The role and perception of peer and teacher feedback in multiple-draft feedback provision on foreign language learners' writing

Blanka Pojslová

Masaryk University, Language Centre

Abstract: This paper presents the findings of an experimental study which examines how effective peer feedback is as a substitute for teacher feedback in computer-mediated multiple-draft feedback provision on undergraduate EFL learners' writing. Sixty-five university students were assigned to two comparison groups to receive different feedback treatments. The first group (N = 33) was given multiple-draft feedback on three subsequent drafts of the same text only by the teacher, while the second group (N = 32) was given feedback by three peers on the first draft, and by the teacher on the second and third drafts. The study adopted a quasi-experimental pre-test/post-test design, with two comparison groups which differed in the source of feedback they received on their writing. The data analysis was conducted by employing the Wilcoxon rank test to evaluate changes in writing quality scores after the treatments. Moreover, the paper discusses how learners in the comparison groups perceived teacher-only and combined peer-teacher feedback, specifically focusing on giving and receiving peer feedback. The findings of the study indicate that both peer-teacher and teacher-only feedback contributed to significant improvement in writing quality in both comparison groups regarding all three perspectives from which the writing quality was assessed – overall quality, genre, and register. The findings confirm learners' strong preference for teacher feedback, but also show that peer feedback helps develop learners' writing ability and performance, and aids learners with their own learning process.

Keywords: computer-mediated feedback, peer feedback, teacher feedback, writing quality, feedback perceptions, English as a Foreign Language

Assessment is an essential part of teaching, curriculum development, and student learning, and can be seen from two different perspectives – as assessment *of* learning, and as assessment *for* learning. While the former focuses on how well the skills, subskills, and content have been learned, the latter aims to determine the learner's incremental improvements (Newton et al., 2018, p. 66). It is the assessment *for* learning which provides learners

with opportunities not only to reflect on their learning but also to receive feedback on their learning.

Feedback is one of the most critical factors contributing to learning, and underpins the other factors influencing learning (Hattie, 2009, p. 253). Hattie and Timperley (2007, p. 81) conceptualise feedback as "information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding." However, feedback is more than information about what is wrong or what can be improved. Feedback is an interactive process between a feedback giver and a feedback receiver in which learners, as active agents, seek and use information from different sources and decide which feedback to use and how to use it (Boud, 2015, p. 4).

The current study was conducted to help foreign language teachers decide how and when to implement computer-mediated peer feedback in their classes. It aims to determine whether making peer feedback a part of multiple-draft feedback provision while adhering to best practice principles of feedback provision can contribute to improvements in the quality of learners' writing after they were instructed on conventions of academic writing and genre requirements. The study also shows how students perceived the computer-mediated feedback they received, focusing on the perceived amount of feedback and attention they paid to different categories of feedback. Finally, perceptions related to giving and receiving peer feedback were investigated.

Specifically, this study seeks to expand on existing research into computer-mediated written feedback and answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How do two feedback treatments with different sources of feedback (teacher-only and peer-teacher) compare regarding changes in writing quality?

RQ2: How do students' perceptions of teacher-only and peer-teacher feedback treatments compare?

RQ3: How do students perceive giving and receiving peer feedback?

The following text presents a theoretical background to the study, a brief review of related research, and a description of the methodology, including research design, instruments, treatment, and data analysis. This is followed

by a report of the findings and a discussion. The article ends with some suggestions for future pedagogical practice.

1   Theoretical background

Teachers, the most common feedback givers, should see feedback as a loop. This loop involves not only giving feedback but also detecting that the feedback was understood and, most notably, that feedback led to a change in learning (Boud, 2015). Therefore, teachers need to ensure that feedback has been effective, and that the information provided has been apprehended and transformed into learning by feedback recipients. To achieve this effectiveness, feedback as information about the gap between the current and desired level of understanding needs to be specifically related to the task to fill this gap (Sadler, 1989). Moreover, feedback must be situated in a learning context to which the feedback is related, and it must happen after the learner's response to the teacher's instruction. Feedback is also most effective for learners if it is based on their faulty interpretations rather than on a complete lack of understanding (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

There has been extensive research into best practices of feedback giving for effective language learning and development of learners' writing skills. Specifically, feedback on writing should be balanced and timely. Besides corrective feedback on linguistic errors, feedback should include comments on the structure, organisation, content, and style of the learner's writing (Zamel, 1985; Ferris, 2003; Hyland, 2007). Furthermore, feedback should be provided multiple times on the same text and related to the teacher's instruction (Ferris, 1997; Hyland & Hyland, 2006). As for the forms of feedback, Ferris (2010) suggested combining direct and indirect feedback methods, as they may deliver different but complementary results. Indirect feedback methods might be preferred to direct feedback methods in the case of advanced writers, since indirect feedback leads to problem-solving and reflection on existing knowledge, which is more likely to contribute to long-term acquisition and promotes responsibility for learners' own writing (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Ferris et al., 2013). Low-proficiency learners will appreciate direct feedback, as their linguistic resources are relatively limited. Finally, feedback should be specific and selective rather than covering all instances of problematic language to prevent feedback from being frustrating for writers and exhausting for feedback givers (Mantello, 1997; Ferris, 2002).

Feedback on learners' writing might be conveyed in oral or written mode. The oral mode takes the form of teacher-student in-person conferences in which the teacher and student interactively negotiate the meaning of a text through dialogue (McCarthy, 1991). Written feedback can be defined as comments written on students' texts to provide a reader response to students' efforts while helping them improve and learn as writers (Hyland, 2007). Written feedback provides fewer opportunities for clarification and is less immediate than oral feedback; however, students can return to it and take time to consider it.

With the development of information technologies, these feedback modes are increasingly mediated by computers, mainly at the tertiary education level (Elola & Oskoz, 2017). In classes where a process-genre approach to writing is adopted, computer-mediated feedback refers to human feedback given by exchanging texts and comments through computer networks, either synchronously, in real-time, or asynchronously (Ware & Warschauer, 2006). Advocates for feedback as a critical element of the process-genre approach to teaching writing recommend that students receive feedback from a range of sources given on multiple drafts (Badger & White, 2000). Thus, teacher feedback, the traditionally dominant form of feedback (Paulus, 1999; Montgomery & Baker, 2007), should be complemented by other sources of feedback, one of which can be peer feedback.

Liu and Hansen (2005) define peer feedback as "the use of learners as sources of information and interactants for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained teacher, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing" (p. 1). To reflect the learner's dual role as a writer and reviewer in this process, Wakabayashi (2013, p. 181) considers this dual role and redefines peer feedback as "a collaborative learning task by which learners acquire revision procedures while taking on the dual role of writer and reviewer."

Benefits of peer feedback for its recipients include positive effects of peer feedback on writing quality (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992; Villamil & Guerrero, 1998; Berg, 1999), an enhanced sense of audience (Mangelsdorf, 1992; Carson & Nelson, 1994; Ho & Savignon, 2007) and ownership of the text (Tsui & Ng, 2000). When describing the benefits of peer feedback, Mendonça and Johnson (1994, p. 746) emphasise the possibility for students

to "reconceptualise their ideas in light of their peers", and Mittan (1989) stresses the importance of receiving reactions and responses from authentic readers and a clearer understanding of reader expectations. Furthermore, peer feedback is often easier to understand and more adequate to the developmental level of the learners (Chaudron, 1984; Allison & Ng, 1992). Most importantly, it develops critical evaluation and self-revision skills, and it supports learner autonomy (Villamil & DeGuerrero, 1998; Tsui & Ng, 2000; Rollinson, 2005).

The benefits of peer feedback for its givers were examined by Tsui and Ng (2000), who found that learners learned more about writing by reviewing peer texts than by receiving peer comments. Lundstorm and Baker (2009) showed that the group in which students only gave peer feedback but received none significantly outperformed the group which only received peer feedback.

However, peer feedback has its limitations, as peers tend to give comments on a surface level and neglect global issues (Leki, 1990). Furthermore, peer comments can be vague, unhelpful, and even counterproductive as students may have inappropriate expectations about the content and structure of peers' text (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005, p. 227).

Despite the benefits of peer feedback, teachers, especially in the EFL context, might remain sceptical about implementing peer feedback in their classes because they find it time-consuming, unreliable, and hard to monitor (Meletiadou & Tsagari, 2022). This is particularly relevant for peer feedback given asynchronously in a computer-mediated mode where teachers have little control over peer interactions.

2 Literature review

There is an extensive body of research exploring written feedback from numerous perspectives; for the purpose of this study, which investigates the role of computer-mediated peer and teacher feedback in improving the quality of EFL learners' writing, the following literature review focuses only on the studies which measure the impact of computer-mediated feedback given by teacher and/or peers on learners' writing production, and on how learners perceive feedback they received. To identify the relevant studies, ScienceDirect, Sage Journal, ERIC, Scopus, and Elsevier databases were

searched for the following key words: peer feedback, writing quality, and feedback perceptions while covering the period of 1995-2020.

2.1 Impact of computer-mediated feedback on writing quality

With ICT developments, computer-mediated feedback has become more visible in writing classes, mainly in tertiary education (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Elola & Oskoz, 2017). However, studies examining the effect of computer-mediated written feedback on the writing quality of EFL writers are relatively scarce. AbuSeileek and Abualsha'r (2014) compared one control and three experimental groups that received different computer-mediated feedback treatments on their writing using track changes, recast feedback, and metalinguistic feedback. All three experimental groups outperformed the control group that did not receive any feedback, and the group that received feedback in the form of track changes significantly outperformed the other two experimental groups on writing quality.

Pham et al. (2020) explored the effect of peer feedback on global and local aspects of EFL academic writing production. They found that post-test writing production improved significantly from global (organisation, idea development, flow) and local (accuracy, punctuation, syntax, lexical choice) perspectives. Motallebzadeh et al. (2011) compared the effect of traditional pen-and-pencil teacher feedback (control group) with computer-mediated teacher and peer feedback (experimental groups) on writing quality. The results showed that both experimental groups outperformed the control group, and the peer feedback group outperformed the experimental group, which received computer-meditated feedback from the teacher.

Al-Olimat and AbuSeillek (2015) compared three computer-mediated feedback treatments: teacher-only, peer-only, and combined peer-teacher feedback. The findings revealed that all three experimental groups, which received one of the computer-mediated feedback treatments, significantly outperformed the control group, which neither received nor provided feedback. The group that received combined peer-teacher feedback significantly outperformed the other experimental groups in writing quality.

2.2 Students' perceptions of feedback

Learners' perceptions of feedback should be taken into consideration, as learners' beliefs and attitudes are "a significant contributory factor in the

language learning process and success" (Breen, 2001). Studies on students' perceptions of traditional pen-and-paper written feedback suggest that students appreciate teacher feedback and prefer it to other feedback forms, such as peer and self-evaluation (Saito, 1994; Zhang, 1995). Students overwhelmingly (94%) prefer teacher feedback to non-teacher feedback, but the majority (61%) preferred peer feedback over self-feedback (Zhang, 1995). Nevertheless, students recognise the importance of peer feedback. Yang et al. (2006) claim that reading peers' writing and giving peer feedback was perceived as useful by 70% of the peer feedback class students because they can learn from each other's strong points, which compensate for their own weaknesses. Moreover, mutual communication contributes to understanding and finding better solutions to writing problems. Research on perceptions of computer-mediated feedback suggests that students perceive computer-mediated feedback as useful and relevant (Liu & Sadler, 2003; Lu & Bol, 2007; Elola & Oskoz, 2016; Ene & Upton, 2018) but usually prefer face-to-face feedback on their writing to computer-mediated feedback, even though the latter leads to deeper revisions (Schultz, 2000; Liu & Sadler, 2003; Tuzi, 2004; Guardado & Shi, 2007).

3   Method

3.1   Ethical considerations

All participants agreed to take part in this study, and a consent form was obtained from each of them. Also, there was no control group that did not receive any treatment, since not giving feedback on participants' writing might have impeded their successful completion of the course.

3.2   Context of the study and participants

The study was conducted in the last semester of the four-semester English for Specific Purposes (ESP) course at the Faculty of Economics, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic. This ESP course aims to develop students' communicative competence in Business English with a target CEFR level of C1. Each semester of the course focuses on a different aspect of foreign language communicative competence. The semester in which the study was conducted aims to familiarise the students with selected conventions of academic writing relevant to their needs, and with the genre requirements of an expository essay.

The study participants consisted of sixty-five undergraduate EFL students from four intact classes of a total of fourteen classes. The intact classes were utilised to avoid interfering with normal university schedules and activities. However, the intact classes were randomly assigned to comparison groups. Two classes each were randomly selected as Group 1 (N = 33) to receive teacher-only feedback and Group 2 (N = 32) to receive combined peer-teacher feedback. The participants, aged 21–24, were homogenous regarding their language proficiency, as they had to undergo three prerequisite courses that were completed by standardised end-of-course pro-achievement tests. The detailed description of participants' profiles can be found in Appendix A.

3.3 Research Design

The current study mostly adopted a quantitative research design, with some qualitative features in the form of open-ended questions in the student survey on feedback perceptions. The quantitative research took the form of a Comparison Group Pretest Postest design (Mackey & Gass, 2005, pp. 146–147) with two comparison groups each receiving a different treatment, which was complemented by a survey on feedback perceptions. The research adopted a quasi-experimental design, since it was not feasible to randomly assign students to comparison groups due to institutional constraints. The classes, which constituted the two comparison groups, were taught by the same teacher, who was also the researcher and feedback giver. The student survey on feedback perceptions was designed as Likert-scale questionnaires with open-ended items that prompted students to elaborate on some Likert-scale items.

The study was conducted over 13 weeks. In the first six weeks, the participants were introduced to selected conventions of academic writing and genre requirements of an expository essay, specifically a problem-solution essay (PSE). Having been given this input, they were assigned to write the first draft of the problem-solution essay, on which they received three-draft computer-mediated feedback. The first drafts were collected in two pre-test learner corpora.

The feedback treatment that each comparison group received differed in the source of feedback. Comparison Group 1 received computer-mediated teacher-only feedback on all three drafts of the problem-solution essay. In contrast, Group 2 received computer-mediated peer feedback on the

first draft, and teacher feedback on the second and third drafts. After the treatments, participants in both comparison groups were assigned to write post-test essays that were collected in two post-test learner corpora. Finally, the questionnaires were administered to examine how students in both comparison groups perceived the feedback treatment they were given.

3.4   Data collection

The pre-test and post-test essays were elicited using two different prompts, and the results of each prompt were compiled in separate corpora – thus resulting in two pre-test corpora and two post-test corpora. The prompts, piloted on a similar population before, offered two topics, and participants could choose either one, depending on their preferences and content knowledge. This decision was based on the findings of Laufer & Nation (1995) that when students are able to choose their topic, it increases their interest in the writing task. The prompts did not explicitly state genre, stylistic, or formal requirements, as the participants had already been familiarised with these in the contact classes. The prompts used for eliciting the learner corpora can be found in Appendix B.

Two raters independently rated the essays in pre-test and post-test corpora. Both raters hold an MA degree in English language and literature and have had ten years of experience teaching and assessing students in English for Specific Purposes courses at the tertiary level. The raters gave scores to anonymised students' essays using three different rating scales to measure three different aspects of writing quality. Their two scores on each essay were averaged to compose a final score for each rating scale. If the raters disagreed by more than one point in any of the assessment criteria of a given essay, that essay was rated by a third rater to grade its disputed criterion. The scores given by the third rater were then averaged with whichever of the two scores was closest to it (Paulus, 1999).

The questionnaires were administered electronically at the end of the semester, a week after the submission of the post-test essays. Although they were administered in English, participants could respond in their L1 (Czech or Slovak) in the open-ended items.

3.5 Instruments

Rating scales

Both pre-test and post-test essays were scored using three different assessment scales, which evaluated the writing quality from different perspectives: overall writing quality, genre, and register. The overall writing quality was assessed using the *Certificate in Advanced English* (CAE) assessment scale for Overall writing quality, which consists of four subscales: content, communicative achievement, organisation, and language. The responses were marked on each subscale from 0 to 5 (Appendix C). To evaluate writing quality from the perspective of genre and register, assessment scales were developed by the researcher following Bachman and Palmer (2010, pp. 229–254) and responses were marked on each subscale by the raters from 0 to 4. The scale evaluating writing quality from the register perspective consists of nine criteria that relate to selected conventions of academic writing as they reflect lexico-grammatical features of academic discourse (Appendix D). Similarly, the scale evaluating writing quality from the genre perspective consists of six criteria that relate to the genre requirements of a problem-solution essay (Appendix E).

Questionnaires

To examine students' perceptions of feedback they received on their essays, students completed questionnaires (Appendix F and Appendix G) based on Ferris's (2003) questionnaire *Student survey on teacher feedback*. Ferris's survey was adopted for the needs of the current study by using three original items (3, 4, 9), which were rephrased and renumbered to follow the research design. Two items on giving peer feedback in the questionnaire for Group 2 were added together with open-ended items and the item on feedback usefulness. Both questionnaires had been piloted by administering them to a similar population a year earlier, and administered electronically with a setting that ensured that all respondents had to fill out all items including the open-ended ones.

On this questionnaire, students in both comparison groups shared how much feedback in the category of *Genre*, *Organisation*, *Grammar*, *Vocabulary*, *Academic writing*, and *Mechanics* they think they received on the first and second drafts, and how much attention they think they paid to feedback in the same categories on the first and second draft. Students were further asked

to share how they perceived the usefulness and effectiveness of feedback they received regarding improvement in their writing skills. Students in Group 2 who received combined peer-teacher feedback were asked whether reading their peers' texts and giving peer feedback improved their writing skills. Students ranked their answers on a Likert scale with the choices "A lot", "Mostly/Some", "A little", and "Not at all/None".

3.6   Treatment

The treatment under investigation consisted of two computer-mediated feedback strategies in the form of multiple-draft feedback provision on the same text with a different source of feedback. Group 1 received teacher-only feedback on all three drafts, while Group 2 received peer feedback on the first draft and teacher feedback on the second and third drafts. Before giving peer feedback, students in Group 2 were given a 45-minute training session to familiarise themselves with the rationale and techniques of giving computer-mediated peer feedback. Such training has been shown to significantly improve students' peer reviewing skills (Berg, 1999; Min, 2005). Students were trained to give peer feedback in a similar manner to the teacher's way of giving feedback.

The logistics of the computer-mediated peer feedback were handled by an online application called *Peer Review*, which randomly and anonymously assigned each essay to three peers. The number of peer feedback givers was set to three to compensate for a lower number of peer comments as compared to the number of teacher's comments (Hublová, 2016, p. 141).

Because of the high language proficiency of the participants, indirect forms of feedback were preferred to direct forms. To make the indirect feedback as specific as possible while meeting the student's needs, the indirect feedback combined colour-coded feedback with MS Word comments. The coded feedback covered five broad categories: *Organisation*, *Academic writing*, *Vocabulary*, *Grammar*, and *Mechanics* and a feedback giver used different colour codes to highlight problematic language in the text in relation to these categories. The coded feedback was complemented by MS Word comments mostly on genre-relevant problems and links to external sources that offered more detailed explanations or metalinguistic information.

The feedback giver also completed a feedback checklist with a 4-point scale to specify the extent to which the writer met the expectations regarding the genre requirements, conventions of academic writing, and organisation.

3.7   Data Analysis

The data were analysed to examine how writing quality changed between the pre-test and post-test in the comparison groups. Since the sample size was small (N = 33, resp. N = 32), Shapiro-Wilk tests were performed. The tests did not show evidence of normal distribution (p-values < 0.05) for variables in Group 2, but in Group 1, they showed evidence of normality for some variables (p-value>0.05). Based on this outcome, and after visual examination of the histograms, nonparametric Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were used to make comparisons possible. To measure the magnitude of the experimental effect, the effect size was calculated as *Pearson r* and interpreted as small for r of 0.1-0.29, as medium for r of 0.3-0.49, and as large for r greater than 0.5 (Cohen, 1988, p. 25).

In order to carry out a statistical comparison between questionnaires administered in the comparison groups, numerical values were assigned to the four quantity options given on each question: "A lot" was coded as 4, "Mostly/Some" as 3, "A little" as 2 and "Not at all/None" as 1. After the numerical values were assigned, the students' responses were averaged for each response item and each feedback category. Open-ended responses were coded using thematic analysis (Suter, 2012).

4   Findings

RQ1: How do two feedback treatments with different sources of feedback (teacher-only and peer-teacher) compare regarding writing quality?

The data in Table 1 show that the means of students' scores for all three aspects of writing quality increased between the pre-test and post-test in both comparison groups. The coefficient of variation for all three aspects of writing quality decreased in both comparison groups, which means that both feedback treatments contributed to more homogeneous post-test writing production. The reductions in the variation were higher in Group 2 with peer-teacher feedback, with a decrease of 7.18 percentage points (pp) for overall quality as compared to a decrease of 5.91 pp in Group 1, a decrease of 11.52 pp for the genre as compared to a decrease of 7.02 pp in Group 1, and a decrease of 5.07 pp for register as compared to 2.19 pp in Group 1. The results suggest that combined peer-teacher feedback contributes to levelling students' writing production more than teacher-only feedback.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for three aspects of writing quality: overall quality, genre, and register

| Writing quality | Group 1 | | | | Group 2 | | | |
| | Pre-test | | Post-test | | Pre-test | | Post-test | |
	Mean/SD	V(%)	Mean/SD	V(%)	Mean/SD	V(%)	Mean/SD	V(%)
Overall quality	13.38/2.78	20.77	15.53/2.31	14.86	14.44/3.36	23.27	16.23/2.61	16.09
Genre	16.26/4.01	24.69	18.50/3.27	17.67	18.02/4.31	23.91	20.56/2.55	12.39
Register	28.65/3.52	12.30	30.55/3.09	10.11	29.27/4.50	15.39	31.47/3.25	10.32

Table 2 shows results of the Wilcoxon test that revealed a statistically significant increase in writing quality between the pre-test and post-test in both comparison groups regarding all three aspects of writing quality. In Group 1 with teacher-only feedback, the effect size was large ($r = 0.6$) for the increase in overall quality and register, and medium ($r = 0.4$) for genre. In Group 2 with peer-teacher feedback, the effect size was large ($r = 0.5$) for genre, and medium ($r = 0.4$) for overall quality and register. The results suggest that teacher-only feedback was more effective regarding improvements in the students' production from the perspective of overall quality and register. In contrast, peer-teacher feedback was more effective regarding improvements from the perspective of genre.

Table 2

Results of the Wilcoxon signed-ranked test for the changes in writing quality

| Writing quality | Group 1 | | | Group 2 | | |
	Z	p	r	Z	p	r
Overall quality	-3.360	**0.001**	**0.6**	-2.490	**0.013**	**0.4**
Genre aspect	-2.534	**0.011**	**0.4**	-2.970	**0.003**	**0.5**
Register aspect	-3.360	**0.001**	**0.6**	-2.485	**0.013**	**0.4**

RQ2: How do students' perceptions of teacher-only and peer-teacher feedback treatments compare?

The second research question compared and explored how the participants perceived the feedback treatments they received. First, students in the comparison groups were asked how much feedback they thought they had received on the first and second drafts in various feedback categories. Table 3 shows that the perceived amount of feedback in Group 1 decreased between the first and second draft in all feedback categories. In Group 2, with peer-teacher feedback, the perceived amount of feedback increased in the categories of Genre, Organisation, and Academic writing and decreased in the categories of Grammar, Vocabulary, and Mechanics between the first and second draft.

Table 3

The perceived amount of feedback in feedback categories

	Group 1				Group 2			
Feedback category	1st draft		2nd draft		1st draft		2nd draft	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Genre PSE	2.76	0.92	2.24	0.95	1.97	0.81	2.58	1.23
Organisation	3.03	0.58	2.41	0.99	2.21	0.70	3.00	0.83
Grammar	2.68	0.73	2.32	0.81	2.64	0.74	2.48	0.83
Vocabulary	2.59	0.89	2.21	0.81	2.58	0.66	2.58	0.83
Academic writing	3.38	0.60	2.47	0.83	2.82	0.73	3.09	0.72
Mechanics	2.21	0.73	1.79	0.77	2.36	0.86	2.15	0.83

The results of the Wilcoxon test in Table 4 revealed that the reductions in the perceived amount of teacher feedback in Group 1 in all feedback categories were statistically significant, with a large effect size for the categories of *Organisation* (r = 0.5) and *Academic writing* (r = 0.7), and with a medium effect size for the categories of *Genre*, *Grammar*, *Vocabulary*, and *Mechanics* (r = 0.4). In Group 2, the results revealed that the increase in the perceived amount of feedback was statistically significant in the categories of Genre and *Organisation*, with a large effect size of r = 0.5 for *Genre* and r = 0.7 for *Organisation*. These results suggest that students in Group 1 perceived that they had received significantly more teacher feedback on the first draft than on the second draft. In contrast, students in Group 2 perceived that they had received significantly more feedback from the teacher on the second draft than from the peers on the first draft in the categories Genre and Organisation.

Table 4

The results of the Wilcoxon test for change in perceptions of feedback amount between drafts

Feedback category	Group 1			Group 2		
	Z	p	r	Z	p	r
Genre PSE	-2.643	**0.008**	**0.4**	-2.877	**0.004**	**0.5**
Organisation	-3.207	**0.001**	**0.5**	-3.912	**0.000**	**0.7**
Grammar	-2.676	**0.007**	**0.4**	-1.076	0.282	0.2
Vocabulary	-2.457	**0.014**	**0.4**	0.000	1.000	0.0
Academic writing	-4.337	**0.000**	**0.7**	-1.889	0.059	0.3
Mechanics	-2.501	**0.012**	**0.4**	-1.377	0.169	0.2

The students in the comparison groups were then asked how much attention they thought they had paid to feedback in various feedback categories on the first and second drafts. Table 5 shows that the perceived amount of attention in Group 1 decreased in all feedback categories between the first and second drafts. In contrast, in Group 2, the perceived amount of attention increased, except for in the category of *Mechanics*. These results suggest that students paid more attention to their first round of teacher feedback, which in Group 1 was the feedback on the first draft, and in Group 2 the feedback on the second draft (except for *Mechanics*).

Table 5

The perceived amount of attention paid to feedback in feedback categories

Feedback category	Group 1				Group 2			
	1st draft		2nd draft		1st draft		2nd draft	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Genre PSE	3.24	1.21	3.03	1.19	1.79	1.52	2.7	1.69
Organisation	3.38	0.70	3.09	1.14	2.58	1.20	3.3	1.16
Grammar	3.41	0.82	2.88	1.10	2.76	1.12	3.03	1.31
Vocabulary	3.35	0.77	2.79	1.12	2.88	1.05	3.03	1.40
Academic writing	3.47	0.71	3.26	0.99	3.09	0.98	3.36	1.20
Mechanics	2.88	1.27	2.24	1.39	2.73	1.32	2.15	1.77

Table 6 shows the results of the Wilcoxon test that revealed that the reductions in the amount of attention paid to feedback in Group 1 were statistically significant in the categories of *Grammar*, *Vocabulary*, and *Mechanics*, with a large effect size for *Grammar* (r = 0.5) and *Vocabulary* (r = 0.5), and a medium effect size for *Mechanics* (r = 0.4). In Group 2, the perceived amount of attention paid to feedback increased significantly in the categories of Genre and *Organisation*, with a large effect size (r = 0.5) for both categories.

Table 6

The results of the Wilcoxon test for change in the amount of attention paid to feedback

Feedback category	Group 1			Group 2		
	z	p	r	Z	p	r
Genre PSE	-0.701	0.484	0.1	-2.637	**0.008**	**0.5**
Organisation	-1.248	0.212	0.2	-2.687	**0.007**	**0.5**
Grammar	-2.887	**0.004**	**0.5**	-1.402	0.161	0.2
Vocabulary	-2.883	**0.004**	**0.5**	-0.739	0.46	0.1
Academic style	-1.064	0.287	0.2	-1.933	0.053	0.3
Mechanics	-2.371	**0.018**	**0.4**	-1.613	0.107	0.3

Finally, students were asked how useful they found the feedback they received and how effective in improving their composition writing skills the feedback was. The data in Table 7 show that 73% of the students in Group 1 thought that teacher-only feedback was useful "a lot", 21% of the students found it "mostly" useful, and 6% thought it was useful "a little". In Group 2 16% of the students thought that peer feedback on the first draft was useful "a lot", 49% of the students found it "mostly" useful, 32% thought it was useful "a little", and 6% of the students thought it was not useful at all. The mean values show that students in Group 2 with peer-teacher feedback found teacher feedback (mean = 3.61) more useful than peer feedback (mean = 2.61) and more useful than students in Group 1 (mean = 3.56) who received teacher-only feedback.

Table 7

Students' perceptions of feedback usefulness

	Group 1		Group 2			
	1st and 2nd draft		1st draft		2nd draft	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
A lot	24	73	5	16	26	84
Mostly	7	21	15	49	5	16
A little	2	6	10	32	0	0
Not at all	0	0	1	3	0	0
Mean	3.56		2.61		3.61	

Table 8 shows that 94% of the students in Group 1 with teacher-only feedback thought that feedback was effective in improving their writing skills either "a lot" (52%) or "mostly" effective (42%), while 6% of these students found teacher-only feedback effective in improving their writing skills "a little". In Group 2, 68% of the students thought that peer feedback on the first draft was either "a lot" (16%) or "mostly" (52%) effective in improving their writing skills, while 33% of these students thought that peer feedback was either "a little" effective (22%) or not effective at all (10%). However, no student thought that teacher feedback on the second draft was effective "a little" or "not all." Students in Group 2 found teacher feedback on the second draft either "a lot" (68%) or "mostly" (32%) effective in improving their writing skills. The mean values show that students in Group 2 with peer-teacher feedback found teacher feedback (mean = 3.45) more effective in improving their writing skills than peer feedback (mean = 2.58) and more effective than students in Group 1 (mean = 3.35) who received teacher-only feedback.

Table 8

Students' perceptions of feedback effectiveness

	Group 1 1st and 2nd draft		Group 2 1st draft		2nd draft	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
A lot	17	52	5	16	21	68
Mostly	14	42	16	52	10	32
A little	2	6	7	22	0	0
Not at all	0	0	3	10	0	0
Mean	3.35		2.58		3.45	

When students in Group 1 with teacher-only feedback were asked to elaborate on how useful and effective the teacher feedback was, they stated that teacher-only feedback contributed to improving their texts and writing ability (e.g., "Owing to the comments and recommendations I received I think there is a *huge improvement*[1] between the first and the last draft. They were really *useful* for me."/R17). They valued the specificity of teacher feedback and appreciated the links to external sources and metalinguistic information (e.g., "It is helpful to see the *comments being linked to the problems* in the text. Then I know what I need to change and how it should be done."/R23; "The corrections and comments were *very factual.*"/R9). However, some of the students remained sceptical about the teacher-only feedback (e.g., "Some of the advice I may remember, but most of it will *be forgotten* for sure." / R28; "I had to write it according to teacher's feedback, which is harder than writing on my own."/R22).

RQ3: How do students perceive giving and receiving peer feedback?

The third research question investigated how the students in Group 2 with peer-teacher feedback perceived receiving peer feedback as compared to receiving teacher feedback, as well as their perceptions of giving peer feedback. Table 9 shows the results of the Wilcoxon test that revealed that changes in the perceptions of peer and teacher feedback between the first and second drafts regarding feedback usefulness and effectiveness were statistically significant. Students in Group 2 found teacher feedback on the second draft statistically more useful than peer feedback on the first draft

---

[1]   Keywords in excerpts from qualitative data are italicised.

with a large effect size (r = 0.8) and statistically more effective in improving their writing skills than peer feedback with a large effect size (r = 0.7).

Table 9

The results of the Wilcoxon test for change in feedback perceptions in Group 2

	z	p	r
Perceived usefulness	-4,443	**0.000**	**0.8**
Perceived effectiveness	-4,058	**0.000**	**0.7**

In open-ended questions, students elaborated on the perceived usefulness of peer feedback on the first draft. Some wrote that peer feedback gave them other views on the topic of the essay (e.g., "Thanks to the (peer) feedback I *added* my own *views* to my essay."/R35). Some said it drew their attention to mistakes they would not have otherwise noticed (e.g., "Their feedbacks point to *mistakes* I haven't noticed before."/R52). Some said they realised the importance of the comprehensibility of the text for the reader (e.g., "Moreover, they show me that not every idea which is understandable for me must be *clear for the others*."/R52).

Nevertheless, about one-third of the students in Group 2 did not find peer feedback useful (35%) or effective (33%) in improving their writing skills. These students, in open-ended questions, wrote that they received very little or no feedback from their peers (e.g., "I don't think so… two of three peers just filled in the form where I can see almost *nothing* and added *no comments.*"/R62). Furthermore, they did not consider peer feedback as valuable or knowledgeable as teacher feedback (e.g., "I don't feel I or my colleagues are *eligible* to assess someone's else English."/R36). Some stated that peer feedback comments did not cover the aspects of genre or text organisation (e.g., "Peer's feedback is not very oriented on *composition and structure*."/R47).

When commenting on teacher feedback on the second draft, students from Group 2 expressed more trust in and preference for teacher feedback. They appreciated that teacher feedback was specific and knowledgeable (e.g., "In the teacher's feedback I feel there was *more helpful advice* for improving my writing."/R60; "I can be sure that the teacher only corrects what is *relevant* and I can then use this feedback *without worrying* about it being wrong."/R65) and provided them with comments on genre and organisation (e.g., "Teacher's feedback does not lack comments on *structure and composition*."/R55).

As for perceptions of giving feedback, students were asked whether they found reading peers' texts and giving peer feedback effective in improving their writing skills. Table 10 shows that 58% of the students from Group 2 thought that reading peers' text was "a lot" (10%) or "mostly" (48%) effective in improving their writing skills, as opposed to 23% of students who found reading peers' effective in improving their writing skills "a little" (11%) or "not at all" (2%).

Table 10

Students' perceptions of peer feedback for improvement in writing skills

	Reading peers' texts		Providing peer feedback	
	n	%	n	%
A lot	3	10	7	23
Mostly	15	48	13	44
A little	11	36	9	30
Not at all	2	6	1	3

When asked to elaborate on these questions, students wrote that reading their peers' text helped them realise their own mistakes, compare their level of writing with their peers' level of writing (e.g., "When you see the mistakes of the others you can *become aware of your own mistakes.*"/R39), find inspiration, and reflect on their own writing (e.g., "I might *inspire*, learn from *mistakes* and compare my *level of writing* with others."/R34; "I could get some inspiration from essay, which I consider good."/R51).

Regarding the effectiveness of giving peer feedback for improving peer feedback givers' writing skills, 67% of the students found giving peer feedback either "a lot" (23%) or "mostly" (44%) effective in improving their writing skills, as opposed to 33% of the students who found it either "a little" (30%) or "not at all" (3%) effective. In an open-ended question, the students wrote that by seeing peers' *mistakes* they realised their own *mistakes* which they want to avoid next time and saw the mistakes as an opportunity to learn (e.g., "I find beneficial to think about mistakes in others' PSEs so I can avoid make them in my writing."/R57; "When I find the mistakes of my classmates, it is a sign that I realise these mistakes and then I know I should avoid them."/R61).

Furthermore, they stated that giving peer feedback helped them with understanding genre requirements and their application (e.g., "Yes, as I try to look for the composition and structure and so *strengthen my own automation of applying it in my essays*."/R58; "It helps me grasp *the concept of the essay*."/R45).

In contrast, the students who did not find giving peer feedback effective in improving their own writing skills doubted their peer's expertise to give feedback or questioned the effort the peer had put into feedback provision (e.g., "It depends if the colleague has *all necessary skills* and as well *how much work* does the colleague put in the review."/R44). Some students did not find peer feedback specific enough (e.g., "*Inappropriate* color use together with *minimum of comments* made me mainly confused."/R37).

5   Discussion

The findings of this study revealed that both treatments significantly contributed to improving writing quality regarding all three aspects of writing quality. Teacher-only feedback was more effective in terms of overall quality and register, while peer-teacher feedback was more effective in terms of genre. The larger effect of teacher feedback on register might be attributed to the novelty of this aspect of writing for students where the teacher's expertise plays a crucial role in offering support and drawing students' attention to this aspect of writing. This might seem contradictory, as genre was an equally new aspect of writing for students, but here there was a larger effect of peer-teacher feedback on improving writing quality. However, in this case, it might be assumed that peer training and giving peer feedback contributed to the students internalising the genre requirements more effectively than internalising conventions of academic writing. Furthermore, the findings suggest that both treatments might have contributed to more homogenous writing performance of the students in both groups regarding all three aspects of writing quality. Peer-teacher feedback seems to level individual differences in writing performance more than teacher-only feedback in all three aspects, in genre aspects most prominently. This might be attributed to multiple-draft feedback provision which clarified the expectations by indicating where the desired level of performance is and showing how to achieve this desired level.

In Group 1, the perceived amount of feedback decreased significantly between the first and second draft in all feedback categories, while in Group 2 the perceived amount increased in all categories except for the category of *Mechanics*. The increase was statistically significant in the categories of Genre and Organisation, which were at the centre of the feedback treatment along with the category of *Academic writing*. This might be attributed to previous findings (Leki, 1990) that peers tend to give comments on a surface level (*Grammar*, *Vocabulary*, *Mechanics*), and also to the novelty of genre requirements and conventions of academic writing.

Students in both groups paid more attention to the first round of teacher feedback on their writing, which was on the first draft in Group 1 and the second draft in Group 2. In Group 1, the reductions in the perceived amount of attention between the first and second draft were significant in the categories that were not the focus of the feedback treatment (*Grammar*, *Vocabulary*, *Mechanics*). In contrast, in Group 2, the perceived amount of attention increased significantly in the categories of *Genre* and *Organisation*, which were at the heart of the feedback treatment. These results suggest that students realised the gap between their current level of understanding and the desired one and focused more on feedback related to these gaps. Group 2, with combined peer-teacher feedback, then managed to transform this focus into significantly better writing performance regarding the genre aspect of writing, while Group 1 was significantly more successful regarding the register aspect of writing.

As for the perceived usefulness and effectiveness of feedback treatments, the findings revealed that students appreciate and value teacher feedback and found it both useful and effective in improving their writing skills. Students in Group 2 with peer-teacher feedback valued teacher feedback as more useful and effective than students in Group 1, and significantly more useful and effective than peer feedback. This result might be attributed to the varying quality of peer feedback they received on the first draft. Nevertheless, students in Group 2 realised the importance and value of peer feedback, as they found reading peers' text (58%) and giving peer feedback (67%) effective in improving their writing skills. This is in line with previous research (Yang et al., 2006).

When asked about how they perceived feedback, the students mentioned that the most important benefits of peer feedback were self-reflection,

the importance of comprehensibility of the text for the reader, and seeing mistakes as an opportunity to learn. However, students also mentioned the lack of expertise, specificity, and trust as drawbacks of peer feedback. Considering this, the benefits of peer feedback are primarily associated with giving peer feedback whereas the drawbacks are associated with receiving it. This result supports previous studies that also found that giving peer feedback contributes more to improving the quality of students' writing production than receiving (Lundstorm & Baker, 2009) and that receiving feedback is where students can benefit most from peer feedback as independent writers (Tsui & Ng, 2000). When giving peer feedback, students take an active role in their learning and are forced to exercise their thinking rather than passively receiving information, which gradually leads to developing the strategies necessary for generating ideas, editing, and revising their own writing.

The findings of this study have some limitations. Firstly, the quasi-experimental design of the study together with the size of the sample might lower its internal validity and generalizability. Secondly, the study excluded a control group for ethical reasons. Thirdly, the time constraints did not allow for a more sophisticated method of data-collection for the qualitative part of the research in the form of structured or semi-structured interviews. Finally, the different levels of interpretation of the Likert scale by the respondents should be considered.

Despite these limitations, this study has value as one of the few attempts so far to explore the phenomenon of computer-mediated multiple-draft feedback in the context of higher education in the Czech Republic, where the issue is underresearched. Moreover, the focus on the change in genre and register aspects of writing quality after feedback treatments makes this research original and highly relevant for developing academic writing in the EFL context at the tertiary level.

6   Conclusion and recommendations

This paper presents the findings of an empirical study which examined whether peer feedback can be an effective substitute for teacher feedback in multiple-draft computer-mediated feedback provision on foreign language students' writing, and how students perceived the feedback they received. The main aim was to evaluate and compare how feedback treatments, which took the forms of multiple-draft feedback given by the teacher on three drafts

and multiple-draft feedback given by peers on the first draft and teacher on the second and third draft, contributed to improving the writing quality of ESP undergraduate students and how the students' perceptions of these treatments compare.

The quality of writing performance was assessed from three perspectives: overall writing, genre, and register. The perspective of genre covered the genre requirements of an expository essay, and the perspective of register covered the conventions of academic writing as they reflect in linguistic features of writing production. Both aspects were linked to class input which preceded the feedback treatments and were the primary focus of feedback.

Despite approximately 33% of the study participants being sceptical about the usefulness and effectiveness of peer feedback, and despite teachers' negative assumptions about implementing peer feedback in their classes (Meletiadou & Tsagari, 2022), this study shows that making peer feedback part of multiple-feedback provision might benefit both students and teachers. For students, such feedback might help improve the quality of their writing in certain aspects, such as genre, especially if there is sufficient training and a direct relation to class instructions. And for teachers, not being the only ones who provide feedback on all students' drafts could save them time and energy. Peer feedback could also help teachers by levelling their students' writing performance.

Furthermore, peer feedback should be perceived as complementary to teacher feedback rather than as a replacement for it. To make peer feedback complementary and beneficial, students need to be given training on practical aspects of giving feedback via a variety of activities (Liu & Hansen, 2005) using authentic students' written production with examples of both teacher and peer feedback. This training might include explaining how they might benefit from peer feedback, not only as feedback receivers but also as feedback givers. Finally, the entire process of multiple-draft feedback should be supported by careful scheduling so that the activities do not come all at once for the students.

Teachers should also consider the order in which types of feedback are given. Giving teacher feedback before peer feedback might assist peers in giving more specific feedback on the second draft, but some peers might fear that after teacher feedback their feedback will not be trusted by the peers, or that

there might be little to comment on (Yang, 2006). Combining peer written computer-mediated feedback with oral peer feedback, possibly as a part of peer feedback training, might be also considered. Nevertheless, for teachers to make informed decisions about peer feedback implementation in their classes, teacher training in this area is of the upmost importance, especially in the EFL context.

References

AbuSeileek, A., & Abualsha'r, A. (2014). Using peer computer-mediated corrective feedback to support EFL learners' writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, *18*(1), 76–95. http://dx.doi.org/10125/44355

Al-Olimat, S. I., & AbuSeileek, A. F. (2015). Using computer-mediated corrective feedback modes in developing students' writing performance. *Teaching English with Technology*, *15*(3), 3–30. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1138425.pdf

Allison, D., & Ng, P. (1992). Developing text revision abilities. In M. Lau & M.J. Murphy (Eds.), *Developing writing: Purposes and practice* (pp. 106–130). Institute of Language Education.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (2010). *Language assessment in practice: Developing language assessments and justifying their using in the real world.* Oxford University Press.

Badger, R. G., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, *54*(2), 153–160. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153

Berg, E. C. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(3), 215–241. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80115-5

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *19*, 207–217.

Boud, D. (2015). Feedback: Ensuring that it leads to enhanced learning. *Clinical teacher*, *12*(1), 3–7. https://doi.org/10.1111/tct.12345

Breen, M. P. (Ed.). (2001). *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions.* Routledge.

Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1994). Writing groups: Cross-cultural issues. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *3*(1), 17–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(94)90003-5

Chaudron, C. (1984). The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. *RELC Journal*, *15*(2), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/003368828401500201

Cohen, J. W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2016). Supporting second language writing using multimodal feedback. *Foreign Language Annals*, *49*, 58–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12183

Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2017). Writing with 21*st* century social tools in the L2 classroom: New literacies, genres, and writing practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *36*, 52–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.04.002

Ene, E., & Upton, T. A. (2018). Synchronous and asynchronous teacher electronic feedback and learner uptake in ESL composition. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *41*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.05.005

Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*, 315–339. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588049

Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing.* University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students.* Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 181–201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*, 307–329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.009

Guardado, M., & Shi, L. (2007). ESL students' experiences of online peer feedback. *Computers and Composition*, *24*(4), 443–461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2007.03.002

Hattie, J. (2009). The black box of tertiary assessment: An impending revolution. In L. H. Meyer, S. Davidson, H. Anderson, R. Fletcher, P. M. Johnston, & M. Rees (Eds.), *Tertiary assessment & higher education student outcomes: Policy, practice & research* (pp. 259–275). Ako Aotearoa.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *1*(3), 255–276. https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(92)90006-B

Ho, M. C., & Savignon, S. L. (2007). Face-to-face and computer-mediated peer review in EFL writing. *CALICO Journal*, *24*(2), 269–290. https://doi.org/10.1558/cj.v24i2.269-290

Hublová, G. (2016). *Rozvoj diskurzivní competence v cizojazyčném akademickém psaní v anglickém jazyce v důsledku účasti v e-learningovém kurzu* [Doctoral thesis]. Masarykova univerzita. https://is.muni.cz/auth/th/63926/pedf_d/DISERTACNI_PRACE.pdf

Hyland, K. (2007). *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

Laufer, B., & Nation, P. (1995). Vocabulary size and use: Lexical richness in l2 written production. *Applied Linguistics*, *16*(3), 307–322. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/16.3.307

Leki, I. (1990). Potential problems with peer responding in ESL writing classes. *CATESOL Journal 3*, 5–17. www.journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/alls/artic

Liu, J., & Hansen, J. G. (2005). *Peer response in language writing classrooms.* The University of Michigan Press.

Liu, J., & Sadler, R. W. (2003). The effect and affect of peer review in electronic versus traditional modes on L2 writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *2*(3), 193–227. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(03)00025-0

Lu, R., & Bol, L. (2007). A comparison of anonymous versus identifiable e-peer review on college student writing performance and the extent of critical feedback. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, *6*(2), 100–115.

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

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think? *ELT Journal*, *46*(3), 274–284. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.3.274

Mantello, M. (1997). Error correction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *54*, 127–131.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers.* Cambridge University Press.

Meletiadou, E., & Tsagari, D. (2022). Exploring EFL teachers' perceptions of the SSE of peer assessment in external exam-dominated writing classes. *Languages*, *7*(16), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7010016

Mendonça, C., & Johnson, K. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*, 745–769. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587558

Min, H. T. (2005). Training students to be successful peer reviewers. *System*, *33*(2), 293–308. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.11.003

Mittan, R. (1989). The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power. In D. M. Johnson, & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 207–219). Longman.

Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *16*, 82–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002

Motallebzadeh, K., & Amirabadi, S. (2011). Online interactional feedback in second language writing: Through peer or tutor? *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *1*(5), 534–540. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.5.534-540

Newton, J., Ferris, D., Goh, C. C., Grabe, W., Stoller, F. L., & Vandergrift, L. (2018). *Teaching English to second language learners in academic contexts: Reading, writing, listening, and speaking.* Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(3), 265–289. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80117-9

Pham, T. G., Lin, M., Trinh, V. Q., & Bui, L. T. P. (2020). Electronic peer feedback. EFL academic writing and reflective thinking: Evidence from a Confucian context. *SAGE Open*, *10*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020914554

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *ELT Journal*, *59*(1), 23–30. https://doi.org./10.1093/elt/cci003

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

Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal*, *11*, 46–70.

Schultz, J. (2000). Computers and collaborative writing in the foreign language curriculum. In M. Warschauer, & R. Kern (Eds.). *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice* (pp. 121–150). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524735

Suter, W. N. (2012). *Qualitative data, analysis, and design.* SAGE Publications, Inc., doi. org/10.4135/9781483384443

Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*, 147–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00022-9

Tuzi, F. (2004). The impact of e-feedback on the revisions of L2 writers in an academic writing course. *Computers and Composition*, *21*(2), 217–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2004.02.003

Villamil, O. S., & De Guerrero, M. (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics*, *19*(4), 491–514. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.4.491

Wakabayashi, R. (2013). The effects of the peer feedback process on reviewers' own writing. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(9), 177–192. http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/viewFile/29656/17594

Ware, P.D., & Warschauer, M. (2006). Electronic feedback and second language writing. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing* (pp. 105–122). Cambridge University Press.

Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *15*, 179–200.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, *21*, 697–715. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586773

Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *4*, 209–222.

Author

Ing. Mgr. Blanka Pojslová, Ph.D., Masaryk University, Language Centre, Komenského náměstí 2, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic, e-mail: Blanka.Pojslova@econ.muni.cz

Role a vnímání vícenásobné vrstevnické a učitelské zpětné vazby při rozvoji cizojazyčného psaní

Abtrakt: Příspěvek představuje výsledky experimentální studie, která zkoumala, jak se nahrazení učitelské zpětné vazby vrstevnickou zpětnou vazbou projeví v kvalitě cizojazyčné písemné produkce pregraduálních studentů angličtiny jako cizího jazyka. Ve studii byl použit kvazi-experimentální design s využitím pretestu a posttestu se dvěma porovnávanými skupinami, které se lišily zdrojem zpětné vazby k písemné produkci. Pro posouzení změny v kvalitě písemné produkce vlivem intervence v podobě dvou typů zpětné vazby byl využit Wilcoxonův test. Účastníci studie (N = 65) byli rozděleni do dvou porovnávaných skupin, které se lišily zdrojem vícenásobné, počítačem zprostředkované zpětné vazby, kterou obdrželi ke své písemné produkci.

První skupina (N = 33) obdržela ke třem průběžným verzím textu výhradně učitelskou zpětnou vazbu, zatímco každý student ve druhé skupině (N = 32) obdržel k první verzi textu zpětnou vazbu od tří vrstevníků a ke druhé a třetí verzi textu od učitele. Příspěvek se dále zabývá tím, jak účastníci studie vnímali zpětnou vazbu, kterou ke svým textům obdrželi. Výzkumná zjištění ukazují, že oba typy zpětné vazby významně přispěly ke zlepšení kvality písemné produkce účastníků studie, a to z hlediska všech tří zkoumaných aspektů kvality písemné produkce – její celkové kvality, žánru a registru. Výzkumná zjištění také potvrzují výrazné preference studentů pro učitelskou zpětnou vazbu, ale současně ukazují, že vrstevnická zpětná vazba napomáhá procesu učení a přispívá k rozvoji schopnosti psát v cizím jazyce.

Klíčová slova: počítačem zprostředkovaná zpětná vazba, vrstevnická zpětná vazba, učitelská zpětná vazba, kvalita psaní, vnímání zpětné vazby, angličtina jako cizí jazyk

Appendix A: Participants' profiles

		Group 1	*Group 2*
Gender	*Male*	17	11
	Female	16	21
Age	*Mean*	21.4	21.4
	Range	21 – 24	21 – 23
L1 background	*Czech*	21	15
	Slovak	11	17
	Other	1	0
English proficiency test (***CEFR based***)	*Mean Score*	59.3	61.8
	SD	11.3	14.3
Course test 1 results	*Mean Score*	54.7	56.3
	SD	6.5	7.4
Course test 2 results	*Mean Score*	52.7	53.8
	SD	6.4	6.8
Course test 3 results	*Mean Score*	44.5	46.8
	SD	5.9	5.6

B1: 42-63; B2: 64-86; C1: 87-95

Course test 1+2: Max.: 75pts. / Min. to pass: 45pts.

Course test 3: Max.: 65pts. / Min. to pass: 39pts.

Appendix B: Prompt for eliciting pre-test and post-test corpora

Write the first draft of a problem-solution essay of 350-450 words on ONE of the following topics that will include:
        - introducing the situation
        - stating the problem and its solutions
        - concluding by summarising and evaluating
   1. A domestic appliance company is facing decreasing sales.
   2. A country's economy is suffering from rising unemployment.

Prompt for eliciting pre-test learner corpora.

Write the first draft of a problem-solution essay of 350-450 words on ONE of the following topics that will include:
        - introducing the situation
        - stating the problem and its solutions
        - concluding by summarising and evaluating
   1. A small Czech brewery has recently been acquired by an American multinational.
   2. A corporate customer has started defaulting on payments to its supplier.

Prompt for eliciting post-test learner corpora.

Appendix C: CAE Assessment scale for overall writing quality

C1	Content	Communicative Achievement	Organisation	Language
5	All content is relevant to the task. Target reader is fully informed.	Uses the conventions of the communicative task with sufficient flexibility to communicate complex ideas in an effective way, holding the target reader's attention with ease, fulfilling all communicative purposes.	Text is a well-organised, coherent whole, using a variety of cohesive devices and organisational patterns with flexibility.	Uses a range of Vocabulary, including less common lexis, effectively and precisely. Uses a wide range of simple and complex grammatical forms with full control, flexibility, and sophistication. Errors, if present, are related to less common words and structures, or occur as slips.
4	*Performance shares features of Bands 3 and 5.*			
3	Minor irrelevances and/or omissions may be present. Target reader is on the whole informed.	Uses the conventions of the communicative task effectively to hold the target reader's attention and communicate straightforward and complex ideas, as appropriate.	Text is well organised and coherent, using a variety of cohesive devices and organisational patterns to generally good effect.	Uses a range of Vocabulary, including less common lexis, appropriately. Uses a range of simple and complex grammatical forms with control and flexibility. Occasional errors may be present but do not impede communication.
2	*Performance shares features of Bands 1 and 3.*			
1	Irrelevances and misinterpretation of task may be present. Target reader is minimally informed.	Uses the conventions of the communicative task to hold the target reader's attention and communicate straightforward ideas.	Text is generally well organised and coherent, using a variety of linking words and cohesive devices.	Uses a range of everyday Vocabulary appropriately, with occasional inappropriate use of less common lexis. Uses a range of simple and some complex grammatical forms with a good degree of control. Errors do not impede communication.
0	Content is totally irrelevant. Target reader is not informed.	*Performance below Band 1.*		

Source: https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/exams-and-tests/advanced/

Appendix D: Assessment scale for writing quality from the perspective of register

	4 Complete	3 Extensively	2 Moderate	1 Limited	0 Zero	Descriptor
The language of the essay is **formal**						The essay is **formal**. It demonstrates an appropriate choice of academic and specific Vocabulary; strong and one-word verbs are preferred. Also, informal phrasal verbs (e.g., *put off, get better, go on*), contractions (e.g., *don't, shouldn't*), run-on expressions (e.g., *etc., so on*), rhetorical questions, idiomatic and colloquial words (e.g., *stuff, a lot of, sort of*), slang, abbreviations and sub-headings, numbering, bullet-points are avoided.
The language of the essay is **objective.**						The essay is **objective** which might be achieved via using impersonal language, i.e., *there is …, it is …,* passive voice, specific nouns, or adverbials (e.g., *arguably*) and via avoiding personal pronouns (*I, we, you, they*) and words showing emotions (e.g., *luckily, remarkably, amazingly*).
The language of the essay is **explicit.**						The essay is **explicit** about the relationships in the text, i.e., the ideas are effectively connected, which is achieved via the link between the thesis statement, topic sentences and the conclusion, between paragraphs, sentences, and words. These connections are expressed via using cohesive devices appropriately and naturally.
The language of the essay is **accurate.**						The use of Vocabulary is **accurate**, e.g., *economics* is not confused with *economy*, and also grammatical structures are used accurately.

	4 Complete	3 Extensively	2 Moderate	1 Limited	0 Zero	Descriptor
The language of the essay is **concise** and **precise**.						The essay is **concise** and **precise**. The facts and figures are given precisely; the redundancies are avoided, e.g., repeating the same words and ideas, including irrelevant points and using empty, vague words (e.g., *people* instead of *employees, thing* instead of *factor, issue, topic, budget*) or expletive constructions (e.g., *due to the fact that instead of because*).
The language of the essay is **tentative**.						The language of the essay is **tentative**, i.e., categorical statements are avoided, and hedged sentences are used instead.
The language of the essay is **complex**.						The language of the essay is relatively **complex**, i.e., longer words are used, and is lexically denser with varied Vocabulary. It prefers noun-based phrases to verb-based phrases. The language is grammatically complex, i.e., more subordinate clauses, more *that/to* complement clauses, longer sequences of prepositional phrases, participles, more attributive adjectives, and more passives than spoken language.
The mechanics of the essay are **correct**.						Punctuation, spelling, and capitalisation is correct.
The use of the above conventions of academic writing is **consistent**.						The conventions of academic writing are followed **consistently**.

Appendix E: Assessment scale for writing quality from the perspective of genre

	4 Complete	3 Extensive	2 Moderate	1 Limited	0 Zero	Descriptor
The **conventions** of the problem-solution essay genre are observed.						The text considers the **problems** of a particular situation and gives **solutions** to these problems. The description of the situation is included in the essay prompt. The structure of the essay follows **the general essay structure** of an academic essay, consisting of an introduction, the main body, and a conclusion. The main body of the problem solution essay may have a block or a chain structure. For the block structure, all of the problems are listed first (2nd essay paragraph), and all of the solutions are listed afterwards (3rd/4th essay paragraph). For the chain structure, each problem (2nd/4th paragraph) is followed immediately by the solution to that problem (3rd/5th paragraph).
The **introduction** gives background information.						The **introduction** of essay introduces its topic by giving some general background information and restating the situation.
The essay has a clear **thesis statement**.						The introduction has a clear **thesis statement** which states the specific topic of the essay (problem(s)) and lists controlling ideas (solutions) that will be discussed in the main body.
Each paragraph has a clear **topic sentence**.						Each essay paragraph has a clear topic sentence that identifies the main ideas of the paragraph, and that is further developed or explained in the paragraph. The supporting sentences in the paragraph develop the **topic sentence**.

	4 Complete	3 Extensive	2 Moderate	1 Limited	0 Zero	Descriptor
The essay has strong **support**.						The essay has **strong support** in the form of facts, reasons, and examples which are relevant, specific, and well-developed. The essay contains enough material to satisfy the reader on the topic that is being addressed.
The **conclusion** summarises the main points.						The **conclusion** of the essay restates the situation, the thesis statement and problem(s) and gives a final evaluation, recommendation, suggestion or comment on the subject or the solutions while adding no new information.

Appendix F: Student survey on teacher-only feedback in Group 1

1. How useful do you find your teacher's feedback on your drafts?

    a) A lot   b) Mostly   c) A little   d) Not at all

2a. Do you feel that your teacher's comments and corrections were effective in improving your composition writing skills?

    a) A lot   b) Mostly   c) A little   d) Not at all

2b. Please, specify

3. How much of the comments and corrections on the 1st draft involve

	A lot	Some	A little	None
Genre				
Organisation of ideas				
Grammar				
Vocabulary				
Academic style				
Mechanics (punctuation, spelling)				

4. How much of the comments and corrections on the 2nd draft involve

Genre	A lot	Some	A little	None
Organisation of ideas				
Grammar				
Vocabulary				
Academic style				
Mechanics (punctuation, spelling)				

5. How much attention do you pay to the comments and corrections on the 1st draft involving

	A lot	Some	A little	None	Not applicable
Genre					
Organisation of ideas					
Grammar					
Vocabulary					
Academic style					
Mechanics (punctuation, spelling)					

6. How much attention do you pay to the comments and corrections on the 2ⁿᵈ draft involving

	A lot	Some	A little	None	Not applicable
Genre					
Organisation of ideas					
Grammar					
Vocabulary					
Academic style					
Mechanics (punctuation, spelling)					

This copy of the survey includes only those parts of the survey analysed in this study.

Appendix G: Student survey on combined peer-teacher feedback in Group 2

1a. How useful do you find your peers' feedback on your 1st draft?

    a) A lot   b) Mostly   c) A little   d) Not at all

1b. How much useful do you find your teacher's feedback on your 2nd draft?

    a) A lot   b) Mostly   c) A little   d) Not at all

1c. Please, specify

2a. Do you feel that your peers' comments and corrections were effective in improving your composition writing skills?

    a) A lot   b) Mostly   c) A little   d) Not at all

2b. Do you feel that your teacher's comments and corrections were effective in improving your composition writing skills?

    a) A lot   b) Mostly   c) A little   d) Not at all

2c. Please, specify

3. How much of the comments and corrections on the 1st draft involve

	A lot	Some	A little	None
Genre				
Organisation of ideas				
Grammar				
Vocabulary				
Academic style				
Mechanics (punctuation, spelling)				

4. How much of the comments and corrections on the 2nd draft involve

Genre	A lot	Some	A little	None
Organisation of ideas				
Grammar				
Vocabulary				
Academic style				
Mechanics (punctuation, spelling)				

5. How much attention do you pay to the comments and corrections on the 1st draft involving

	A lot	Some	A little	None	Not applicable
Genre					
Organisation of ideas					
Grammar					
Vocabulary					
Academic style					
Mechanics (punctuation, spelling)					

6. How much attention do you pay to the comments and corrections on the 2nd draft involving

	A lot	Some	A little	None	Not applicable
Genre					
Organisation of ideas					
Grammar					
Vocabulary					
Academic style					
Mechanics (punctuation, spelling)					

7a. Was reading your peers' texts effective in improving your own composition writing skills?

 a) A lot b) Mostly c) A little d) Not at all

7b. Please, specify

8a. Was providing peer feedback effective in improving your own composition writing skills?

 a) A lot b) Mostly c) A little d) Not at all

8b. Please, specify.

This copy of the survey includes only those parts of the survey analysed in this study.