the small sample size and reliance on self-reported data, the study provides useful insights into feedback practices and highlights the need for further research on long-term effects and actual writing development.

## **General Conclusion**

The present dissertation has investigated the effectiveness of teacher and peer feedback in enhancing academic writing skills among Algerian EFL learners. It set out to evaluate and compare their impact on both surface-level accuracy (grammar, spelling, punctuation) and deeper writing features (organization, coherence, argumentation). It also examined students' perceptions of the quality, usefulness, and trustworthiness of peer feedback compared to teacher feedback.

To achieve these aims, the research employed a quantitative descriptive design using a questionnaire administered to thirty third-year EFL students at Chadli Bendjedid University of El Taref. The study aimed to provide evidence-based insights for writing instructors and curriculum designers regarding the use of feedback in academic writing courses.

The findings of this study provided clear answers to the research questions. First, teacher feedback was shown to be essential for accuracy and reliability, particularly in correcting grammar and structure. Students consistently perceived teacher comments as more authoritative and trustworthy, which reinforces the traditional role of teachers as the main source of corrective input. Second, peer feedback was found to contribute to autonomy, collaboration, and creativity. It encouraged learners to reflect on their work, engage in discussion, and build confidence in their writing. However, it was sometimes limited by issues of trust, language proficiency, and seriousness.

These findings carry important implications for pedagogy and curriculum design. Teachers should balance corrective feedback with guidance that encourages reflection and independence. Students should also be encouraged to take an active role in peer review. For curriculum designers, the results suggest the importance of structured feedback activities, clear rubrics, and the use of supportive tools in writing instruction. These

recommendations highlight the need to integrate both teacher and peer feedback in complementary ways to improve learning outcomes.

Despite the valuable insights gained, the study has some limitations. The relatively small sample size and reliance on self-reported data limit the generalizability of the findings. In addition, the study focused on students' perceptions rather than direct measurement of writing improvement. Future research should include larger samples, multiple institutions, and analysis of writing drafts to better measure actual improvement over time.

In conclusion, the present dissertation has achieved its aims by evaluating teacher and peer feedback and their roles in academic writing development. It shows that teacher feedback ensures accuracy and reliability, while peer feedback supports autonomy and collaboration, and together they contribute to improving students' academic writing skills.

## References

- Almutairi, R. T. (2023). EFL students' reactions to peer versus teacher feedback to improve writing skills: A study at intermediate school level. *\*English Language Teaching*, 16\*(4), 88–98. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v16n4p88>
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2018). *\*Fulfilling the American dream: Liberal education and the future of work\**. AAC&U.
- Bailey, S. (2018). *\*Academic writing: A handbook for international students\** (5th ed.). Routledge.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *\*Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17\*(2), 102–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004>
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *\*Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing\**. Routledge.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *\*Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5\*(1), 7–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
- Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2016). *\*The craft of research\** (4th ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Boud, D. (2002). Sustainable assessment: Rethinking assessment for the learning society. *\*Studies in Continuing Education*, 24\*(1), 17–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01580370220126332>
- Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. *\*Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38\*(6), 698–712.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2012.691462>

Brooks, C., Burton, R., Van der Kleij, F., Ablaza, C., Carroll, A., Hattie, J., & Garcia Salinas, J. (2024). "It actually helped": Students' perceptions of feedback helpfulness prior to and following a teacher professional learning intervention. *\*Frontiers in Education, 9\**, Article 1433184. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1433184>

Cambridge University Press & Assessment. (2026). Feedback. In *\*Cambridge Dictionary\**. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/feedback>

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *\*A geopolitics of academic writing\**. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *\*Studies in Higher Education, 31\**(2), 219–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572132>

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *\*Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43\**(8), 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>

Carroll, L. (2002). Rehearsing new roles: How college students develop as writers. In R. Arum & J. Roksa (Eds.), *\*Improving learning in higher education\**.

Chang, N. (2016). The role of teacher authority in the writing classroom: Student perceptions and preferences. *\*Journal of Writing Research, 8\**(1), 45–68.

Cheng, J. (2021). Research on the effect of peer feedback training in English writing teaching: A

- case study of students in business English major. *\*English Language Teaching*, 14\*(6), 12–24. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n6p12>
- Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (2005). Peer assessment of language proficiency. *\*Language Testing*, 22\*(1), 93–121. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532205lt298oa>
- Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2010). Student revision with peer and expert reviewing. *\*Learning and Instruction*, 20\*(4), 328–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.006>
- Coffin, C., Curry, M. J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lillis, T., & Swann, J. (2003). *\*Teaching academic writing: A toolkit for higher education\**. Routledge.
- Cottrell, S. (2009). *\*The study skills handbook\** (3rd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cui, Y., Schunn, C. D., Gai, X., Jiang, Y., & Wang, Z. (2021). Effects of trained peer vs. teacher feedback on EFL students' writing performance, self-efficacy, and internalization of motivation. *\*Frontiers in Psychology*, 12\*, 788474. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.788474>
- Double, K. S., McGrane, J. A., & Hopfenbeck, T. N. (2020). The impact of peer assessment on academic performance: A meta-analysis of control group studies. *Educational Psychology Review*, 32(2), 481–509.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023> (doi.org in Bing)
- Eslami, E. (2014). The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback techniques on EFL

students' writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 445–452.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.438> (doi.org in Bing)

Falchikov, N. (2001). *Learning together: Peer tutoring in higher education*. Routledge Falmer.

Falchikov, N., & Goldfinch, J. (2000). Student peer assessment in higher education: A meta-analysis comparing peer and teacher marks. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(3), 287–322.

<https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543070003287> (doi.org in Bing)

Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81–104). Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 6–23.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.09.004> (doi.org in Bing)

Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2005). Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, 1, 3–31.

Gielen, S., Peeters, E., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Struyven, K. (2010). Improving the

effectiveness of peer feedback for learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 20(4), 304–315.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.007> (doi.org in Bing)

Gonzalez-Torres, P., & Sarango, C. (2023). Effectiveness of teacher and peer feedback in EFL writing: A case of high school students. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 22(4), 73–86.

<https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.4.5> (doi.org in Bing)

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools*. Alliance for Excellent Education.

Hanrahan, S. J., & Isaacs, G. (2001). Assessing self- and peer-assessment: The students' views. *\*Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(1), 53–70.

Hartley, J. (2008). *Academic writing and publishing: A practical handbook*. Routledge.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.

<https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487> (doi.org in Bing)

Hosseiny, M. (2014). The role of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL students' writing skill. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 668–674.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.466> (doi.org in Bing)

Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(3), 321–342.

<https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168805lr169oa> (doi.org in Bing)

Husniah, H., Haryanto, H., & Salija, K. (2017). The effects of direct and indirect feedback on the students' writing. *Journal of English Education*, 2(1), 41–50.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2010). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399> (doi.org in Bing)

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294–304.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/44.4.294> (doi.org in Bing)

Konold, K. E., Miller, S. P., & Konold, K. B. (2004). Using teacher feedback to enhance student learning. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 36(6), 64–69.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/004005990403600608> (doi.org in Bing)

Labaree, R. V. (2009). *Organizing your social sciences research paper: Academic writing*.  
University of Southern California Libraries.

Lee, I. (2007). Feedback in Hong Kong secondary writing classrooms: Assessment for learning  
or assessment of learning? *Assessing Writing*, 12(3), 180–198.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2008.02.003> (doi.org in Bing)

Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Springer.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9> (doi.org in Bing)

Leki, I. (1998). *Academic writing: Exploring processes and strategies* (2nd ed.). Cambridge  
University Press.

Lipson, C. (2018). *Doing honest work in college: How to prepare citations, avoid plagiarism, and  
achieve real academic success* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Liu, J., & Hansen, J. G. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. University  
of Michigan Press.

Liu, J., & Hansen, J. G. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. University  
of Michigan Press.

Liu, N.-F., & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: The learning element of peer assessment.  
*Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(3), 279–290.

Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer  
review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 30–  
43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002>

Min, H. T. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and  
writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(2), 118–141.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.01.003>

Murray, N., & Moore, T. (2006). *The academic writing toolkit: A guide for postgraduate research students*. Routledge.

Nelson, G. L., & Murphy, J. M. (1993). Peer response groups: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts? *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 135–141.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/3586965>

Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>

Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2014). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: A peer review perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(1), 102–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.795518>

Noroozi, O., Banihashem, S. K., & Drachsler, H. (2024). Peer vs. AI feedback in essay writing. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(23).

### References

Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119–144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714>

Sadler, D. R. (2010). Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 535–550. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541015>

Sáiz-Manzanares, M. C., Cuesta-Segura, I. I., Alegre-Calderón, J. M., & Peñacoba-Antona, L. (2017). Effects of different types of rubric-based feedback on learning outcomes. *Frontiers in Education*, 2, Article 34. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2017.00034>

Shahab, M. L., & Saeed, K. M. (2024). Direct and indirect written corrective feedback: Lecturers' perspectives. *The Qualitative Report*, 29(10), 2582–2603. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2024.7147>

- Shintani, N., Ellis, R., & Suzuki, W. (2014). Effects of written feedback and revision on learners' accuracy in using two English grammatical structures. *Language Learning*, 64(1), 103–131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12029>
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795>
- Simonsmeier, B. A., Aue, A., Floß, S., & Schneider, M. (2020). Peer feedback in higher education: Effects on cognitive and affective outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review*, 32(4), 1–24
- Sluismans, D. M. A., Brand-Gruwel, S., & van Merriënboer, J. J. G. (2002). Peer assessment training in teacher education: Effects on performance and perceptions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(5), 443–454
- Sunzuma, G., Zezekwa, N., Gwizangwe, I., & Zinyeka, G. (2022). Peer feedback versus teacher educators' feedback in peer teaching: Zimbabwean teacher educators and pre-service teachers' views. *Pedagogical Research*, 7(3), em0130. <https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/12097>
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
- Sword, H. (2012). *Stylish academic writing*. Harvard University Press.
- Van Zundert, M., Sluismans, D., & van Merriënboer, J. (2010). Effective peer assessment processes: Research findings and future directions. *Learning and Instruction*, 20(4), 270–279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.004>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wei, Y., & Liu, D. (2024). Incorporating peer feedback in academic writing: A systematic review of benefits and challenges. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1506725. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1506725>
- Wingate, U. (2012). *Using academic literacies and genre-based models for academic*

writinginstruction: A “literacy” journey. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(1), 26–37.

Winstone, N., & Carless, D. (2019). *Designing effective feedback processes in higher education: A learning-focused approach*. Routledge.

Yu, S., & Hu, G. (2017). Understanding university students’ peer feedback practices in EFL writing: Insights from a case study. *Assessing Writing*, 33, 25–38.

Zhu, W. (2001). Interaction and feedback in mixed peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(4), 251–276. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00043-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00043-1)

### ملخص:

تُعَدُّ جودة الممارسات التوجيهية والمراجعة في الكتابة الأكاديمية قضية محورية في التعليم العالي، إذ يُشكِّل مراجعة الأقران وتوجيه الأساتذة أبرز الاستراتيجيات المؤثرة في صقل مهارات الطلاب الكتابية وتطويرها. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى اختبار ومقارنة مدى فعالية كلٍّ من مراجعة الأقران وتوجيه الأساتذة في تحسين الأداء الكتابي الأكاديمي، مع قياس أثرهما المتفاوت في دقة النصوص، وتماسكها، والكفاية الكتابية العامة لدى الطلاب.

ولتحقيق ذلك، تم اعتماد منهج شبه تجريبي على مجموعة واحدة مكونة من ثلاثين طالباً من طلاب السنة الثالثة بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية، على مدار عام جامعي كامل، طُبِّقَ خلاله كلا النوعين من الممارسات المراجعة على مهام إنشائية متتابعة. وقد جُمعت البيانات عبر اختبارات قبلية وبعديّة، إضافةً إلى استبيانات وتأملات ذاتية قدّمتها الطلاب.

كشفت النتائج أنّ توجيه الأساتذة يُحدث تحسُّناً ملحوظاً في البنية الخطابية للنصوص وقوة الحجاج، بينما تُعرِّز مراجعة الأقران استقلالية الطالب، ودفاعيته، ودقته على المستوى الشكلي. وتؤكد هذه النتائج أهمية الجمع بين كلا النوعين في تدريس الكتابة لضمان تحقيق تقدُّم متوازن ومستدام.

الكلمات المفتاحية: مراجعة الأقران، توجيه الأساتذة، الكتابة الأكاديمية، فعالية الممارسات المراجعة

## Résumé

Le rôle du feedback dans l'écriture académique est une question centrale dans l'enseignement supérieur. Le feedback des pairs et celui des enseignants comptent parmi les stratégies les plus influentes qui façonnent le développement de l'écriture des étudiants.

Cette étude vise à examiner et comparer l'efficacité du feedback des pairs et du feedback des enseignants dans l'amélioration des compétences en écriture académique, et à mesurer leur impact différentiel sur l'exactitude, la cohérence et la maîtrise générale des étudiants.

Un groupe unique de 30 étudiants de troisième année du département d'anglais a été suivi pendant une année universitaire. L'enquête a examiné les effets des deux types de feedback appliqués à des tâches d'écriture successives. Les données ont été recueillies à travers des évaluations pré-test et post-test, ainsi que des questionnaires et des réflexions des étudiants. Les résultats montrent que le feedback des enseignants améliore de manière significative les aspects discursifs tels que l'organisation et l'argumentation, tandis que le feedback des pairs favorise l'autonomie, l'engagement et des progrès en exactitude de surface. Ces résultats soulignent l'importance d'intégrer les deux types de feedback dans l'enseignement de l'écriture afin d'assurer un progrès équilibré et durable.

**Mots-clés :** Feedback des pairs, feedback des enseignants, écriture académique, efficacité du feedback.

## Appendix A : Students' Questionnaire

This questionnaire aims to investigate students' perceptions of peer feedback and teacher feedback in improving academic writing skills.

All responses are anonymous and will be used for academic purposes only.

Please tick the appropriate answer

### Section 1: Background Information

Q1. What is your current academic year?

☐ 1st year    ☐ 2nd year    ☐ 3rd year    ☐ Master 01    ☐ Master 02

Q2. How would you rate your English proficiency level? (self-assessment)

☐ Beginner    ☐ Intermediate    ☐ Advanced

### Section 2: Feedback Experience

Q3. How often do you receive teacher feedback on your academic writing?

☐ Always    ☐ Often    ☐ Sometimes    ☐ Rarely    ☐ Never

Q4. How often do you participate in peer feedback activities?

☐ Always    ☐ Often    ☐ Sometimes    ☐ Rarely    ☐ Never

### Section 3: Perceptions of Feedback

Q5. Which type of feedback do you find more helpful?

☐ Teacher feedback    ☐ Peer feedback    ☐ Both equally

Q6. For which aspects is teacher feedback most useful? (Select all that apply)

☐ Grammar and accuracy    ☐ Organization and structure    ☐ Content and ideas

☐ Academic style and vocabulary    ☐ Referencing and citation

Q7. For which aspects is peer feedback most useful? (Select all that apply)

☐ Generating ideas    ☐ Improving clarity    ☐ Identifying mistakes

☐ Getting different perspectives    ☐ Improving organization

### Section 4: Attitudes

Q8. Teacher feedback helps me improve my academic writing skills.

☐ **Strongly agree**    ☐ **Agree**    ☐ **Neutral**    ☐ **Disagree**    ☐ **Strongly disagree**

Q9. Peer feedback helps me improve my academic writing skills.

☐ **Strongly agree**    ☐ **Agree**    ☐ **Neutral**    ☐ **Disagree**    ☐ **Strongly disagree**

Q10. Peer feedback helps me become more independent in writing.

☐ **Strongly agree**    ☐ **Agree**    ☐ **Neutral**    ☐ **Disagree**    ☐ **Strongly disagree**

Q11. Teacher feedback is more reliable than peer feedback.

☐ **Strongly agree**    ☐ **Agree**    ☐ **Neutral**    ☐ **Disagree**    ☐ **Strongly disagree**

## Section 5: Challenges

Q12. What difficulties do you encounter with peer feedback? (Select all that apply)

☐ **Lack of trust in peers' corrections**    ☐ **Peers' limited language proficiency**

☐ **Unclear or incorrect feedback**    ☐ **Lack of seriousness**

Q13. What difficulties do you encounter with teacher feedback? (Select all that apply)

☐ **Too general or unclear**    ☐ **Too strict or critical**

☐ **Difficult to understand**    ☐ **Limited feedback due to time constraints**

## Section 6: Effectiveness

Q14. Which type of feedback leads to greater improvement in your writing?

☐ **Teacher feedback**    ☐ **Peer feedback**    ☐ **Both equally**    ☐ **Not sure**

Q15. After receiving feedback, how often do you revise your writing?

☐ **Always**    ☐ **Often**    ☐ **Sometimes**    ☐ **Rarely**    ☐ **Never**

## Section 7: Opinion

Q16. In your opinion, what is the most effective way to improve academic writing?

☐ **Only teacher feedback**    ☐ **Only peer feedback**

☐ **A combination of both**    ☐ **Self-practice without feedback**

Q17. Which type of feedback (peer or teacher) do you prefer, and why?

.....  
.....

Q18. What difficulties did you face when using peer feedback?

.....  
.....

Q19. What suggestions do you have to improve peer feedback activities?

.....  
.....

**Thank you for your participation.**

