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Abstract

The principal aim of this study is to compare between the perceptions of peer feedback (PF) and teacher feedback (TF) as viewed by adult Egyptian L2 writers. That aim is pursued to address a gap in the literature of that area, which is the lack of abundance of that line of research in Egypt, and particularly targeting adult L2 writers. Earlier researchers, such as Yang et al. (2006), urge other researchers around the world to conduct more research in different countries to further explore the perceptions of peer feedback in different settings. Consequently, the study is guided by four research questions enquiring about general perceptions of PF versus TF, how PF and TF prioritize feedback on writing features differently, the perceptions of PF and TF uptake, and differences between genders in their perception of PF and TF.

This study adopted mixed methods approach consisting of, a questionnaire, multiple interviews, and writing samples as the three data collection tools employed to collect quantitative and qualitative data. The total number of participants is 81 filling in the questionnaire, seven interviewed, and 16 writing samples compiled. The data analysis presents a considerable awareness of the importance of PF in comparison with TF. L2 writers understand the value, use and benefit from PF, but not at the same extent of using TF. Two thirds of the adult L2 writers participating in this study support the importance of training the peer on giving effective writing feedback. Furthermore, the data shows that the peer prioritizes almost the same writing features that the teacher does in their feedback; however, there is a large gap in the instances of highlighting those features except for the vocabulary feature, where the peer and the teacher highlight them nearly in the same way. As for perceptions of PF and TF uptake, L2 writers in Egypt believe, react, and feel motivated towards PF and TF in roughly the same way. They also have the same preference of feedback form from the peer and from the teacher in nearly the same
fashion; however, very slight differences in perceptions, especially in how they prefer to receive PF and TF form, do exist, but those differences are limited in number. Finally, the investigation of gender differences and the effect of that on the perceptions of PF and TF yields no significant differences quantitatively, but the interviewed sample indicates that male participants, in particular, see differences in accepting feedback from the peer.

These results imply that peer feedback practices ought to be maintained and encouraged in adult L2 education in Egypt. Teachers need to train learners on how to provide feedback in a structured manner in order to obtain more effective results from the practice. In addition, educators are advised to raise more awareness of the importance of practicing peer feedback, especially in large classes, to promote more interaction, and create communities of learning among learners.

*Keywords*: Feedback perceptions, Peer feedback, Perceptions of feedback uptake, Teacher feedback, Writing features, Written feedback
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Providing effective feedback contributes significantly to learning a foreign/second language (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). In a classroom setting, feedback is a tool through which the teacher guides the learners to those areas they need to improve, and as well gauges their degree of learning. Feedback also motivates learners to further improve in their learning journey (Ghani & Asgher, 2012). Noroozi et al., (2016) argued that the provision and receipt of feedback in the form of the debate and negotiation that take place between peers, for instance, lead to learning the content, and thus, constructing deeper knowledge. Feedback on students’ writing–specifically–should endorse the improvement of the writing skill in L2 learning as argued by a number of researchers in the field of English language teaching (ELT), such as Min (2006), Paulus (1999), and Zhang (2008).

Comparing writing feedback, which is provided to L2 writers in a written form that is direct on all writing features, from the peer (PF) with that from the teacher (TF) has given rise to controversy for decades. The general perception that L2 writers have about feedback is that it is optimum when it is received from the teacher (Ghani & Asgher, 2012); however, some research has also looked at PF as a new practice since the 1980s (e.g., Chaudron 1977; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Partridge, 1983). “Peer feedback is a learning strategy in which students respond to one another’s written work and provide feedback” as defined by Ghani and Asgher (2012, p. 84). Moreover, those studies that compared students’ perception of PF versus TF have gained traction and showed some interesting findings as will be discussed below.

As posited by Lindsay and Norman (1991), perceptions, in their broad meaning, are characterised by being experiences where humans deal with the data provided by their sensory
systems and organize them selectively. Many studies have investigated L2 writers’ perceptions of feedback. Of those studies, which concluded that the teacher’s writing feedback (WF) is more favored over that of the peer, is Chen and Lin’s (2009) experiment proving that preference, but the students in their sample maintained the acknowledgement of the peer’s effort in correcting their mistakes. On the other hand, rejection of PF was a significant common finding in research studies done by Falchikev (1986), and Orsmond et al. (2000). In both studies, there were wide gaps in grading the same writing samples by the tutor and the peer. That disparity in grading led participants to perceive PF negatively and prefer TF. Orsmond et al.’s (2000) experiment is particularly prominent and is worth mentioning as it is complementary to two other studies carried out by them in 1996 and 1997 where all three studies yielded the same results. In all experiments conducted by Orsmond et al., and despite having different participants in each experiment, lack of understanding the marking criteria was a common reason why there was a gap in marking between the tutor and the peer. For Orsmond et al., it was apparent that learners had different perceptions and interpretation of individual marking criteria both among themselves, and between them and the tutor despite being given verbal and written training. This dichotomy of grading between the tutor and the peer caused the lack of trust of PF and rejection of it to ensue. Furthermore, one contentious article published by Truscott (1996) criticised the provision of teacher’s feedback especially on grammar, and opposed vehemently its effectiveness in improving that feature in L2 writing.

1.2 Earlier Studies

This section provides an overview of earlier studies of PF perceptions in comparison to TF perceptions. Examples of studies indicating the preference of PF over TF in some instructional settings are briefly displayed here, as that will be thoroughly discussed in Chapter
Two. In addition, this section displays briefly a comparison between the writing features that the peer and the teacher focus on. Finally, brief showcasing of a few studies exploring L2 writers’ view of uptake is also included.

The research on whether PF does have advantages reports striking findings. Tsui and Ng (2000) argued that positive PF fosters more motivation for learners owing to the fact that, in their study, their participants acknowledged the low apprehension that they experienced when they discussed their writing with the peer than with the teacher. Moreover, Ghani and Asgher (2012) listed a number of advantages of the PF practice. They claimed that it makes students perform the role of a reader and a writer simultaneously, which sharpens their analytical and critical thinking skills. It also paves the way for communication to occur authentically; students explain, justify and arrange their writing, or the writing they critique, in a real communicative way. What is additionally totally unique in PF according to them is that it is immediate; clarifications sought are responded to instantly from the peer sitting in the next seat. Nicol’s (2021) research study on internal feedback provides supports to that. He posits that L2 students build new knowledge when they compare the knowledge they have with that they receive when working collaboratively with their peer.

The analogy drawn between PF and TF has induced more research in that area. Of those researchers, some have affirmed that PF is more advantageous to learners than TF. Rollinson (2005), for instance, claimed that PF surpasses TF in a number of features. Firstly, the casual interaction that happens between peers leads to effective negotiation of meaning, posing questions, requesting clarification, and most importantly, rejecting the peer’s comment altogether. In contrast, interaction with the teacher while receiving feedback is one-way; hence, the student may revise their piece of writing based on the feedback of the teacher without fully
understanding the justification underlying it. A second advantage that Rollinson saw as paramount is the fact that the peer can get engaged in prolonged discussions and meaning negotiation; a conversation can extend even beyond the boundaries of a classroom, and peers can exchange resources to prove the correctness and validity of one lexical or grammatical point they are making, and this aids the positive perception of that practice. Teachers, on the other hand, do not always exercise this privilege when teaching classes that operate at full capacity. Rollinson indicated the following:

It is also obvious that peers can spend much more time providing feedback on an individual draft than the overworked teacher, and there will also be a quicker ‘turnover’ time between finishing writing a draft and receiving feedback. Thus there is both higher density of feedback, as well as a more immediate interaction between writer and reader.

(p. 25)

Caulk (1994) held the same view about the upside of PF, not only in large classes, but in the majority of learning settings. Caulk argued that classmates provide each other with comments on writing instantly and meticulously, and in different aspects of writing.

The results of the aforementioned studies show that there is a widening chasm. On the one hand, some research studies indicate the negative perceptions of the effectiveness of PF (Chen & Lin, 2009; Falchikev, 1986; Orsmond et al., 2000; Truscott, 1996 to mention but a few), and on the other hand, some other studies denote positive perceptions (Caulk, 1994; Ghani & Asgher, 2012; Rollinson, 2005; Tsui & Ng, 2000 to name but a few). This chasm is attributed to the discrepancy in the research methodology, the recruitment method of participants’ sample and its size, and the study aim. This disparity instigates the need for further research in different countries and in diverse settings in order to establish a pattern for the effectiveness of one source
of feedback over the other, or the balanced students’ perception of both in facilitating the revision of students’ writing.

Another perspective that has sparked the interest of researchers is the writing features that are prioritized in PF and TF. In one early study to locate any similarities between PF and TF in terms of what writing features are focused on and are advised to be revised, Nelson and Murphy (1993) reported some interesting findings that indicated that in 50% of the cases, the peer and the teacher provided feedback on the same areas; however, in the rest of the cases, the teacher focused on cohesion of the writing draft while the peer opted for topic sentences as an area that needed further revision.

What writing features students prefer their peer to prioritize in their feedback is another area of research worth investigating. Mangelsdorf (1992) was one of the early researchers to examine PF from that perspective. Her study showed that half of the sample felt positive about peer feedback, and reported that their peer commented on clarifying and developing ideas, organizing the paragraphs, and reducing the frequency of mistakes. Nevertheless, peer rating of writing is an area of research that is quite limited as posited by Saito and Fujita (2004). Hence, and according to them, it is rather hard to find a study that shows definitively what the peer prioritizes in their feedback versus what the teacher do. They also argued that feedback on writing can be either holistic where all mistakes are corrected as soon as they are spotted, or can be focused on a certain writing feature. Therefore, it is judicious to first confirm the purpose of the writing draft before pointing out what the teacher focuses on in their feedback. The same concept is applicable to peer feedback as it is wiser to tell learners, before they start reviewing their classmates’ draft, what to precisely correct or to guide them to a holistic feedback approach.
Looking into *uptake*, it is defined by Loewen (2004) as the student’s attempt to include the feedback received into their future writing draft. Loewen categorised uptake—considering the time of the students’ incorporating or producing the linguistic form—into *successful* and *unsuccessful uptake*, based on the result of the subsequent drafts.

Comparing the uptake that takes place after PF and TF is key to deeper understanding of uptake. Zhang (1995) carried out a study on ESL students in two American universities in which 94% of students showed more signs of uptake following TF than PF. Jacobs et al. (1998) investigation about learners’ attitude towards PF and TF reported opposite results where 93% of their students voiced their liking of PF and showing higher uptake from it.

Expectations from feedback are a major factor in the uptake of feedback. Atmaca (2016) argued that perspectives of feedback that are different between the teacher and their students can result in misinterpretation of how valuable the feedback is; hence, teachers need to raise their learners’ awareness of the purpose of feedback; how to react to and use it to improve their writing skills. That early awareness, according to Atmaca, helps reshape their attitude and belief about the value of feedback.

Gender difference in peer feedback is another area of research that the current study aims to explore. As claimed by Noroozi et al. (2020), it is an area that is under represented, and thus requires more research. In their study, Noroozi et al. explored how the gender difference variable impacts: The quality of PF provided; the difference in responses to that PF; and the extent to which they benefit from it. Using an argumentative essay task as their data collection tool, Noroozi et al. found that females provided higher quality feedback—more elaborate—than their male counterparts. Moreover, no difference was recorded between both genders in terms of benefiting from PF.
1.3 Research Gap

By sifting through the literature of PF effectiveness and acceptance or rejection by learners (as will be shown in Chapter Two), one will find a commonality between many research papers. Many of those researchers, looking into the viability of PF, urge other researchers in different countries and in different instructional settings to conduct more research into that area. They presume that the findings of research may change with learners of other nationalities, age groups and settings of educational instruction. That assumption is supported by Chen et al. (2016) who observed that the EFL practices in developing countries are not included significantly in the international literature of that area, and that the EFL classes require their own unique research studies.

In Egypt, more studies are needed to compare between PF and TF as perceived by the age group of adult learners–who do general English language courses to boost their proficiency level for some personal, academic or professional reasons–. This research problem has prompted some Egyptian researchers to scrutinize the influence of PF on students in higher education institutes. Their main research objective has been to gauge the effect of feedback from the peer and what features of language PF generally focuses on. For example, Shaalan (2017) recommends that more studies be carried out in the Egyptian context, especially to investigate whether (a) the proficiency level of the peer, and (b) the quality of the feedback have an effect on the learner’s decision to use the peer’s feedback. Therefore, this study will work towards deeper exploration of the perception of feedback of adult L2 writers and sealing the gap in that area. Hence, it is believed that there is a need for the current study, and consequently, the purpose of the study is to apprehend how adult Egyptian L2 writers perceive both types of feedback source (i.e., from the peer versus from the teacher), and the influence of that on the uptake of feedback.
1.4 Research Questions

This current study aims at exploiting a certain sector of L2 learners in Egypt. The study will primarily focus on those adult learners taking general English language courses in different proficiency levels, and who study general English for diverse goals. What is quite distinctive about this sector of learners is the intrinsic motivation that is the driving force behind the decision to enrol in an English language course. Scrutinizing their perception of PF and TF in this research study will have far-reaching implications for adult classroom practices. Two specific areas are of interest in this context, namely the field of research and classroom practices. Firstly, as mentioned in an earlier section, more studies of L2 classes, and the perceptions about PF and TF of especially adult professionals learning English language in Egypt is an area requiring further research. Secondly, the results of this study can enlighten educators about how that age group of learners perceives PF in comparison to TF; thus it could help the L2 teacher in the decision to incorporate PF in their teaching practice if found to be of significance and value to them. Otherwise, should the study show no appreciation and interest in PF (and that TF is yet the ultimate source of feedback as would be viewed by adult L2 learners), the L2 teacher can opt to overlook PF practice in class, and can invest that time in honing the teaching practices that target that sector of learners in Egypt.

This current study aims to explore (a) what adult Egyptian L2 writers believe regarding receiving feedback from their peer versus from their teacher, (b) what writing features are mostly prioritized in the PF versus those in the TF, (c) the uptake of PF versus TF, and lastly (d) gender differences in the perceptions of PF versus TF. The research questions (RQs) compiled for this study are:

RQ1: What are adult Egyptian L2 writers’ perceptions of peer and teacher feedback?
RQ2: According to adult Egyptian L2 writers’, which writing features do both peers and teachers focus on/prioritize?

RQ3: What are adult Egyptian L2 writers’ perceptions of uptake of the writing feedback received from peers versus that received from teachers?

RQ4: To what extent do female and male L2 writers perceive PF and TF differently?

The first RQ will explore how adult L2 writers in Egypt perceive feedback on their writing composition received from the peer versus from the teacher; it will target reaching a conclusion as to whether Egyptian L2 writers have a balanced view about both feedback sources or one outweighs the other. Furthermore, the second RQ will provide more profound understanding of that perception by collecting data about the writing features L2 writers receive feedback on from both the peer and the teacher, and whether they express a need for receiving more feedback on different features. RQ3 pursues the comprehension of how the L2 writers’ uptake of writing feedback occurs, and finally, RQ4 will attempt to uncover any differences between males and females in PF and TF perception.

To conclude, the purpose of this study is to provide evidence concerning the worth of peer feedback in the learners’ view, and consequently, stakeholders can take a judicious decision of whether to encourage this classroom practice or to subdue it, and focus on other pedagogical practices.

1.5 Delimitations of the Study

Ideally, research studies have delimitations. Firstly, this current research focuses exclusively on adult Egyptian L2 learners, i.e., senior high school students, university students, and graduate learners from all educational, and professional backgrounds. Secondly, the study comprises participants who mostly have common socioeconomic standard as they all study
general English at AUC. The study lastly examines one classroom practice of L2 teaching in Egypt: Receiving WF from a classmate and how that is perceived; therefore, the study is detailed to include only the WF (and not the oral or the speaking practice feedback).

Conversely, this research study does not include some factors. For instance, adult learners studying general English in privately owned language institutes/centres, which a city such as Cairo abounds with, are not included. There is no statistical data about the spread of the peer feedback practice in those language institutes, while it is encouraged strongly in international universities in Egypt providing English language courses. Another limitation is concerning the type of feedback. The study will not examine the feedback of Speaking activities (i.e., the focus is on the Writing activities). Furthermore, WF is exclusively the core of this study. i.e., no oral feedback from the peer or from the teacher is encompassed in the study. A final limitation has to do with the sample size; owing to the nature of the study (i.e., the study focuses on a unique teaching practice), it was challenging to expand the scale of the data collection process. The researcher relied mainly on convenience sampling, and targeted those learners that were reachable.

1.6 Definitions of Constructs

As mentioned earlier, the scope of this study is to uncover how learners’ perceive both PF and TF that are specifically provided in a written form to an L2 writer, targeting commenting on all features of writing (organizational, linguistic and mechanics) that are found to include mistakes.

The Definitions of Constructs section illustrates the theoretical and operational definitions of the constructs utilized in this study. To spot the difference, the theoretical definition is how a construct is set forth conceptually and cited from the literature; conversely, the operational
definition is what measurement instrument(s) the researcher proposes to use in order to quantify that construct throughout the data collection stage (Creswell, 2007).

1.6.1 Theoretical Definitions

Perceptions as defined theoretically by Richardson (1996) are a set of ideas and beliefs that fall under several categories, such as “psychological propositions, premises, and other understandings about the world that are felt to be true” (p.103).

Teacher’s writing feedback was given a theoretical definition by Ghani and Asgher (2012) as that feedback the teacher typically provides on the writing composition of their students after reviewing it and analysing it critically to work for the improvement. They also added that the reason behind the teacher’s feedback being that significant is the fact that the teacher’s feedback has a profound effect on the students’ comprehension of how the writing process takes place.

The peer’s writing feedback, as explained theoretically by Ghani and Asgher, is a strategy of learning where classmates exchange their pieces of writing production with the purpose of reviewing each other’s work and responding through correcting the mistakes.

The theoretical definition of uptake was provided by Shamsudin and Karim (2013) as the student’s response to a correction or a comment provided by the class teacher on a linguistic form that is incorrectly generated by the student. Uptake can be classified into reactive versus preemptive focus on form (Ellis et al., 2001), successful versus unsuccessful based on the learner’s use of it (Loewen, 2004), and immediate versus delayed (Shamsudin & Karim, 2013).

1.6.2 Operational Definitions

In the current study, learners’ perception is defined operationally as being the ideas and thoughts that learners have towards the WF from the teacher and the peer. That is achieved in
this study by examining, coding, analysing and quantifying the data received from the sample of participants through the data collection instrument (e.g., a questionnaire).

Operationally, teacher feedback in the current study is defined as the teacher’s highlighting of a writing feature that causes a gap in the meaning, and the comments for improvement that the teacher provides their learners with on their writing composition. That was investigated in this research by means of analysing participants’ responses to the questionnaire that enquired about their perception of TF. In addition, qualitative data was sought through one-to-one interviews where the interviewed L2 writers analysed the advantages and disadvantages of teacher feedback. Moreover, the researcher collected writing samples composed during authentic in-class tasks, and provided feedback on eight different writing features as will be shown in Chapter Three and Chapter Four, including organizational, syntactic, semantic and mechanics features.

To define peer feedback operationally, it is the peer’s highlighting of a writing feature that causes a gap in the meaning, and the comments for improvement that the peer provides their classmate with on their writing composition. The researcher utilized the collected authentic writing samples from L2 writers, and quantified the number of instances in which the peer wrote a comment, or corrected a writing feature. In addition, that was also operationalized by means of analysing participants’ responses to the questionnaire items that enquired about their perception of PF. In addition, qualitative data was sought through one-to-one interviews where the interviewed L2 writers analysed the advantages and disadvantages of peer feedback.

To operationally define uptake, this research study looked at how learners react to the WF, and what they usually do or intend to do with it. A set of factors come into play as far as uptake is concerned, namely learners’ beliefs about feedback and their subsequent attitude
towards it. That was measured in this research through questionnaire items that asked the participants directly about their beliefs about feedback, their reaction to it, and their behaviour upon receiving it. Textual analysis of qualitative interview responses as well was carried out to show the patterns of responses across different participants.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

The majority of theories of L2 learning and language pedagogy have the role of feedback as a common feature. Behaviorists and cognitive theorists view feedback as a key contributor in L2 learning. Furthermore, proponents of communicative and structural approaches adopt the perspective that feedback encourages motivation and ensures linguistic accuracy (Ellis, 2009).

In the course of learning an L2, learners need to accumulate knowledge in the four fundamental skills of the language: listening, reading, writing and speaking. Writing, especially and unlike the other skills, develops over years and years of practice owing to the myriad of subskills that it entails and to “the complex nature of the composing process” (Zamel, 1982, p. 195). For that development in writing to happen, L2 learners need a response from the teacher to help them correct their errors and improve. Hyland and Hyland (2006) posited that feedback is a core element in L2 writing courses.

This chapter is a thematic review of the literature of peer feedback and teacher feedback that is contextualized in four themes. The first theme of this literature review is the analogy between PF and TF as perceived by L2 learners. The second theme looks into previous analogies drawn from the perspective of those writing features the peer prioritizes versus those prioritized by the teacher. What the literature holds with regard to learners’ uptake of PF and TF is the objective of the third theme. Lastly, the fourth theme is about the effect of the gender variable on the perception of PF and TF.

2.1 Peer Feedback Theoretical Background

Some tenets give grounds to the justification of using peer feedback as a classroom practice. Of these: process writing, collaborative learning. Vygotskian learning theory and interactionist theories of L2 acquisition have gained traction with researchers and have been
widely investigated (Liu & Hansen, 2013). In the *process writing* theory, drafting a piece of writing composition and redrafting it—for a better written end product—are primarily supported by PF (Zamel, 1982). Interacting with the peer, learning through dialogue, completing tasks collaboratively with classmates and sharing resources to compile a piece of writing are all principles of the *collaborative learning* theory (Bruffee, 1984). Furthermore, the Zone of Proximal Development is a theoretical construct developed by Vygotsky (1978), and it suggests that learners can improve their writing significantly in the presence of the peer’s assistance. In language learning, the Zone of Proximal Development, as defined by Foster and Ohta (2005) is “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by individual linguistic production, and the level of potential development as determined through language produced collaboratively with a peer or a teacher” (p.144). Thus, peers can potentially facilitate each other’s development of proficiency. Additionally, in general, the *Vygotskian approach* emphasizes the positive impact of social interaction with the peer in learning. Finally, according to *interactionists*, language learners acquire a language effectively if given the opportunity to negotiate meaning within the group (Long & Porter, 1985). Interactionists also believe that PF offers novice writers the chance to understand how their readers will receive their writing—a factor that helps in writing better according to them. Therefore, interaction with the peer can impact the development of writing skills greatly as the peer’s input is comprehensible, and their feedback is always available whenever more drafts and redrafts are made.

Peer scaffolding is another term coined by Donato (1994). Building on the Vygotskian socio-cultural framework, Donato and other L2 writing researchers (Antón & Dicamilla, 1998; Lim and Jacobs, 2001; Ohta, 2001) scrutinized the relation between the interactions happening during PF and their effect on L2 writing skills, and they attempted to broaden the traditional
notion of scaffolding that the expert (i.e. the teacher) only helps the novice (i.e. the learner) into the mutual peer scaffolding where the help between classmates is reciprocal, and hence, the writing competence of both parties is emerging.

2.2 Literature Review Themes

2.2.1 L2 Writers’ Perceptions of PF and TF

Examining the differences between PF and TF has lured researchers for decades. Several studies in different countries and diverse instructional settings have been carried out to pinpoint the potential uses of these two sources of feedback and how learners of the English language view them. Yang et al. (2006), in a study on 12 undergraduate students over two groups in a Chinese university, concluded that TF had stronger effect on L2 writers’ than PF; however, PF had a considerable potential in developing the writing skills. By experimenting the effect of PF and TF on eight ESL learners of different nationalities, all studying in a university in the USA, Connor and Asenavage (1994) found that the impact of TF was more significant than PF. In the same line of research and to support Connor and Asenavage, Paulus (1999) investigated the effect of PF and TF on 11 ESL learners; her research findings favored how learners favored TF by showing that 87% of the teacher’s comments produced a change in their production compared to only 51% of the peer’s comments. Yang et al.’s results were similar to Paulus with 90% of comments incorporated against 67% of TF and PF respectively. Moreover, in their responses to Yang et al.’s questionnaire, “Students said that the teacher was more professional, experienced and trustworthy than their peer” (p. 189). Nevertheless, more research studies were needed to further explore more dimensions in this analogy between PF and TF.

To answer the question of whether PF can potentially replace TF, a number of further research papers were published. For instance, Yang et al. (2006) called for research in this area
to be done in order to ascertain whether the time constraints imposed on the teacher can be removed by delegating the feedback task to the learners to correct their peer’s writing production. Although Villamil and De Guerrero’s (1996) study in Puerto Rico, which included 54 Spanish-speaking college students doing a writing course, concluded positive results in favor of PF, as it enhanced learners’ quality of writing and learners autonomy, Yang et al.’s results showed otherwise; TF was more impactful on students than PF.

Nonetheless, some factors influence how learners benefit or waste the feedback they receive. In a study done by Wu (2006), seven adult language learners were the focus, and their reaction towards both PF and TF on their writing composition yielded some interesting findings. Wu reported that both sources of feedback generated the same results as the lower-intermediate learners in Wu’s sample did not benefit fully from the feedback of the teacher despite exerting effort to do positive revisions. In this particular study, the proficiency level of learners did not lend itself to fruitful improvement to the students’ writing skills as they were unable to fully understand how to incorporate the teacher’s comments in future writing tasks, and they were, as well, unable to provide feedback to their peer. From this study, it can be corroborated that in order to guarantee the accuracy of the study results, especially studies concerned with the comparison between PF and TF, the level of learners needs to be carefully considered.

Another factor that comes into play when comparing PF and TF is the comprehensibility of the feedback provided. Zhao (2010) took the research into the area of PF effectiveness to a different level when she asked her sample of 18 Chinese English language learners in a Chinese university about the degree of clarity of understanding PF and TF. Her results showed that while TF prompted learners to make more modifications to their writing than PF did, the sample used only 58% of TF as that was what they found to be useful for them to use. That was on account of
lack of understanding of all the teacher’s comments. Through this significant study, Zhao found that learners perceived TF as a *requirement* while PF a *suggestion*. This perception adds value to the importance of PF as it urges them to think critically about the value and validity of that *suggestion*.

Peer feedback has shown to be beneficial to learners, even more than TF, in some contexts. Yang et al. (2006) acknowledged the worth of PF by reporting that PF is “a useful adjunct to teacher feedback” (p. 193) as it promotes learner autonomy. Gibbs (2009) championed the same view by stating that PF surpasses TF in its promptness and volume, together with the fact that students learn from giving and receiving feedback. This is particularly true in case of teenage students, where peer pressure causes them to be alert to classmates’ opinion, so PF in this case can be a strong motive for them to improve their writing as claimed by Liu and Carless, (2006) in their large sample of 1740 tertiary students and 460 academics in a Hong Kong university. In the same vein, Yu and Lee’s (2014) study had a similar outcome where the researchers observed that the 22 Chinese EFL students in their sample exerted more effort with respect to: (a) the clarity of writing and (b) the scrupulousness not to make mistakes because they knew that their writing work was corrected by the peer. Thus, this supports the hypothesis that L2 writers become highly motivated to write better when the teacher permits peers to correct each other’s writing.

On the other hand, the possibility that giving feedback—not only receiving it—can improve students’ writing skills is worth researching. Cho and MacArthur (2011) undertook the initiative and studied a sample of 61 college undergraduate students providing feedback to their classmates. Cho and MacArthur adopted the theoretical framework of learning-by-reviewing,
which theorizes that language learners acquire knowledge about L2 writing by rating and commenting on the writing compositions of their peer.

Self-confidence and the degree of comfort are two other dimensions when comparing PF and TF. Being engaged in communicative tasks with the peer was a source of more positive sentiments, such as more comfort and more confidence, than with the teacher as recorded in Tulung’s (2013) study on a classroom of EFL pre-medical students in one university in Indonesia. Yoshida (2008) supported this finding, but voiced a reservation over how the level of satisfaction, which a learner feels with their peer’s input, could hinder the L2 writer’s benefit and application of peer’s comments on their future writing. It is worth noting that Yoshida’s study was rather a case study on three Japanese EFL learners.

Students become increasingly selective when offered both PF and TF. In Mendoca and Johnson’s (1994) study, their survey of the study sample (12 advanced level college students taking a writing module) illustrated that their participants were quite selective about incorporating the peer’s comments to their writing. Connor and Asenavage (1994) pointed out the same conclusion when the two groups of ESL first-year students in their sample, enrolled in a writing course, used only a marginal 5% of the peer’s comments in their writing revisions compared to seven times that percentage of the teacher’s comments. Some researchers were interested in explaining that outcome. By interviewing five Chinese- and Spanish-speaking university students, Nelson and Carson (1998) received replies indicating students’ preference for TF as they trust more the teacher’s comments. Zhang’s (1995) study uncovered the same belief of students where 75% of a sample of 81 college freshmen expressed their preference of TF to PF. According to Tsui & Ng (2000), their 27 high school students in Hong Kong perceived the teacher as the expert who is more knowledgeable than the peer in terms of diagnosing their
linguistic deficiencies, and they believed that the teacher represented authority and quality feedback.

In the course of drawing more comparisons between PF and TF, Jacobs et al. (1998) debated another vital issue. They argued that the questionnaires given to students to compare between feedback from the peer and from the teacher are misleading because—according to them—PF and TF do not have to be mutually exclusive, i.e. it is true to believe that it is possible for both PF and TF to be happening at the same time. In their experiment, which included 121 undergraduates, 93% of them said that they wanted to have both PF and TF, but not only one instead of the other. These complementary roles of both feedback sources were also found in Tsui and Ng’s (2000) study.

2.2.1.1 Teacher Feedback Preference Over Peer Feedback. Reasons of why learners favor TF over PF vary; of which the affective preference is a major one. Eighty one Asian college EFL learners from south eastern countries were interviewed by Zhang (1995) to pinpoint their preference among the teacher, the peer, or self; the results obtained were spectacularly in favor of TF with 94% of the sample preferring it. Carson and Nelson’s (1996) and Nelson and Carson’s (1998) studies corroborated the same findings of Zhang, where all their Chinese EFL learners, through interviews, expressed their confidence in TF owing to the teacher’s deeper knowledge of the language, and the fact that TF is particularly more helpful than PF. More reasons of why TF is the most preferable source of feedback were concluded by Yang et al. (2006) in their study; their sample of participants believed that TF was more accurate, reliable, and relevant.

However, the affective preference of TF has drawbacks. The most serious drawback is using TF without thorough comprehension sometimes of that feedback. Through retrospective
interviews regarding the use of TF, the L2 learners of Hyland’s (1998) research, who were six students enrolled in a language proficiency program in a university in New Zealand, said that at times they revised their drafts without full understanding of why certain writing features were corrected. Similarly, concerns about the necessity of TF on some parts of their writing comprehension were raised by a small sample of two learners (a native American undergraduate studying in an urban university, and a Japanese MA student studying in a graduate school; both studied in California, the USA) in Goldstein’s (2006) study. Therefore, using the feedback of the teacher without profound understanding leads inevitably to repeating the same mistakes in subsequent writing assignments as ascertained by Lee (2004) in a study on six teachers and eighteen secondary school students in Hong Kong.

Accordingly, the findings of the aforementioned research studies represent a threat to the existing body of research affirming the effectiveness of TF in the process of improving L2 learners’ writing skills. If no successful internalization of feedback happens, L2 writers will not be able to maintain the corrected language feature or structure in the long term; hence, effective language development will be under threat as argued by Lantolf (2003). Lantolf defines internalization as “the process through which learners construct a mental representation of what was at one point physically presented (acoustic or visual) in external form” (p. 351). So, if the feedback is simply used or copied, internalization becomes meaningless as no mental representation occurs in the internal plane of the brain. Lantolf also claims that copying of feedback without understanding it can contribute to the immediate or the short-term proficiency of writing, but certainly not to the long-term one.

Another type of feedback that distinguishes TF is electronic feedback (e-feedback). Especially during the coronavirus pandemic, several studies were published about the impact of
the virus lockdown on education. One of those pedagogic practices that have witnessed momentous changes is feedback, and thus, the practice of e-feedback has emerged. In one study in Saudi Arabia, AbuSa'aleek and Alotaibi (2022) recruited 40 English language university tutors to investigate their perceptions of e-feedback. The study suggested that the tutors provided writing e-feedback that was oral, written, and video recorded to their students. In addition, all tutors reported that e-feedback helped them to focus on local and global writing issues in their students’ essays. However, the tutors also informed the researchers, through the questionnaire, that while the majority of their learners were engaged with the feedback they received from their tutors, and were able to make successful revisions, few students neither understand all points in the feedback report provided to them, nor used it to improve future writing.

In another interesting and recent study in Turkey, Bakla (2020) carried out his experiment to investigate which of the three L2 writing feedback modes: The written, the audio, or the screencast feedback, had the optimum effect in improving students’ writing. To explore that, Bakla recruited 33 Turkish intermediate students, enrolled in an English language teaching department of a Turkish university, to complete two writing tasks: one prior to receiving the three modes of feedback, and the other task followed the feedback to gauge the effect of each feedback mode on their writing. The group that had the audio feedback mode demonstrated signs of positive uptake of the teacher’s feedback.

2.2.1.2 Peer Feedback Efficacy. Through scanning the literature, researchers can observe many studies that support the advantages of PF. At the forefront of those advantages is the learner autonomy that PF promotes; language learners are involved personally and actively in the feedback process, unlike the case in TF where learners rely passively on the teacher (Mendoca & Johnson, 1994). Following the factor of autonomy promotion, the factor of having
an audience to gauge the clarity of writing comes. According to Caulk (1994), having an audience is one feature unique to PF as opposed to TF. To reach to that finding, Caulk recruited 43 intermediate to advanced students, who were his students, studying writing in one German university. Cheng and Warren (1997) endorsed the same viewpoint and argued that reviewing the work of the peer allows reviewers to reflect on their own writing. When learners observe that their classmates face the same challenges in writing, they become less apprehended by the tasks of writing, and they become more autonomous and self-confident. It is worth noting that Cheng and Warren carried out their study in three classes with a total of 52 undergraduates studying electrical engineering in a Hong Kong university who received training on peer feedback provision. Guerrero and Villamil (1994) and Hyland (2000) added that oral interactions happening between peers are crucial in lending social and affective support. Guerrero and Villamil pursued their study in an American university in Puerto Rico where they recruited 54 intermediate students who completed writing samples, provided PF, and were audio recorded while giving PF.

Training the peer on giving feedback can potentially increase its efficacy. That was investigated in Hojeij and Baroudi’s (2018) study. Learners, who were 15 in total, of an intermediate academic English class in a university in UAE were trained on peer reviewing and on providing feedback on the local level (sentence level) and the global one (organisation of content). Furthermore, the peer review training included face-to-face sessions, and self-training through a web-based application. The results demonstrated that PF training had a positive impact on the quality of peer feedback and on the proficiency of L2 writers on both the local and global levels.
2.2.1.3 **Drawbacks of Peer Feedback.** Peer feedback shows to be efficient only when the peers are homogenous. For instance, in Villamil and Guerrero (1996) study, students were teamed up to work collaboratively to revise a narrative text composed by one of them. Villamil and Guerrero had an observation that nearly 80% of interactions were collaborative and successful as peers were especially careful not to hurt each other’s feelings whilst providing the feedback. Villamil and Guerrero concluded that cultural and linguistic homogeneity, as all participants of their sample were Spanish-speaking students, facilitated that smooth and constructive PF process; a condition that does not necessarily prevail in all teaching contexts.

The provision of PF in students’ L2 is a hindrance in some cases. Villamil and Guerrero stated further that communicating in L2 to give feedback is difficult for some learners and that acts as an obstacle to pragmatic skills for successful dyadic interaction. Additionally, peers of different cultures and ethnicities ideally have different notions and expectations about social interaction, and that can potentially stifle the entire PF process according to them.

Despite the fact that PF is believed to be fully well-utilized by the teacher, as stated by Falchikov (2006), some researchers identified some weaknesses. Of those researchers are Sato and Lyster (2012) who analysed the PF procedure by saying:

[L]earners often avoid negotiation and solely focus on task completion . . . Presumably, this is because they do not provide one another with interactional moves that indicate errors. Second, although some studies reported negotiation of form in peer interaction . . . their interactional feedback is usually made up of simple segmentations of their partner’s erroneous utterances . . . This is not quality feedback because it lacks a corrective force to signal that there is an error . . . Last but not least, learners’ perceptions of one another may hinder the effectiveness of peer interaction (p. 597).
Sato and Lyster’s participants (N = 167) wrote essays for the study in four treatment conditions of four different feedback strategies. A firm support of this argument comes from Liu and Carless (2006) who claimed that students in their samples were not confident about receiving insightful PF.

The efficacy of PF is contingent upon the writing genre per se. While PF shows positive effects in some cases, opposite effects are shown in some others. For instance, the effect of PF in journaling, which is a reflective writing genre, was scrutinized in a noticeable study conducted by Xie et al. (2008). In their study, a group of 44 university students were assigned a task of reflective thinking in the form of a journal. In addition to writing a journal, the students were instructed to give and receive feedback about it. The outcome of the study was that students’ reflective skills in journaling cannot be promoted by PF. Xie et al. ascribed that outcome to two main reasons; firstly, according to Xie et al.: “journaling is a self-introspective process. Thus, when students were journaling, they could be distracted by the fact that their writings would be examined by other students . . . [and] they thought other people wouldn't understand or might laugh at” (p. 23). The second reason as interpreted by Xie et al. was based on Latham’s (1997) view that there is a fundamental concern about the peer being capable to offer high-quality feedback. Hence, researchers concluded that PF is not a reliable tool in promoting deep thinking processes.

More researchers voiced their serious concerns about the quality of PF. Hyland (2000), Leki (1991), Lockhart and Ng (1993), Mendoca and Johnson (1994), and Nelson and Murphy (1993) are some of those researchers who suggested, through their studies, that error detection and quality feedback provision were two common pitfalls of PF. According to them, students
adopt a strategy of giving formulaic, irrelevant and over-critical comments, or they focus excessively on surface errors.

Therefore, it can be concluded from the abovementioned studies that while PF is productive regarding some aspects of the L2 learning process, it can be unpromising in others. The learning context and the educational setting influence its effectiveness greatly.

2.2.1.4 Peer Feedback and the Cultural Context. As it is believed intuitively that high status is ascribed to language teachers and their feedback in many cultures around the world (Scollon, 1999), in contrast, peer feedback faces some issues due to cultural differences. The relationship between culture and the quality and quantity of feedback has piqued the interest of some researchers who concluded that cross-cultural issues should be a prime consideration when applying the peer feedback practice in class (Carson & Nelson, 1994, 1996; Nelson, 1997). Grouping learners of diverse cultural background can bring problems as contended by Allaei and Connor (1990): “[C]onflict, or at the very least, high levels of discomfort may occur in multi-cultural collaborative peer response groups” (p. 22). Politeness strategies, the group dynamics, and the role of each group member are some examples of elements that learners of different cultures have different expectations about (Nelson & Murphy, 1993). For instance, as suggested by Nelson and Carson (1998), in a case study of two Spanish and three Chinese participants, learners from countries of the collectivist cultural orientation (e.g., China) tend to consider chiefly the group consensus and circumvent the idea of suggesting any changes to the peer’s writing as they see that this threatens the group cohesion. This argument instigated more research; Nelson and Carson, after a few years (in 2006) investigated the matter further and found that in order for the peer feedback practice to succeed in the group interaction, homogeneity of the group comes into play where the learner will feel significantly less anxious
among a group who speaks the same L1, and shares the same cultural background; factors that help in the group harmony and in the mutual understanding of each other’s messages. As mentioned earlier, the study by Villamil and Guerrero (1996) concluded a similar finding that the group’s cultural homogeneity impacts positively the peer feedback process.

2.2.2 Writing Features The Teacher Prioritizes Versus Those Prioritized by The Peer

The objectives of analysing the errors in writing features have morphed over the years (Ludwig, 1982). The aim of the earlier studies (in the last quarter of the last century) was to measure the types and frequencies of errors in order to uncover the communicative and linguistic strategies of learners (Burt & Kiparsky, 1975); however, the focus has recently shifted to measuring the native reader’s reaction to the writing production of L2 writers; that can happen by determining those errors that damage the overall comprehension of the writing draft, or those errors that are deemed irritating or unacceptable to the native reader. To deflect any criticism relating to the small sample size being non-indicative and not suitable for extrapolation, Tomiyana (1980) managed to increase the size of her experiment’s participants—who were a group of 120 native graduate students from a large public university, yet the scope of the study was still limited to two grammatical items, i.e. articles and connectors, representing the local and the global distinction, and three types of errors: (a) the omission of the article and/or the connector where it is obligatory, (b) the insertion of the article and/or the connector where it should not be inserted, and (c) the wrong choice of the article and/or the connector.

Nonetheless, the aforementioned studies, despite being limited in scale, have provided other researchers with illuminating insights. Those studies have partly validated the idea of local and global errors. To identify local errors, Burt (1975) suggested that the local error is the one that is localized to a single part of the sentence, and does not obstruct the communication such as
verb conjugation, inflection, articles and auxiliaries. On the other hand, those errors that extend to reach the organization of the sentence, and hinder communication are labeled as global errors. It is worth noting that Burt was not the first researcher to make attempts to create hierarchies of language errors. A number of researchers have attempted the same in different languages; Olsson (1973) was one of the early researchers establishing that for the English language. In spite of that strenuous effort exerted by those researchers, another community of researchers claimed that it was futile to search for a hierarchy for writing errors, stating that “all errors [are] equally irritating ... irritation is directly predictable from number of errors regardless of the error type or other linguistic aspects” (Albrechtsen et al., 1980, p. 394).

For decades, researchers have attempted to explore more about learners’ perspectives on the teacher’s response to their writing tasks. Even though, for the most part, surveys show that L2 learners prefer that their teacher highlight the grammatical errors, some surveys indicate that feedback on the ideas and the quality of the content are features that are equally preferred in some learning contexts (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994, 1996). Furthermore, the usefulness of feedback was reported by Leki (2006) in her experiment with 21 L2 graduate students in an American university; the participants in the interviews expressed their hope for more feedback especially on how the same ideas can be conveyed by native speakers. In addition, they said that they would appreciate the duality of feedback: feedback focusing on both the content and the language.

Attempts have been made to locate differences or similarities between the focus of PF and TF. In one early study to locate any similarities between PF and TF in terms of what writing features are focused on and are advised to be revised, Nelson and Murphy (1993) reported some interesting findings that indicated that in 50% of the cases, the teacher and the peer provided
feedback on the same areas; however, in the rest of the cases, the teacher focused on cohesion of the writing draft while the peer opted for topic sentences as an area that needed further revision. However, the sample in Nelson and Murphy’s study was only four intermediate students from four different nationalities (Chile, Colombia, Peru & Taiwan).

What writing features students prefer their peer to prioritize in their feedback is an area of research worth investigating. Mangelsdorf (1992) was one of the early researchers to examine PF from that perspective. Her study showed that half of the sample (the sample was 40 advanced students studying L2 writing) felt positive about peer feedback, one third felt uncertain about its effectiveness, and a few below fifth of the sample expressed negative sentiments about PF. Those who benefitted from PF said that their peer commented on clarifying and developing ideas, organizing the paragraphs, and improving writing mistakes; writing features that that sample had a preference for at the time of the study.

Additionally, the peer’s rating of writing skills is an area of research that is quite limited as posited by Saito and Fujita (2004). Saito and Fujita’s participants were 47 Japanese L2 writers who also filled in a survey. Hence, and according to them, it is rather hard to find a study that shows definitively what the peer prioritizes in their feedback versus what the teacher does.

Feedback on writing can be either holistic where all mistakes are corrected as soon as they are spotted, or can be focused on a certain writing feature. Therefore, it is judicious to first confirm the purpose of the writing draft before pointing out what the teacher—in their feedback—focuses on. The same concept is applicable to peer feedback as it is wiser to tell learners, before they start correcting their classmates’ draft, what to precisely correct or to guide them to a holistic feedback approach.
One of the principal factors to consider when looking at what the peer prioritizes in their feedback is bias. Saito and Fujita (2004) listed a number of biases that come into play when evaluating the effectiveness of PF, and what writing features are being focused on. *Friendship bias* is the foremost one: The peer tends to provide lenient feedback to friends in class than to strangers; *reference bias* has to do with the peer using different criteria from those used by the teacher; *purpose bias* pertains to the peer’s degree of understanding of the writing task, whether it is done to develop the skill of writing or to give a grade to the draft writer; and lastly, *feedback bias* that draws a relation between receiving negative feedback from the peer and the effect of that on the practice of PF in the future. Therefore, the teacher needs to consider minimizing these biases through some administrative measures, such as setting clear criteria, conveying clear goals and limits, and guiding learners on the process of giving feedback (Chapelle & Brindley, 2002).

Opponents of PF have voiced their concerns about what the peer prioritizes in their feedback. Supporters of process writing claim that the sentence-level feedback given by the peer, in fact, hinders any development in the skill of L2 writing: “Rather than seeing writing as something that develops over time, the students’ focus on finding mistakes, and fixing them seems to problematize writing” (Nelson & Carson, 1998, p. 128). In Nelson and Carson’s study, eleven students form an Advanced Writing L2 class in a university in the US, raised some concerns that the writing features their peer pointed to in their feedback were more suitable for the final editing stage of writing, and not suitable for an initial draft. The researchers commented on the sample’s concern positively by saying that PF was not in line with what the teacher would plan for in order for writing to develop over multiple drafts. For the participants of the study, they perceived the task of PF as finding their peer’s mistakes solely; thus, the entire focus of PF was on writing as a product, and not as a process that requires continuous development. Villamil
and De Guerrero (1996) identified the same problem of the narrow focus of PF. Moreover, Villamil and De Guerrero argued that this idiosyncratic prioritization feature of PF inhibits writers as they view their writing composition as a draft that is filled with mistakes, and they overlook the fact that writing is a process. Lockhart and Ng (1995) maintained the same view through their analysis of transcripts of response groups that were 27 in total, and claimed that when peers, whilst correcting each other’s work, focus exclusively on sentence-level feedback, they therefore transform into an authoritative figure operating in an evaluative mode of identifying narrow scale writing features, and that behaviour does reflect learning writing skills in a product-oriented fashion, not in a process-oriented one. A further issue that is rather grave in how PF could, in some cases, focus only on the sentence-level feedback is that this problem-identification method of providing feedback is detrimental to the effectiveness of PF. The excessive focus on writing features of the sentence level does not help the writer to convey the ideas they target in their writing. Finally, this leads learners to prefer the TF as the teacher uses a grading rubric that helps them to balance their feedback between the language-level and the content-level (Linden-Martin, 1997; Zhang, 1995).

To maximize the benefits that accrue from writing classes, the convergence or the divergence of the writing features prioritized by both the teacher and the peer are indeed required to be put under close scrutiny. According to Nelson and Carson (1998), there are significant reasons for this. Firstly, it is crucial to investigate whether the teacher and the peer provide feedback on the same writing features from a practical point of view. As the belief persists that PF is inferior to TF in its reliability, many L2 teachers refrain from using it as a class practice. However, by examining the similarity, the benefits and drawbacks of that class practice will crystallize, and all unsubstantiated beliefs about it can be abandoned. A second reason behind the
importance of gauging the similarity between PF and TF in terms of feedback focus has to do with the amount of research in that area. In effect, studies that compare the similarity between PF and TF in terms of prioritized writing features in feedback using specific tasks are still scarce (Nelson & Carson). In previous studies—which are quite few—examining how the peer rates writing products of each other, a correlation was shown to be consistent between the teacher and the peer in the feedback provided for writing drafts although some gaps in the understanding of how peers evaluate each other’s writing draft were identified and were not fully explained. For instance, Newkirk (1984) indicated big gaps between how the teacher and the peer judged that an essay was well written owing to a significantly different criteria set by the peer than those set by the teacher when providing writing feedback. Newkirk’s sample was large as it included 302 freshmen students in an English university, and 17 instructors. More research is indeed required in that area to pinpoint what the peer prioritizes in their feedback versus what the teacher does in their feedback on learners’ writing composition.

The significant differences between PF and TF in terms of writing features does not cease to be presented through more recent research in that area. In an interesting study in an EFL context—in a Middle Eastern country; Ayachi (2017) experimented with an all-female group of 17 learners from an advanced English level course as she was their instructor. Her first research question was “Are scores of peer-assessment (PA), and teacher-assessment (TA) similar when assessing writers’ abilities?” (p. 157), and the outcome of the study for this question, which was carried out using descriptive statistics, showed that there was a sharp difference between PF and TF. Ayachi explicated that result through the answers she received in the open-ended questionnaire filled in by the participants; she reported that the majority of participants attributed that explicit difference of PF versus TF to their lack of confidence in their writing and editing
skills. Another portion of participants referred to their peer’s handwriting as a reason for their inability to provide feedback properly on the writing compositions they received. A noticeable outcome from Ayachi’s results was that a few participants, below fifth of the sample, said that subjectivity could not be overcome while they were correcting their peer’s drafts although they know that it was a blind peer correction practice. Ayachi claimed that learners were yet subjective in their feedback provision although they doing blind peer review. She added that some of her participants expressed concerns about their inability to maintain interaction with the peer, and that they lacked skills of critiquing others’ writing.

Another interesting area of research is understanding what writing features that the teacher considers the most grave in terms of hindering comprehension. Vann et al. (1984) invited a large cross-sectional group of 440 faculty members at Iowa University from different colleges. The faculty members were given a set of 12 typical ESL writing errors at the sentence level in 24 sentences. The study of Vann et al. concluded that faculty members were different in their judgement of the level of gravity of the L2 errors, and so, a hierarchy of errors was generated. Interestingly, the study also illustrated that the age of the faculty member and their academic discipline had a role to play in judging which errors were at the top of the error gravity hierarchy. The faculty surveyed was from three major disciplines: (a) Social Sciences, Education and Humanities, (b) Agricultural and Biological Studies, and (c) Physical and Mathematical Sciences and Engineering. For them, word choice, *it*-deletion, and tenses were the most intolerable errors (i.e. those were global errors affecting the overall understanding of the meaning and the sentence organization), while spelling, articles, and comma splice were at the bottom of the hierarchy as the most tolerable errors made by an L2 writer (i.e. those were local errors that do not hinder communication).
2.2.3 Factors Affecting L2 Learners Uptake of Writing Feedback

Chaudron (1977) was one of the early researchers to propose the concept of uptake as he suggested that the “effectiveness of any type of corrective reaction would be a frequency count of the students’ correct responses following each type” (p. 42). After two decades, Lyster and Ranta (1997) defined uptake as “a student’s utterance that immediately follows the teacher’s feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher’s intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student’s initial utterance” (p. 49). Consequently, in simple terms, the response given by a student to the information provided by the class teacher on a flawed linguistic form generated by the student is what makes the uptake. Lyster and Ranta further simplified the definition of uptake by saying that it is “what the student attempts to do with the teacher’s feedback” (p. 49). In the same vein, Ellis et al.’s (2001) definition of uptake was in line with previous versions of the definition and said that uptake is student’s response “that occurs where learners have demonstrated a gap in their knowledge (either by making an error, or by asking a question)” (p. 286). Moreover, the teacher provides implicit or explicit information on a linguistic form, generated by a student, which made a communication gap as suggested by Loewen (2004). Loewen added that uptake is the student trying to include that information in their future writing. Loewen also categorised uptake—considering the time of the students’ incorporating or producing the linguistic form—into successful and unsuccessful uptake, based on the result of the subsequent drafts. It is indeed important to look at the drafts that follow the initial one, on which feedback was given by the teacher, to see whether those drafts are simple repetition or imitation of the initial draft. Loewen devised another marked categorisation of uptake based on the time of uptake occurrence: The immediate uptake and the delayed uptake.
Comparing the uptake that takes place after PF and TF is key to deeper understanding of the concept. It is inevitable that learners look at and, in fact, use that feedback from those two sources differently. A controversial study was carried out by Zhang (1995) on 81 L2 students filling in a questionnaire in two American universities. A majority of 94% of students showed preference of TF to PF. Jacobs et al. (1998) investigation about learners’ attitude towards PF and TF yielded opposite results where 93% of their 100+ sample of L2 students in Hong Kong and Taiwan voiced their liking of PF as one kind of feedback.

Some studies have been published to explain the uptake of PF. There have been some discussions within the educator and methodologist circles about whether learners deal with PF equally well. Students’ culture is a significant variable in studying learners’ uptake of PF (Allaei & Connor, 1990). Nelson and Murphy (1993) found that Chinese students were less likely to accept and use feedback from their peers who are non-native users of the language. Nelson and Carson (1998) interpreted that idiosyncratic attitude of Chinese students towards PF by saying that cultures with large power distance (i.e. the non-physical distance between the students and their teacher) tend to value, and consequently to use the teacher’s feedback and they are less likely to value and use the feedback of the peer.

A fundamental question that captures the attention of the majority of researchers in the area of PF is what learners do with their peer’s feedback, and whether they, in effect, implement their peer’s comments. The influence of PF and what learners do with it in future revisions was the scope of the study done by Mendoza and Johnson (1994). That was carried out on a group of graduate learners working in pairs. Mendoza and Johnson found that while nearly half of the sample took up the feedback and applied the comments of their peer, and 10% did not take up the feedback and ignored it completely, 40% of the sample made their own changes that were not
suggested by the peer. Nelson and Murphy (1993) obtained a nearly similar result where 50% of the learners in their sample made significant changes based on PF. Conversely, Connor and Asenavage (1994), upon examining the issue of whether students listen to their peer’s voice, got the opposite results of Mendoza and Johnson, and Nelson and Murphy; a marginal percentage of the sample size (nearly 5%) reacted positively to PF and used it in the following writing tasks.

Perceptions and expectations about feedback are a major factor in the uptake of feedback. Perspectives and notions about feedback that are different between the teacher and their students can result in incomprehension or misinterpretation in how valuable the feedback is; hence, teachers and students need to have common understanding of the purpose of feedback; how to react to it and, in fact, use it to improve the writing skills. Should the teacher, very early on in the course, sets forth their expectations from learners, their cognitive awareness about the importance of feedback can increase, and eventually, they can benefit better from it and use it effectively in their assignments (Atmaca, 2016).

Learners’ beliefs about feedback influence their uptake of it as well. Building on the work of some earlier authors, Sato (2013) investigated the beliefs of learners toward PF in a sample of 167 university students enrolled in English classes in Japan trained to provide PF. As hypothesized by some earlier authors (Borg, 2003; Grotjahn, 1991), teaching methods can become more efficient with more research and better understanding of how learners believe in the effect of PF on improving their L2 skills. A questionnaire was administered to his learners to gather their reaction and impressions towards PF. Sato’s participants reported that they enjoyed PF to an extent due to the fact that their affective filter was significantly lowered while interacting with the peer, and not directly with the teacher; they did not feel apprehended by
making mistakes, but that depended on the classmate they were interacting with. They also reported that they understood their peer’s comments and would use those in future assignments.

Research on how learners interact with and process both PF and TF, and why they decide to use or not to use them is a strand of research worth more studies as stated by Storch & Wigglesworth (2010). Most researchers lean towards researching the types of revision learners make as a response to the feedback they received, whether from the teacher or the peer. This is intuitively understood because it is quite challenging to gauge how the processing of feedback occurs cognitively inside the brain of students. Few studies have attempted to gather how that cognitive processing happens through (a) think-aloud protocols (e.g., Qi & Lapkin, 2001; Sachs & Polio, 2007), (b) through interviews that are retrospective in nature (e.g., Hyland, 1998), and through (c) discussions between pairs who jointly wrote the same text (e.g., Swain & Lapkin, 2003). The common outcome of these three types of studies is that how feedback impacts learners depends primarily on (a) how deep the processing is, and (b) learners’ attitude towards it. By looking profoundly into these studies, the think-aloud protocol study (Qi & Lapkin, Sachs & Polio) helped the researchers to distinguish between two types of noticing: the *substantive* and the *cursory* one. Substantive noticing was deeper in nature than the cursory one because learners were able to explain why they were given comments on some linguistic items in their writing, and thus, a big improvement was noticed in the revised writing composition. On the other hand, the retrospective interviews conducted by Hyland showed that learner’s goals, attitudes and beliefs affect the uptake of feedback. From those interviews, Hyland observed that the importance that learners attached to a certain writing feature (grammatical accuracy in the case of Hyland’s study) is the base upon which learners’ response to feedback can be explained. Hyland said that if learners felt that some comments had violated the meaning they wanted to
convey through their text, or had violated a certain belief they had about the structure of the language, that would cause them to reject the feedback in its entirety.

Adult learners are intentional agents in their journey to learn a second journey. This sociocultural theory goes in line with how crucial learners’ beliefs are in comprehending how and why feedback processing and uptake happen. Adult learners consistently make connections and seek to know the relevance and significance of what they do due to certain events in their lives, and their behaviour in L2 learning is governed by the target(s) they set to themselves. Consequently, this background knowledge, beliefs and goals may affect a number of elements, namely, what they notice, what they give importance to, what feedback they tend to accept or reject, and how much of feedback retention occurs (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

2.2.3.1 Learners’ Beliefs About TF. Most of the research instruments employed, such as interviews, questionnaires and observation of classrooms showed that L2 learners need feedback from their teacher whenever they makes linguistic mistakes (e.g., Ellis, 2009; Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Nicholas et al., 2001; Sato, 2011).

Particularly, 90% of learners and teachers of eight different foreign language courses in the University of Arizona (824 students and 92 teachers) believed that TF was extremely important in L2 learning as reported by Schulz (1996) in her study. Surprisingly, in some cases, learners’ expectation of the amount of feedback to be received from the teacher surpassed what the teachers themselves prefer (Cathcart & Olsen, 1976). Brown’s (2009) study outcome agreed with Cathcart and Olsen where the learners in Brown’s sample (49 ESL teachers and their 1600+ first- and second-year L2 students speaking nine different languages filling in a Likert scale questionnaire) wished to be given more feedback although their teachers wanted to give less of it
to keep them encouraged to produce more language. Interestingly as well, for them a competent teacher was the one who provided more feedback. In line with that outcome is Chenoweth et al.’s (1983) questionnaire results; almost half of the 418 participants in Chenoweth et al.’s study who were enrolled in three different ESL programs in a university in Hawaii had their concerns exhibited that the TF they received was not adequate, and that they believed that the teacher ought to give a substantial amount of feedback for them to improve. In some studies, results of some questionnaire items were rather surprising, as for instance, the participants in Oladejo (1993) research (647 high school and undergraduate students in Singapore), who were asked by him to fill in a questionnaire, went to the extreme by objecting to some questionnaire items, especially one that read: “Constant error correction could frustrate the learner and inhibit his willingness to perform in the language” (p. 75), and almost 63% of the sample marked it as strongly disagreed.

Having a positive view about TF alters depending on L2 writers’ culture. By large, L2 writers’ view about TF—especially under the grammar instruction framework—is that it is positive in the majority of L2 contexts; however, that remains dependent upon the cultural background. As mentioned earlier, in one strenuous attempt to examine the impact of cultural differences on learner’s uptake of TF, Schulz (1996) carried out her cross-cultural study in the University of Arizona, and administered her questionnaire to both 92 teachers and 824 students. The focus of her study was the explicit grammar instruction. She found that students in Arizona valued TF on grammatical features more than the teachers did. Schulz gathered that that particular finding was due to the lack of one unified method to teach a foreign language, and that the difference between students’ and teachers’ perceptions about explicit grammar instructions was worrying. Another study that is worth mentioning is the two-phase cross-cultural comparison that
McCargar (1993) made on the role expectations, beliefs and feedback uptake of a large post-secondary ESL program’s 161 learners in the United States from Arab countries, China, Hispanic countries, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Korea, Persia, Thailand, and 41 American ESL teachers. McCargar opted for that intensive English program as learners were fresh residents in the US, and thus, they were not quite influenced by the host culture, which would cause the cultural differences in terms of teachers’ and students’ roles quite explicit. That served McCargar perfectly in his study, which was designed to gauge the effect of cultural differences on what ESL learners expected from their peer and their teacher. Through the administration of a survey, McCargar reported large differences between different nationalities in how they perceived the teacher’s and the student’s roles. However, among cultures of geographical proximity (e.g., the Arab nationals and Persians), the differences in those expectations were quite marginal. From the several questions in McCargar survey, one item in his questionnaire is noteworthy as it reads: “Language teachers should correct every student error” (p. 198); learners from all the nationalities in the study strongly agreed with it while only the Japanese learners agreed but slightly.

Another research scope that is fundamental to the studying of learners’ uptake of TF is the type of feedback per se. Very few studies have reported on that (Sato, 2013), and to know that the findings of that are mixed as well. For instance, Brandl (1995) stated that the majority of his sample’s subjects, i.e., 21 college-level American learners studying German in the University of Texas, demonstrated a preference for prompting feedback from the teacher over the reformulating type. That preference came mainly from subjects who were highly proficient in German. In the same line of argument comes Brown’s (1994) research study; when comparing between first- and second-year college students in a sample of 49 subjects, he found that the
students of the second year, who were ideally more advanced that first-year ones, preferred the indirect TF, unlike the first-year students who liked more of TF that is explicit.

Establishing a correlation between the proficiency level and the tendency of the learner to work dependently or independently is not always successful. The two aforementioned examples indeed show that there seems to be a tendency that the higher the level of the learner is, the more they prefer working independently. However, some other studies indicated the opposite. One previously mentioned case study, for instance, undertaken by Yoshida (2008) in an Australian university including three learners indicated that the beginners of the Japanese language program preferred to put effort into discovering their errors themselves. Nevertheless, 588 beginners in an EFL program in several Japanese universities expressed their preference for indirect TF, i.e., the teacher just marks that there is an error and they rewrite that part themselves, to direct TF as illustrated by Katayama (2007) in her research paper. Therefore, the type of TF that learners prefer depends on several factors; while the learner’s proficiency level may seem the most prominent of those, the learning context is the core of that preference.

To conclude that section, L2 learners desire to be given TF. Research on learners’ beliefs and attitude towards TF shows that fact despite the lack of absolute affirmation as to the optimal frequency of this feedback provision that best suits all learners (Oladejo, 1993). This goes in line with the notion that learners in the classroom do not feel negatively when given feedback by the teacher during the lesson and in the presence of their classmates as they are not ordinary people in a real-life situation, and so they are cognitively and psychologically cognizant of the fact that they are there to learn (Van Lier, 1988). It is also worth mentioning that the cultural background and the proficiency level affect learners’ attitude and uptake of TF, and hence, one cannot expect that research results will be consistent across cultures and across educational contexts.
2.2.3.2 Learners’ Beliefs About Peer Interaction and PF. Some research studies have investigated L2 learners’ attitude towards PF. This investigation has been pursued from a socio-cultural perspective with a special focus on the scaffolding that happens among peers during their interaction in the peer feedback practice (e.g., Foster & Ohta, 2005; Ohta, 2001; Storch, 2002; Swain & Lapkin, 1998). Nevertheless, what has been thus far under-investigated is how learners perceive that peer interaction, and the subsequent feedback that is generated from their classmates. As mentioned earlier by Van Lier (1988), the classroom ought not to be viewed as a normal social medium; however, if the learner perceives the classroom as a social environment, then TF given to them during the lesson will certainly cause some embarrassment to some learners even if they requested it to be given instantaneously from the teacher (Allwright, 1996).

Of those studies that examined the beliefs and the uptake of PF is Tulung (2013). Her sample of 90 subjects—an L2 teacher and eight college-level learners—in Indonesia reported that during the peer interaction practice they (a) were more motivated than dealing directly with the teacher, (b) had positive opinion that PF is beneficial, and (c) were not apprehended by feedback from a classmate.

Not all teachers allow for PF as an inside or outside classroom practice. That is a principal reason behind the scarcity of research on PF beliefs among learners (Adams, 2007; Pica et al., 1996; Sato & Lyster, 2007). Working with a small group of Japanese language learners at university-level (three learners), Yoshida (2008) stated that the level of satisfaction with the peer interaction and the PF provided are key to PF efficacy. The PF being incomprehensible or completely discarded is an inevitable outcome should there be dissatisfaction with peer interaction. Yoshida added that the lack of confidence in the linguistic abilities of a classmate, sometimes, means that the effectiveness of PF is not a categorical statement, and that this
effectiveness depends on the personal attributes of the peer; in her experiment, one learner said that she trusted her peer’s metalinguistic feedback because of the confidence exuded by that peer.

Peer feedback is reciprocal in nature. Learners provide as well as receive feedback from the peer. This reciprocity needs to be carefully considered as advised by Philp et al. (2010) following the completion of their research that had seven undergraduate students recruited from a Business French class. According to them, considering reciprocity is key because it may lead to the learner’s hesitancy to provide PF. This hesitation stems from (a) their confidence about their level of readiness to give feedback to a classmate, and (b) social relationships between learners. As aforementioned, L2 learners feel less anxious working with the peer for the most part, but reluctance to give feedback to the peer cannot be overlooked in some learning contexts.

2.2.3.3 Different Nature of PF and TF. In deciding to use PF, learners consider the nature of PF per se, and the role of using L1 in peer interaction as claimed by Zhao (2010). First, the nature of PF itself will be clarified. In her sample of 18 Chinese second-year English major subjects of an intermediate proficiency level, Zhao reported that students view TF as a revision requirement that must be followed as the teacher is “the sole legitimate agent to mark . . . [the] writing” (p. 12) whereas PF is a suggestion that could be simply followed or discarded. Therefore, it can be concluded that reactions to PF and TF are triggered by the assessment culture, i.e., the teacher was the only party they trusted to judge the quality of their writing. Zhao further suggested that PF be given some grades in the final mark of students’ writing in order for it to be given more attention to, and to be dealt with seriously. Some other students in Zhao’s study expressed different views about PF that they took it up more actively than TF that, for them, was taken up more negatively. Through interviewing the participants, Zhao found that
learners spoke positively about PF, and especially praised the high interactivity involved in it. Learners said that in PF practice, they had the chance to discuss the feedback when they felt confused, it was a process of feed forward and feedback between peers, and they had a clearer idea about the errors. On the contrary, TF, for them, was a matter of a problem being explained in a convincing way by the teacher, and finally accepted by them in a passive manner. That passivity was described as an authoritative role of the teacher and of TF at large. What was more serious in the interviews with the study participants is the fact that some of them admitted using TF without full understanding of the feedback rationale; that was a direct result of the unwillingness of some of them to challenge the teacher, and to investigate more about the error in question. That hesitation to question TF, as suggested by Zhao, was generally due to the conventional dominant role of the teacher, in China, that many students believed in (from previous learning experiences). However, the case was distinctly different with PF because of “[t]he relatively equal social status among students” (p. 13) that caused learners to be both willing and brave to challenge the peer before deciding to use or to ignore their feedback.

2.2.3.4 Use of L1 in Peer Interaction. The second element as to why learners decide to utilize PF has to do with the use of L1 among them. With reference to Zhao’s (2010) experiment, more than half of the participants confirmed that using L1 while interacting with the peer in the provision or the receipt of feedback aided them in advancing their understanding of feedback. One participant stated explicitly that the use of L1 helped her to express her thoughts and ideas better, and that the mutual understanding she had with the peer was unattainable in the discussion with the teacher as some learners tend to avoid further discussions with their teacher. As social interaction boosts the language development as asserted by socio-cultural theorists (e.g., Lantolf, 2003; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Vygotsky, 1978), using L1 in peer interaction plays a facilitative
role. This assertion was given support by Guerrero and Villamil (1994) as they observed that L1 facilitated greatly the interaction between peers in their research study that comprised 54 intermediate ESL students studying in an American university in Puerto Rico. Students used Spanish in their peer-to-peer interaction and their reflection was quite positive about it.

Hence, research in the area of peer interaction and PF, in general, inclines towards recommending that learners be given proper PF training to know how to work collaboratively and how to provide feedback (Sato, 2013). By doing so, awareness about the value and effectiveness of PF can increase, and consequently, some social obstacles can be overcome, such as (a) the lack of confidence in each other’s ability to provide feedback, and (b) the hesitation and reluctance to give feedback to the peer.

2.2.4 Gender Difference Effect on Peer Feedback

Few studies have looked at the amount to which gender influences how students engage in peer feedback procedures (Noroozi et al., 2020). According to them, and based on their study that focuses on writing argumentative essays, thus far, the majority of gender and argumentation research has focused on the females’ versus males’ ability to produce quality argumentative discourse rather than the quality of PF that either gender provides. Noroozi et al. added further that researchers and instructional designers need to know how the quality of female and male students’ feedback differs as this could affect how learning groups are formed. Furthermore, they argue that it is unknown whether female and male students respond differently to their peer feedback on their revised written argumentative essays.

To investigate the role of gender differences, Noroozi et al. (2020) recruited 189 undergraduates studying in the Netherlands to write a pre- and a post-test argumentative essay. Noroozi et al. concluded that female students provide more detailed and higher quality feedback
than males regarding some aspects of argumentative essay writing, and not all aspects. In addition, they found that females and males benefitted similarly from feedback, and that was evident in the post-test essay that they produced.

The scarcity of studies exploring gender differences ought to instigate further studies. As reported by Noroozi et al. (2020), their study only focuses on students whose culture is driven by a small power distance (i.e., in the Netherlands); therefore, they suggested that other societies with a larger power distance could yield different results, and recommend that further studies be conducted to explore the pattern of gender differences in peer feedback provision.

2.3 Peer Feedback Research in Egypt

Giving feedback to students is commonly considered as one of the most difficult and time-consuming duties for the teacher (Ferris, 2007). Tahir (2012) argues that opting for assigning peer feedback activities in class may allow them to devote more time to focusing on other parts of writing instruction, and thus, that could reduce their excessive workload. Tahir’s research study was carried out in Malaysia with 10 university level students trained on peer review. In the Egyptian context, however, the limited research studies tackling peer feedback perception and techniques is a cause of concern; this fact indicates that stakeholders in Egypt have not as yet been provided with research-based evidence whether adult L2 learners in Egypt benefit from that practice or the teacher ought to shun it entirely, and to utilize the class time in more beneficial activities. In the capital Cairo, for instance, educational institutions providing L2 education to adults are diverse. In the context of this study, an adult who wants to improve their language skills can choose among several options: They can do general English courses either in a language centre administered by a public university, in a language department managed by an international one (e.g., the LD of AUC), or can enrol in one of many privately owned language
centres that abound in Egypt. Not all of those institutions provide writing instruction as it is not readily available to find L2 instructors willing and available to teach writing. This has become rather exclusive to large institutions. For instance, at the LD of AUC, L2 writing is practiced in 10 to 11 out of 12-session course, and L2 learners have the opportunity to practice individual and collaborative writing. A structured rubric is employed by instructors to give feedback and grade learners’ writing. Furthermore, the most common genres of writing are instructed, i.e., learners practice integrated and independent writing to produce essays, informal and formal emails, informal and formal letters, reviews, story narration, and reflections.

Of those studies targeting exploring PF and TF in Egypt, one comprehensive study that is worth mentioning in that regard is the one conducted by Shaalan (2017) where the researcher records positive results in how her 77 freshmen, studying English language in one government university in Egypt, were able to provide PF that was well-trained on and well-structured via a feedback guidance sheet, and through an online platform (Edmodo).

Another study presented in the CDELT conference, Seliem and Ahmed (2009) focused on e-feedback, i.e., electronic feedback sent by the peer or the teacher to the learner on their writing production. Through a sample of 80 students and seven L2 writing lecturers, questionnaires and interviews indicated the following: E-feedback helped students more than the oral one; negative perceptions and low levels of use of peer feedback (students attributed that to the peer being in the same proficiency level, so no benefits could be derived from PF); and a significant acceptance of the e-feedback as an innovative pedagogy owing to the high level of participation and engagement with learning that students display, becoming more autonomous and more responsible for their own learning.
Screencast or video feedback generated the interest of Ali (2016). She investigated the effect of that type of feedback on the development of L2 writing. In her sample, Ali recruited 63 students studying academic writing in an Egyptian university, and assigned pre and post-writing tasks in two groups: one group received written feedback while the other received video feedback. Questionnaires were also administered after the experiment to collect their perceptions about screencast feedback. Results revealed positive perceptions of screencast feedback and describing it as personal, engaging and constructive. The posttest results as well showed that the group receiving the screencast feedback demonstrated considerable improvement in the quality of their writing compared to the pretest task and to the group that received written feedback.

Comparing TF practices across proficiency levels was the core of the research study undertaken by Soliman (2016). Five English language teachers from an international university in Cairo were interviewed, and 95 writing samples were employed by Soliman to investigate how dealing with different proficiency levels transformed the teacher’s feedback practices. Her research yielded that TF practices did change to adapt the low and the high proficiency levels of the learners in terms of the feedback strategy and its focus. Moreover, the writing samples that she collected indicated that low proficiency learners received direct written feedback that focused mostly on the micro or the sentence level; in contrast, the feedback of higher proficiency levels was indirect (i.e., only pointing to the error without correcting it), and the focus was on the macro level, i.e., the content, the coherence, and the idea development. Following interviewing the five teachers, Soliman recommended that L2 teachers practice both direct and indirect feedback with low proficiency learners to help them become autonomous at the early stages of their language learning journey.
Compared to the volume of research studies in the western world, the limited of studies in Egypt might be attributed to the rather limited writing practice in language centres. Owing to large class sizes in Egyptian schools and language centres, the teacher avoids assigning frequent writing tasks because this entails spending extended hours of strenuous grading and providing individual feedback. This consequently leads to the teacher being cautious about instructing it in class, and a shortage in learners themselves practicing peer feedback.

2.4 Research Gap

The objective of this chapter was to review the extensive literature on two distinct sources of writing feedback, namely, peer feedback and teacher feedback. It was found that each source has its discrete merits and demerits. Learners of English value the feedback they receive from their teacher, and look to the teacher as an authoritative figure and a reliable source of information that cannot be questioned or challenged as shown in the several aforementioned studies. This is particularly true in cultures (e.g., the Chinese culture) where a large distance of power exists between students and teachers (Nelson and Carson, 1998). On the other hand, some research studies that have been carried out in different countries indicated reserved acknowledgment of peer feedback. In those studies, participants have accepted feedback from their peer and expressed their satisfaction with the peer-to-peer interaction experience at best, and have either ignored it completely or used it marginally in their redrafts at worst.

The effectiveness of both sources of feedback (i.e. PF and TF) was thoroughly scrutinized in a number of studies, mainly on the school and the university level. The comparison between both sources has not thus far yielded a definitive outcome in favor of one source over the other in those research papers conducted with school- and university-level subjects. There is a need for the same kind of studies but with adult learners as those studies are inadequate in the
Middle East region. Therefore, this was a gap identified by the researcher and was addressed in this research study.

As can be noticed in the chapter, the majority of the literature are those studies done primarily in ESL classes, followed by those done in EFL ones. EFL classes are a unique context that requires its bespoke studies, and those EFL classes that have been under study are chiefly in Asian countries; countries of the Middle East and the Arab region have not been quite privileged with studies of that nature, with the exception of Iran where a few experiments have been done there. In Egypt, more studies comparing between PF and TF as perceived by the age group of adult learners, who do general English language courses to boost their proficiency level for some personal, academic or professional reasons are needed. For example, Shaalan (2017) recommends that more studies be carried out in the Egyptian context, especially to investigate ‘whether the language proficiency of the peer reviewer and the linguistic quality of the comments have any effect on whether the writer incorporate[s] the comments or not’ (p. 97); therefore, this study has worked towards deeper exploration of the feedback perception of adult learners in Egypt and sealing any gap in that area.

Another gap that this research study has pursued to fill is the writing features that TF focuses on as opposed to PF focus for L2 writers in Egypt. The majority of research studies, to the researcher’s best knowledge, are conducted separately to identify what writing features the teacher prioritizes in their feedback in contrast to what the peer does. This thesis research aimed to compare between PF and TF in terms of writing features prioritization in one study where each participant was asked—through the research instrument—to select simultaneously those writing features prioritized by both sources. Another study that is worth citing is a study conducted by Al Saeed (2010). In her study, the grammar feature was the focus of the study.
Recruiting 60 first-year students in a government university in Egypt, she divided them into three equal groups: one treatment group receiving grammar coded error, another treatment group receiving grammar underlined error, and the third control group received no grammar feedback. She reported no differences between the three groups in terms of grammatical accuracy, and she concluded that grammar accuracy specifically improved through writing and rewriting practice, and not through feedback.

A further gap worth addressing was the correlation between gender difference and the feedback perceptions. Studies carried out on both EFL and ESL learner levels show manifest shortage in addressing that scope. As shown in the aforementioned sections of this chapter, rather little research tackles the gender variable, and its impact on the quality of feedback. Additionally, the example study included in this chapter uses only the argumentative essay as its instrument; that study authors recommended more studies within the same scope in other instructional settings.
Chapter Three: Methodology

This thesis research sought to report on the findings of a set of four research questions pertaining to peer feedback of L2 writing as opposed to teacher feedback. In the pursuit of these results, the perception of adult Egyptian L2 writers of receiving PF versus TF was investigated. Additionally, this research reported data and conclusions about the writing features that the peer gives more attention to in their feedback of L2 writers’ production, and how that contrasts with the teacher feedback of the same. A third area of research that was covered in this research is the L2 writers’ perception of uptake of PF in comparison to TF. A final area of enquiry is gender differences, and how that shapes the genders’ perception of peer and teacher feedback.

This chapter draws on all the details of the methodology and comprises three sections. The first section illustrates the procedures for measuring the study variables and that entails the research design and approach. The data collection procedure is the second section, and it includes the description of participants and instrumentation. Finally, the third section of this chapter demonstrates the data analysis techniques.

3.1 Research Design & Procedure

By looking at Perry’s (2017) three dimensional diagram of the three design continua of research design, the current study lies in that three dimensional space between the basic-applied, the qualitative-quantitative, and the exploratory-confirmatory continua. However, through a more focused and detailed view, the current study leans towards the applied, the quantitative, and the exploratory ends of the three continua. The qualitative-quantitative continuum is of special interest in the study at hand as the study is quantitative and qualitative in nature (mixed-method).
The quantitative method led the gathering of data about the participants’ level of motivation, their preference of feedback source (i.e., from the peer or from the teacher), their level of acceptance of PF versus TF, the frequency of using PF and TF, the feedback’s clarity from both sources, their belief in the peer’s ability to correct their writing, the writing features that they find corrected more frequently in PF against that in TF, the format they need the feedback to be in (e.g., in bullet points or in a paragraph), what they do with the feedback after receiving it, their reaction towards the feedback, the effect of positive encouragement in the feedback, and what they believe, at large, about the value of feedback on writing. Furthermore, the quantitative method explored the differences of data reported from females in contrast to males.

On the other hand, the qualitative approach (through multiple interviews) obtained in-depth knowledge about the difference between PF and TF as viewed by L2 writers. The qualitative data focused on perceptions of PF and TF in terms of advantages and disadvantages, why participants believe their peer focuses on writing features other than those focused on by the teacher, writing features they wish to get more PF and TF on, and whether they believe gender differences do exist in the perception of feedback.

Lastly, the writing samples compiled for this study served to answer the second RQ. The writing samples provided information about eight writing features, and the instances of highlighting those in PF and TF. For that, two copies of each writing sample were made: One reviewed by the peer and the second by the teacher. The count of the instances was exported to an MS Excel sheet to compare the total number of error count by the peer and by the teacher. The results of the count are displayed in Chapter 4. Those results helped in analysing whether the
peer and the teacher prioritized the same or different writing features, and whether the instances of error highlighting showed significant differences between PF and TF.

3.2 Data Collection Procedure

3.2.1 Description of the Sample

The sampling strategy adopted in this research study was the nonprobability sampling (Creswell, 2003). In nonprobability sampling, both convenience sampling and snowball sampling were utilized to collect data. The sample was a group of 81 mixed gender adult L2 learners enrolled in general English language courses at the School of Continuing Education (SCE), at the American University in Cairo (AUC). The participants, mostly the researcher’s former students, practiced peer feedback activities in the course of their learning at the SCE; however, students at the LD do not receive official training on PF; they receive instructions from their instructor to provide holistic feedback or to provide feedback targeting a certain writing feature in accordance with the lesson’s learning outcome. For the purpose of this study, only participants’ holistic feedback was utilized for data analysis.

The participants were all 18 years old or above: Some were senior high school students, some university students, and some were working professionals. Hence, adults of diverse educational, socioeconomic, and cultural background took part through the data collection instrument that was electronically sent to them directly by the researcher. The researcher disseminated one of the research instruments through virtual groups on one of the well-known multiplatform messaging mobile phone applications (i.e., WhatsApp).

To enrol in the general English language course, the admission requirements of the SCE stipulate that applicants sit for the Standardized English Proficiency Test (SEPT) to be placed in their appropriate level; therefore, learners joining the English language program for the first time
need basic computer literacy and English alphabet knowledge. It is worth noting that the SCE adopts the flipped classroom method, and thus, learners are assigned material to read and listen to at home prior to the class, and speaking and writing tasks are done in class. To be promoted from one level to the one higher, learners are assessed on speaking and writing only, and are required to score a minimum of 60% for promotion. The general English language program is aligned to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and the SCE subscribes to the Task Based Learning (TBL) approach where learners work collaboratively in groups to complete the speaking and writing tasks, and report back to class. Ideally, learners spend six weeks in one level; they meet with the teacher twice a week, for a total of 5 hours per week, and thus, one level is 12 sessions in total. Writing tasks are practiced in 10 to 11 sessions. The average class capacity is 12 learners and in some levels, learners reach 15 in one group.

Table 1 hereunder provides data about the gender distribution of the participants who filled in the questionnaire. Figure 1 illustrates data about their language proficiency levels. Furthermore, Figure 2 shows the level of motivation of the 81 participants, while Figure 3 presents information about their educational background. On the other hand, Table 2 provides discrete demographic data of the male and females participants who filled in the questionnaire, while Table 3 displays the gender and proficiency distribution of those participants who gave their consent and took part in the interviews.

Table 1

**Questionnaire Sample Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 81*
Figure 1

L2 Proficiency Level of the Questionnaire Participants
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Table 2

The Demographic Data of the Male and Female Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Proficiency Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University graduate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree holder</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of motivation*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean value</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly motivated</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not motivated</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 81; *1 = Not motivated, 5 = Highly motivated

As aforementioned, the participants were the researcher’s former learners. The sample
that was approached personally was assured, through a consent statement, that the study was fully anonymous, and that both data instruments would not consume more than five minutes for a questionnaire and 15 minutes for an interview.

**Figure 2**

*Level of Motivation of the Questionnaire Participants*

![Bar chart showing motivation levels.](chart)

*Note.* N = 81; 1* = Not motivated; 5** = Highly motivated

**Figure 3**

*Educational Background of the Questionnaire Participants*

![Pie chart showing educational backgrounds.](chart)

*Note.* N = 81

**Table 3**

*Interview Sample's Profile*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>L2 proficiency level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 7*

### 3.2.2 Description of the Instruments

The research instruments used in this study were three different tools. The researcher opted for an online self-administered questionnaire, interviews and collecting learners’ writing samples.

**3.2.2.1 The Questionnaire.** The questionnaire was designed and developed by the researcher (see Appendix A). The employment of this instrument stems from the fact that “the questionnaire embodies the attitudes, beliefs, and practices that you [the researcher] wish to document by administering it to your [the researcher’s] respondents” (Nunan & Bailey, 2009, p.130). Questionnaires are a fast, efficient and a non-expensive way to collect data (McLeod, 2018). McLeod also argued that owing to its simplicity of use and the minor guidance required from the researcher to the respondents, questionnaires are preferred by many researchers of all disciplines. As the data collection in this study was completely anonymous, the choice of questionnaires showed to be a viable one.
The questionnaire items in the current study were adapted from questionnaires devised by (a) Amrhein and Nassaji (2010), (b) Chen and Lin (2009), and (c) Tsui and Ng (2000). The design of the questionnaire items of the current study followed the *funnel sequence* (Siniscalco & Auriat, 2005) where the questions were interrelated and ordered from the broadest to the most specific scope. All items targeted quantitative data through closed-ended items. The questionnaire was administered online, and included 35 items to answer all four research questions. A Google Form was employed to collect data. Google Forms, at large, allow for a variety of question types, e.g., multiple choices, checkboxes, linear scales, multiple choice grids, and checkbox grids. A digital link was sent electronically to the sample.

Items 1 to 4 collected demographic data about the sample of participants: their gender, L2 proficiency level, educational background and level of motivation, as listed below:

1. What is your gender?
   - Female - Male

2. What is your English language level?

3. What is your educational level?
   - High school student - College student - University graduate - Master’s degree holder - PhD holder

4. How motivated are you in your English learning journey?
   - Not motivated - Less motivated - Neutral - Motivated - Highly motivated

That item about the participants’ gender fulfilled the requirement of RQ4 with regard to how gender as an independent variable impacts the perception of feedback as a dependent variable.
Items 5 to 17 sought to answer RQ1: What are adult Egyptian L2 writers’ perceptions of receiving PF versus receiving TF? as shown hereunder:

5. How do you find the teacher feedback on your writing versus your peer feedback?

- Teacher feedback is important

- Both teacher feedback and classmate feedback are equally important

- Peer feedback is important

6. It is only the teacher who can give you feedback on your writing.

   Strongly agree - Agree - Neutral - Disagree - Strongly disagree

7. Your writing can improve through feedback from your peer.

   Strongly agree - Agree - Neutral - Disagree - Strongly disagree

8. Giving feedback to the peer needs training.

   Strongly agree - Agree - Neutral - Disagree - Strongly disagree

9. You accept your teacher feedback on your writing.

   Always - Often - Sometimes - Rarely - Never

10. You use your teacher feedback on your writing.

    Always - Often - Sometimes - Rarely - Never

11. You accept your peer feedback on your writing.

    Always - Often - Sometimes - Rarely - Never

12. You use your peer’s feedback on your writing.

    Always - Often - Sometimes - Rarely - Never

13. After receiving your teacher feedback on your writing, you discuss the feedback with your teacher.

    Always - Often - Sometimes - Rarely - Never
14. After receiving your peer feedback on your writing, you discuss the feedback with your peer.

   Always - Often - Sometimes - Rarely - Never

15. Which is easier for you to understand?

   - Your teacher’s feedback
   - No difference in clarity and ease of understanding between both
   - Your peer’s feedback

16. You believe in your peer’s feedback ability to correct your writing.

   Strongly agree - Agree - Neutral - Disagree - Strongly disagree

17. If you repeat an error more than once, you believe that highlighting the error every time it happens is …

   Useful - Somehow useful - Neutral - Somehow useless - Useless

   Furthermore, items 18-26 in the online questionnaire provided deeper comprehension of the variables that contribute to learners’ uptake of TF specifically, while items 27-35 provided the same, but from the perspective of PF.

18. As soon as you receive the writing feedback from your teacher, you …

   - read it carefully to use it in future writing
   - do not generally use all that feedback in future writing
   - just look at the grade and do not read the feedback

19. Generally, you like the writing feedback you receive from your teacher to be (Participants can check more than one box)

   - in a paragraph
   - long sentences to provide detailed explanation
   - in bullet points
- including words like ‘you’ & ‘your’ as if the teacher is talking to you personally

20. You become highly engaged in your teacher feedback that is focused on

(Participants can check more than one box)

- vocabulary
- grammar
- punctuation
- linking
- organization of ideas & paragraphs
- how to fully answer the writing question
- spelling
- number of words if fewer than the word limit in the question

21. You understand well the writing feedback that is (Participants can check more than one box)

- direct; the teacher just gives the correction
- indirect; the teacher just highlights that there is a mistake and leaves me to find it out and correct it
- given orally through a one-to-one meeting with my teacher
- commentary; the teacher just provides comments about the overall quality of my writing but no specific mistakes are corrected

22. When you receive the writing feedback from your teacher, you (Participants can check more than one box)

- tell yourself that the teacher is always right as this error is something new you are learning
- reject some corrections when they do not agree with the previous knowledge you have about the language
- feel there is no need for it because mistakes will be corrected by time

23. When you receive your writing feedback from your teacher, you …
- generally know how to correct your mistakes in the future
- ask the teacher about only those feedback points that you do not understand
- do not know how to avoid those mistakes in future writing tasks
- memorize the correction of the mistakes to use in future writing

24. When you receive a lot of correction on your writing from your teacher, you …
- feel encouraged to work on reducing the number of errors in future writing tasks
- feel demotivated and discouraged to work on your mistakes because they are many

25. The teacher’s words of encouragement ("good job", "you did a good job", "excellent") on your writing task
- motivate you to do better in future tasks
- do not make any difference to you
- are usually ignored by you and you do not notice them
- are a waste of the teacher’s time; you just need comments on your mistakes to push you to do better

26. You see that receiving writing feedback from your teacher (Participants can check more than one box)
- helps you to improve
- only justifies the grade you received
is considered part of the teacher’s duty

is not that important as you only want to pass the course

27. As soon as you receive the writing feedback from your peer, you …

- read it carefully to use it in future writing
- do not generally use all that feedback in future writing

28. Generally, you like the writing feedback you receive from your peer to be (Participants can check more than one box)

- in a paragraph
- long sentences to provide detailed explanation
- in bullet points
- including words like ‘you’ & ‘your’ as if the peer is talking to you personally

29. You become highly engaged in your peer feedback that is focused on

(Participants can check more than one box)

- vocabulary
- grammar
- punctuation
- linking
- organization of ideas & paragraphs
- how to fully answer the writing question
- spelling
- number of words if fewer than the word limit in the question

30. You understand well the writing feedback that is (Participants can check more than one box)
- direct; the peer just gives the correction

- indirect; the peer just highlights that there is a mistake and leaves me to find it out and correct it

- given orally from my peer

- commentary; the peer just provides comments about the overall quality of my writing but no specific mistakes are corrected

31. When you receive the writing feedback from your peer, you (Participants can check more than one box)

- tell yourself that the peer is right as this error is something new you are learning

- reject some corrections when they do not agree with the previous knowledge you have about the language

- feel there is no need for it because mistakes will be corrected by time

32. When you receive your writing feedback from your peer, you …

- generally know how to correct your mistakes in the future

- ask the peer about only those feedback points that you do not understand

- do not know how to avoid those mistakes in future writing tasks

- memorize the correction of the mistakes to use in future writing

33. When you receive a lot of correction on your writing from your peer, you …

- feel encouraged to work on reducing the number of errors in future writing tasks

- feel demotivated and discouraged to work on your mistakes because they are many

34. The peer’s words of encouragement ("good job", "you did a good job", "excellent") on your writing task …
motivate you to do better in future tasks
- do not make any difference to you
- are usually ignored by you and you do not notice them
- are a waste of the peer’s time; you just need comments on your mistakes to push you to do better

35. You see that receiving writing feedback from your peer (Participants can check more than one box)
- helps you to improve
- does not help you to improve

For the questionnaire to be functioning effectively, the researcher needed to look into its validity. As a data collection instrument, the questionnaire must provide data that answer the study’s RQs. As Creswell (2007) defined it: “Validity is the degree to which all of the evidence points to the intended interpretation of test scores for the proposed purpose” (p. 159). Furthermore, the validity was tested through piloting where the researcher conducted a piloting phase, and found that the responses collected from the piloting sample provided information to answer the RQs.

In addition to the instrument’s fulfilment of validity, reliability is another main criterion. “Reliability means that scores from an instrument are stable and consistent (Creswell, 2007, p. 159). Nevertheless, throughout the piloting stage, evidence for reliability was provided. One particular item, coherence, during the piloting stage was reported by the 15 participants as the writing feature receiving the least feedback from the peer and from the teacher in two questionnaire items enquiring about that. In two other items asking the participants about the writing feature they wish to receive feedback on from the peer and from the teacher, the same
item, *coherence*, was at the top of the list of writing features. With the occurrence of these values, and the fulfilment of consistency of results, that provided evidence that the instrument used is indeed reliable. Furthermore, the consistency of items was calculated through the Cronbach Alpha. Employing SPSS version 23, the Cronbach Alpha for the sets of questions measuring TF and PF with the same wording ranged from .665 and .740 indicating that from 66% to 74% of the variances are reliable.

As mentioned earlier, the questionnaire employed in this study was inspired and adapted from three references: Amrhein and Nassaji (2010), Chen and Lin (2009), and Tsui and Ng (2000). Table 4 herein provides information about the adaptation undergone on some items from previous studies to fit the purpose of this study.

**Table 4**

*The adaptation of questionnaire items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amrhein and Nassaji (2010)</td>
<td>4- If you repeat an error in a writing assignment more than once do you think it is useful for your teacher to mark it every time it occurs? Yes – No Why?</td>
<td>17- If you repeat an error in writing assignments more than once, you believe that marking the error every time it happens is ... Useful - Somehow useful - Neutral - Somehow useless - Useless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale: Amrhein and Nassaji’s study used a questionnaire only that collected both quantitative and qualitative data. In this study, the researcher opted for a complete separation between quantitative and qualitative data collection. Therefore, item 17 here gathered quantitative data through a 5-point Likert scale providing participants with more choices than *yes* or *no*, and *why?* in the source study.
If there are many different errors in your written work, which type(s) of errors do you want your English teacher to point out most? A) Organization, B) Grammar, C) content/idea, D) punctuation, E) spelling, F) Vocabulary, G) add another type (if any). Explain your choice.

Rationale: Amrhein and Nassaji’s study used a questionnaire only that collected both quantitative and qualitative data. In this study, the researcher opted for a complete separation between quantitative and qualitative questions. Interview questions 3 and 4 here sought qualitative answers.

Chen and Lin (2009) 23- I benefited from reading my teacher’s comments 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = no comment, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

23- When you receive your writing feedback from your teacher, you …
- generally know how to correct your mistakes in the future
- ask the teacher about only those feedback points that you do not understand
- do not know how to avoid those mistakes in future writing tasks
- memorize the correction of the mistakes to use in future writing.

Rationale: The aim of Item 23 in this study was to pursue an understanding of L2 writers’ attitude towards TF, and thus, their uptake of it. Receiving a variety of replies to that item helped in recognizing the form of uptake of the feedback received from the teacher.
While revising, I accepted all of my teacher’s comments
1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = no comment, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

When you receive the writing feedback from your teacher, you…
- tell yourself that the teacher is always right as this error is something new you are learning
- reject some corrections when they do not agree with the previous knowledge you have about the language
- feel there is no need for it because mistakes will be corrected by time.

Rationale: The reason underpinning this modification was the need to uncover details of L2 writers’ beliefs about TF, and the process that takes place whilst reading the TF to decide on the action that the learner would take afterwards with regard to how to use that feedback (for more profound understanding of TF uptake).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tsui and Ng (2000)</td>
<td>15- I liked the peer response sessions. 1=not at all 6=very much</td>
<td>14- After receiving your peer feedback on your writing, you might discuss the feedback with your peer Always - Often - Sometimes - Rarely - Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale: The source’s items was morphed in that way in order to uncover the fact whether a learner, in the first place, might take the initiative and decide to speak to their peer about the PF, or might simply accept that feedback without pursuing explanation and clarification of that feedback received.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21- I liked the way that my classmates gave me written comments on my compositions</td>
<td>11- You accept your peer feedback on your writing. 1=not at all 6=very much</td>
<td>Always - Often - Sometimes - Rarely - Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- I found my classmates' comments in peer response sessions useful</td>
<td>12- You use your peer feedback on your writing</td>
<td>Always - Often - Sometimes - Rarely - Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- I benefited from my classmates' comments in peer response sessions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale: The researcher opted for the action verb *accept* rather than *liked* for more accuracy and clarity for participants. In addition, the frequency of accepting PF was the objective of item 11 here.

3.2.2.2 The Interview. Interviewing was the second data collection instrument adopted in this study. As pointed out by Miller and Crabtree (1999), an interview is an event of sharing cultural knowledge; the interlocutors engage in a convention of turn-taking, conversation etiquette, and linguistic utterances. They elaborated on the merits of interviews by saying that they are an illustration of a high level of communication routine, and thus, they are extremely
effective as a ‘versatile’ instrument for research. Nunan and Bailey (2009) posited that interviews are the most commonly used among a range of qualitative data collection tools.

Among the various types of interviews, the pre-prepared highly structured type was the one used in the current study. A ‘one-to-one professional conversation’ (Kvale, 1996, p. 5) is what the researcher intended to employ to obtain qualitative data about PF and TF perceptions from L2 writers. Also, the interview was a single session type (Nunan and Bailey, 2009) owing to the time constraints of the study although Polkinghorne (2005) doubted its effectiveness in extracting descriptions from the sample of participants that are rich in sufficient detail. According to Polkinghorne, the researcher needs multiple sessions to (a) break the ice with the interviewee, (b) to orientate them on the purpose and the nature of the study, and (c) to allow the chance for the interviewee to be familiar with the topic and be ready with deeper thoughts about the experience in question; however, in this study, the researcher interviewed his former learners who have been practicing peer feedback, and thus, found no need for multiple sessions.

The interview used in this study was a structured seven-question interview developed by the researcher, with the exception of items 3 and 4 (as explained earlier). As shown in Appendix B, questions 1 and 2 targeted RQ1; how the participants perceive the benefits and drawbacks of both PF and TF respectively. Additionally, questions 3 and 4 targeted what L2 writers found the most attention paid to in all writing features in PF and TF; the interviewees provided qualitative data about their analysis of why some writing features were prioritized in both PF and TF. Questions 5 and 6, nevertheless, required the participants to reflect on their reactions towards PF and TF, and by asking them for elaboration, their answers provided an idea about the landscape of beliefs and attitudes they had about these two types of feedback. Finally, question 7 was designed to collect data about the impact of the independent variable of gender on how females
and males differed in their perception of feedback from the peer and from the teacher. The interview questions were:

1. From your point of view, name one most important advantage, and one most serious disadvantage in classmate feedback on your writing. Why?

2. From your point of view, name one most important advantage, and one most serious disadvantage in teacher feedback on your writing. Why?

3. Do your classmate and your teacher focus on the same types of error in your writing? How?

4. What types of errors do you wish to have more feedback on from your peer and your teacher?

5. How do you react to the writing feedback you get from your classmate? Why do you react that way?

6. How do you react to the writing feedback you get from your teacher? Why do you react that way?

7. Do you believe all learners of your gender have the same idea about classmate feedback and teacher feedback like you do? Why?

3.2.2.3 Collecting Writing Samples. Finally, the third data collection instrument was collecting writing samples from learners. Those samples were studied to help in answering RQ2. The researcher was in possession of a considerable number of written essays done by L2 writers in A2, B1 and B2 levels from authentic in-class tasks. The samples collected were 16 in total, and each sample was in two copies: One copy for PF provision, and the other for TF. The writing samples in this study were independent writing tasks, not integrated writing ones, as practiced in the LD. As mentioned earlier, out of researcher’s corpus, the writing samples selected for this study were those where the PF provided was holistic, i.e., targeting eight writing features, to
compare that with TF. Those writing samples where PF was focused on certain writing features were excluded for a more general view of PF and TF.

3.2.3 Steps Used in Data Collection

With respect to the first data collection instrument, the participants were sent the questionnaire electronically to fill in. The researcher included a few lines at the top of the Google form, explaining the study’s aim to guarantee that participants were all well informed about the scope of the study. Participants were assured as well—through a consent item in the Google form—that the data collection process was entirely anonymous, so no names, contact numbers, or email addresses were collected through the Google form. To ensure that all participants would read that consent item, it was marked as Answer Required, which is a feature in Google Forms that does not permit the submission of the form unless the marked item is seen and answered by the participant.

As the study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic situation throughout 2021 and 2022, the data instrument was designed, administered and filled in entirely electronically. The SCE was informed prior to disseminating the questionnaire, and their approval was granted provided that the learners participating were former and not current learners of the researcher in order for them to be encouraged to participate, and not to suspect any threat to their grade in the course in case they were the researcher’s current learners.

The questionnaire items were phrased in diverse ways. To relieve the monotony of items, some were in interrogative form, sentence completion form, and some were affirmative sentences needing confirmation or repudiation. The question-form items were especially worded carefully in order not to be leading questions, i.e., not subtly pointing the participants’ answer in a certain direction (Dornyie, 2007). Closed-ended questions, moreover, were utilized
subsequently to serve the purpose of the study, and the researcher attempted almost the full range of question types available on Google forms to break the monotony that participants might have felt, especially in light of the length of the questionnaire.

Conducting interviews, on the other hand, required adequate planning. The researcher invited participants through a WhatsApp message inviting them for an online meeting via an online meeting platform (i.e., Zoom meetings). Participants were informed explicitly that the meeting was recorded for data analysis purposes, and were advised not to turn their web camera on so that their identity would be treated with confidentiality. In addition, prior to the meeting commencement, the need to record the meeting was reiterated to them for additional confirmation.

3.3 Data Analysis Techniques

The responses collected from the questionnaire were exported to an MS Excel spreadsheet and coded for data analysis. For single-answer multiple choice items, each answer was given a code from 1 to 3 for the three-choice item, and from 1 to 4 for the four-choice one. On the other hand, questionnaire items allowing for checking more than one answer were binary coded, where (0) meant that an answer was not checked, and (1) meant that it was. Frequency, t-tests, and Chi-square tests were run on the data through SPSS statistical software, version 23. The values of the mean, standard deviation, mode and p-value were calculated to obtain the study results.

The responses of interviews were treated differently. In total, seven learners were interviewed: three males and four females in two proficiency levels (i.e., B1 and B2), age groups, and educational backgrounds. The names provided in Appendix D are the pseudonyms given to interviewees. The digital files of the recorded interviews from Zoom meetings were exported to
electronic transcription software (www.otter.ai) to generate transcribed interviews. The transcription of interviews was reviewed to remove interjections and mannerism, and to adjust verb conjugations. Following that, the transcription of all seven interviews was exported to an MS Excel spreadsheet to spot the patterns of answers and the commonality within each question of all seven learners. Codes were then established within which the answers were categorised. Appendix C in the appendices section displays the coding of textual analysis.

As for the writing samples, the researcher collected 16 writing samples produced during writing in-class tasks done by the SCE’s LD learners. The writing samples were from A2, B1 and B2 learners who collaborated to write essays of different lengths. Each sample was in two copies: one was corrected by the peer and the other by the researcher himself. The feedback was categorised into eight categories: vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, linking, coherence, capitalization, prepositions, and spelling. The feedback under each category was manually counted once in the peer copy and another in the researcher copy. A table was then compiled to compare between both types of feedback for each category and for each sample. The table compiled in Chapter 4 (Table 6) provides the breakdown of the instances of feedback for every category. Data from the writing samples was quantitatively analysed to pinpoint the difference between the areas of feedback focus from the peer and from the teacher.

3.4 Conclusion

To conclude, this chapter explicated the methodology employed to carry out the thesis research. Employing three data collection tools: a questionnaire of 35 items, multiple interviews of seven questions, and authentic writing sample from in-class tasks, the researcher collected data from 88 participants, who were the researcher’s former students. The questionnaire and the
writing samples were dedicated for collecting quantitative data, whereas the interviewees were devised to collect qualitative data.

All 88 participants were enrolled in general English classes at the LD of the SCE; 81 filled in the questionnaire, and seven were audio and video interviewed by the researcher himself. In addition, the writing samples utilized, 16 samples in total, were each reviewed twice: one time by the peer, and another by the teacher (the researcher).

The data analysis process was divided into different phases. In the first phase, all quantitative data obtained from the questionnaire were exported to an MS Excel spreadsheet and were coded for the analysis that was conducted using SPSS ver. 23. From that, means and standard deviations were extracted. Moreover, a t-test and a Chi-square test were conducted for the comparison between the variables. In another phase, the interviews were transcribed online, the transcription was reviewed for adjustment, the text was analysis to generate patterns, and the patterns were coded for reporting in the study. Finally, in the last phase, the writing samples were analyzed, and the instances of errors highlighted by the peer and by the teacher were tallied for analysis and reporting in the next chapter, i.e., the results.
Chapter Four: Results

This chapter displays the results of the data analysis carried out on the data collected through the different data collection instruments utilized in this study. The research study was conducted with the primary goal of comparing between the perceptions of PF and TF from different perspectives. The study aimed to investigate (a) adult Egyptian L2 writer’s perceptions of PF and TF, (b) the writing features that the peer and the teacher prioritize in their writing feedback, (c) their perceptions of uptake of the writing feedback received from the peer versus the teacher, and finally (d) the extent to which female and male L2 writers perceive PF and TF differently.

This chapter illustrates the qualitative and quantitative data collected and analysed in accordance to the above-mentioned research questions and in the same order. For optimum illustration, data will be shown in tables, bar charts, pie charts.

4.1 RQ1: L2 Writer’s Perceptions of PF and TF

Perceptions of PF and TF were investigated in RQ1. Results of the descriptive and the inferential analysis of the data collected through questionnaire and interviewing will be illustrated hereunder. Tables 5-8 below provide descriptive analysis of items from 5 to 17 in the questionnaire that examined the L2 writers’ perceptions of PF and TF. As the study drew an analogy primarily between PF and TF, some items are displayed in figures for optimum illustration of PF perceptions versus TF perceptions.

In Table 5, by looking into the mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) of each of those items, in item 6, the participants believed that only the teacher can provide feedback as 69 out of the 81 participants (84.2%) chose the three options: strongly agree (coded as 1 for the data
analysis, agree (coded as 2), and neutral (coded as 3); however, the mean score was 2.3 as the two options strongly agree and neutral were quite close in their percentages of selection.

**Table 5**

*Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages of Agreement of the Perceptions of PF and TF*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Percentage of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. It is only the teacher who can give you feedback on your writing.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>29.6% 24.7% 30.9% 12.3% 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Your writing can improve through feedback from your peer.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>25.9% 21.0% 27.2% 17.3% 8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Giving feedback to the peer needs training.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>37.0% 29.6% 24.7% 7.4% 1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. You believe in your peer feedback ability to correct your writing.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.9% 21.0% 45.7% 16% 7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note. N = 81**

The feedback from the peer was believed to be effective by the participants (item 7), but not completely, as the mean score was 2.6 (2 = agree; 3 = neutral) and SD = 1.3. One quarter of them (25.9%) chose strongly agree (coded as 1), roughly one fifth (21%) chose agree (coded as 2), and slightly above another quarter (27.2%) selected neutral (coded as 3). The importance of training on how to provide PF was manifested in the participants' choices in item 8; two thirds of participants (66.6%) selected strongly agree and agree, the mean score was 2.1 where (2) was agree (SD = 1.2), and the highest percentage was recorded for the strongly agree option (37%). Moreover, when asked in item 16 about their confidence in the peer’s ability to provide
feedback, the result signaled a non-conclusive view as 45.7% of them were neutral, while almost 31% of the sample chose both strongly agree and agree. The mean was 2.9, where (3) was neutral on the Likert scale.

Table 6

*Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages of Frequency of the Perceptions of PF and TF*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Percentage of Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. You accept your teacher feedback on your writing.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. You use your teacher feedback on your writing.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. You accept your peer feedback on your writing.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. You use your peer feedback on your writing.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. After receiving your teacher feedback on your writing, you</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discuss the feedback with your teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. After receiving your peer feedback on your writing, you</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discuss the feedback with your peer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $N = 81$*

In Table 6, more frequency items are displayed. In item 9, the acceptance of TF was consistent as the analysis results showed a high percentage of 84% for Always and a mean score of 1.2. In contrast, item 11, that investigated the participants’ acceptance of PF, showed a mean
score of 2.3 and an SD value of 1.1, indicating a lower level of acceptance compared to TF: 84% of participants chose Always in item 9 about TF, whereas only 33.3% chose Always for PF. To illustrate, in item 9 about TF, 96.3% of them selected Always and Often, but in PF (item 11), only 51.8% selected Always and Often, and almost 40% of the sample was neutral.

Additionally, item 10 indicated that the majority used that feedback: 97.5% of them selected Always and Often. The mean score recorded was 1.2 where code (1) referred to Always, and code (2) referred to Often. Conversely, the following item—item 12—about the use of PF showed that 2.6 was scored in the mean indicating less use of PF than TF as fewer than half the participants (43.2%) chose Always and Often. In the same vein, from the figures recorded in items 13 and 14, it was apparent that the participants preferred to discuss the feedback they received with both the peer and the teacher, as the mean value in both items was identical: 2.4 for both PF and TF (2 = Often; 3 = Sometimes), and 27.2% of the sample chose Always for PF and TF alike.

The analogy drawn between TF and PF in Table 6 is further illustrated in the following figures: Figure 4 illustrates the difference in TF and PF acceptance by L2 writers, Figure 5 shows the extent to which L2 writers use TF and PF, and lastly, Figure 6 presents the percentage of those L2 writers who discuss the feedback they receive on their writing with the teacher and with the peer.

**Figure 4**

*The Difference in TF and PF Acceptance by L2 Writers*
Note. The percentages illustrated are round numbers

Figure 5

The Difference in TF and PF Use by L2 Writers

Note. The percentages illustrated are round numbers
Figure 6

The Difference in TF and PF Discussion by L2 Writers

Note. The percentages illustrated are round numbers

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations and percentages of Usefulness of the Perceptions of PF and TF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Percentage of Usefulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If you repeat an error more than once, you believe that highlighting the error every time it happens is … Useful - Somehow useful - Neutral - Somehow useless - Useless</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 81$
Table 7 above shows the percentages of usefulness of highlighting an error every time it occurs. Item 17 in the questionnaire enquiring about that showed that the participants believed it was useful as more than three quarters of them (80.3%) selected both option (1) *useful* and option (2) *somewhat useful* ($M = 1.7; SD = 1.0$).

**Table 8**

*Percentages of Responses of the Perceptions of PF and TF*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. How do you find the teacher feedback on your writing versus your peer feedback?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher feedback is important</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Both teacher feedback and classmate feedback are equally important</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Peer feedback is important</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Which is easier for you to understand?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Your teacher feedback</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No difference in clarity and ease of understanding between both</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Your classmate feedback</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 81*

More responses to the perceptions of PF and TF are presented in Table 8 above. In item 5, participants were divided between (a) the importance of only TF, or (b) the equal importance of TF and PF, with more participants believing that TF was more important (60.5%) and (2) *Both TF and PF are equally important* (39.5%). None of the participants believed that PF was more important as that option recorded 0% of participants’ selection. As for the ease of understanding–
item 15—all participants selected the first two options: TF and No difference, with 75.3% of the sample selecting TF and 24.7% selecting the No difference in ease of understanding between TF and PF option, and thus, the results indicated more inclination towards TF. Similar to item 5, none of the participants opted for the peer’s feedback as easier to understand than TF.

In addition to the above, the first two interview questions garnered qualitative data from participants on their perceptions of PF and TF. Through the thematic analysis of the transcribed interviews, it was further manifest that L2 writers acknowledge the value of PF, in addition to their appreciation of TF. However, the interview questions were unique in their ability to obtain revealing insights from participants about the merits and demerits of both PF and TF. When asked about the most important advantages of PF, it was discernible that the participants agreed that it was beneficial for diverse reasons. The qualitative responses mentioned the following benefits: (a) The possibility of requesting the peer to provide feedback on a specific writing feature was mentioned by Yara: “We come to correct to each other the grammar mistakes.”; (b) Learning from PF and gaining new knowledge from it; some participants mentioned the avoidance of repeating mistakes after PF, and how the different perspectives of the peer helped in learning from each other.

The participants were also asked about the disadvantages they experienced whilst practicing providing and receiving feedback from the peer. The responses to that question included a variety of drawbacks; feelings of embarrassment and insecurity were reported by some (Abdallah & Hala): “Peers may feel some negative things like embarrassment” and “I feel insecure … A lot of people see this feedback that it's against them or annoy [sic] them or put [sic] them in a bad situation.” Some other participants spoke about their lack of trust that the peer could provide effective feedback; they believed that the peer in a similar proficiency level was
not qualified to give feedback, the peer’s patience and attention span to give comprehensive feedback were quite limited, and that peers themselves make language mistakes, so they cannot be trusted entirely to carry out the task of giving feedback. One unique perspective was provided by one of the interviewees, Yara, who said: “Someone insists on his point”, which signaled a serious issue with PF and that is the disagreements and conflicts of opinions arising during PF.

The following question in the one-to-one interview was about the advantages and disadvantages of TF. Diverse reasons were reported in the participants’ responses. The teacher as an ultimate source of knowledge, reliable notes that can be taken from the teacher’s explanation, the benefit of the teacher’s advice and guidance, the teacher having the right tools to deliver knowledge, and having effective techniques to address learners’ weaknesses were how the participants perceived the upside of TF. One participant, Mayar, had a unique perspective about TF by saying: “The behaviour of the teacher [in giving feedback] is important”, and that was in reference to how the teacher gives feedback in a way that does not inhibit or belittle the learners’ effort in the writing task. As for the disadvantages, while some participants did not report any disadvantages, some mentioned the teacher’s: Insufficient knowledge to deliver feedback, inadequate time allotted for feedback, inaccuracy of feedback due to misunderstanding the meaning that the L2 writers intended to convey, and being judgmental, i.e., writing comments might mock learners’ mistakes. It is worth noting that the last disadvantage mentioned here was reported by the same participant (Mayar) who highlighted the importance of the teacher’s responsible attitude when providing feedback.

4.2 RQ2: The Writing Features Prioritized in PF Versus TF

RQ2 was framed to address what writing features the peer prioritized in writing feedback in comparison to those features prioritized by the teacher in their feedback. It is important to be
reminded that the participating L2 writers provided PF during a regular in-class writing task without being given training or guidelines on how to provide feedback. Therefore, it was noticed that the peer focused on some writing features and overlooked some others. Results of the descriptive and the inferential analysis of the data collected through writing samples and interviews are displayed hereunder.

As mentioned previously, 16 writing samples from three different proficiency levels were compiled for this study. The results of the count of instances of eight different errors are demonstrated in Table 9 and Figure 4. By looking at the error instances count, it is noticed that there were significant differences between errors count in all writing features except in the vocabulary feature where the total of errors commented on by the peer were close to those by the teacher, i.e., 90 and 87 instances respectively. Furthermore, it can be noted that the instances count in TF were higher than those in PF in all the eight writing features; TF ranged from 37% to 63% higher than PF. Coherence and Prepositions recorded exceptional difference where the percentage of differences between PF and TF were 2.6 times and 2.2 times respectively higher in favor of TF.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency level</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Voc</th>
<th>Gr</th>
<th>Punct</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Coh</th>
<th>Cap</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Sp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. S = Sample; Voc = Vocabulary; Gr = Grammar; Punct = Punctuation; Link = Linking; Coh = Coherence; Cap = Capitalization; Prep = Preposition; Sp = Spelling

This disparity in the instances of writing features highlighted in PF and TF in the writing samples is further supported through the qualitative interview responses. The sample of participants of the current study provided diverse answers to those questions about the writing features that both PF and TF focus on. In the case of PF, while some participants indicated specific writing features, such as sentence structure, tenses, vocabulary, spelling, grammar and word count, the majority of participants agreed that the peer did not focus on more substantive features, such as the coherence of the written subject or its value. This is supported by the results obtained from the writing samples that coherence is one of the rather least highlighted writing features.

Figure 7

The Count of Error Instances of Eight Writing Features as Highlighted in PF Versus TF

Note. N = 16 samples; Voc = Vocabulary; Gr = Grammar; Punct = Punctuation; Link = Linking; Coh = Coherence; Cap = Capitalization; Prep = Preposition; Sp = Spelling
Some participants showed disapproval that the peer focused on insignificant features (e.g., spelling) and ignored feedback on the major ideas of their writing production. One interviewee (Amgad) said: ‘Peers spot only the things that make the line look bad, or look like it is not correct”, which signified one of the disadvantages of PF. However, the participants’ responses as regards TF showed focus on all writing features, general and specific. More than one participant stated the fact that the teacher provided feedback in accordance to set criteria, and thus, the teacher had a more comprehensive approach in their provision of feedback. A few participants mentioned specifically how they appreciated the teacher’s focus on relevance, the building of a paragraph, and cohesion between paragraphs. Those opinions were plainly evident in the writing samples; TF scanned all writing features, and was consistently more frequent than PF as depicted in Figure 4.

For further illustration, Table 10 and Figure 5 hereunder provide more analysis of writing features. They show further the distinction between PF and TF in the percentage of every writing feature from the total number of errors highlighted by the peer and by the teacher. As shown in Table 10, the vocabulary feature occupied the largest percentages out of the total instances of errors in PF (211 instances) and TF (293 instances).

Table 10

The Percentage of Every Writing Feature of the Total Errors in PF Versus TF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voc</th>
<th>Gr</th>
<th>Punct</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Coh</th>
<th>Cap</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Sp</th>
<th>Total instances of error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PF in %</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF in %</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 16 samples; Voc = Vocabulary; Gr = Grammar; Punct = Punctuation; Link = Linking; Coh = Coherence; Cap = Capitalization; Prep = Preposition; Sp = Spelling
4.3 RQ3: The Perceptions of Uptake of PF Versus TF

In this section, the results of data analysis conducted to gauge the perception of uptake of PF and TF is presented. RQ3 was utilized with the objective of comparing between the participants’ perception of PF and TF uptake. For that question, data was collected through the questionnaire and the interviews. Hence, descriptive statistics of the questionnaire item results, and the thematic analysis of the interviews are provided hereunder.
The percentages of participants’ selection in items 18-26 concerning the uptake of TF, and in items 27-35 concerning the uptake of PF are illustrated. In addition, the result of the Chi-Square test that compared between the perceptions of uptake of both types of feedback (PF and TF) are shown. Tables 11 to 19 illustrate the percentages of option selection, the p-value and df of questionnaire items 18 to 35. The p-value as well indicates the existence or non-existence of significant difference between TF and PF, and consequently the non-validity or validity of the null hypothesis respectively.

In Table 11, items 18 and 27 enquired about the participants’ perceptions of uptake in terms of reviewing the written feedback from the teacher and the peer. For these two items, option (1) was *read it carefully to use it in future writing*, while option (2) was *do not generally use all that feedback in future writing*. With the percentages of selection of TF and PF illustrated, that indicated that participants read the TF and PF carefully to use them in future assignments. Although the TF recorded 96.3% of selection, which is higher than the PF’s 84%, the p-value was $0.440 > .05$ indicating that there was no significant difference between TF and PF in that respect.

**Table 11**

*The Perceptions of Using TF and PF in Future Writing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/27. As soon as you receive the writing feedback from your teacher/peer, you read it carefully to use it in future writing</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do not generally use all that feedback in future writing</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 81; p < .05*

The following items in Table 12, 19 and 28, were used to collect data about the best
feedback form that participants found beneficial for feedback comprehension. While they found that *long sentences to provide detailed feedback* was the most beneficial from the teacher (59.8% of them selected it), bullet points from the peer were the clearest feedback form (43.2% of the 81 participants selected it). The results yielded no significant differences in how participants perceived the optimum form of TF and PF except for the *long sentences to provide detailed feedback* option as its *p*-value recorded .001 which was <.05 indicating that the null hypothesis was null for that option. On the other hand, all participants agreed that receiving *words like ‘you’ & ‘your’ as if the teacher/peer is talking to you personally* was the least favorable feedback form from both the teacher and the peer, yielding 22.2% and 27.2% respectively, and the *t*-test indicated no significant difference between perceptions (*p* = .209 > .05).

**Table 12**

*The Perceptions of TF and PF Format*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th><em>p</em>-value</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19/28. Generally, you like the writing feedback you receive from your teacher/peer to be</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- in a paragraph</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- in long sentences to provide detailed explanation</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- including words like ‘you’ &amp; ‘your’ as if the teacher/peer is talking to you personally</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *N* = 81; *p* < .05

The writing features that attracted the participants’ attention the most when they received feedback, were investigated in items 20 and 29–Table 13. When comparing TF and PF, the results showed feedback on *grammar, linking words* and *vocabulary* were in the top three
features preferred by the participants in TF with percentages of selection at 82.7%, 75.3% and 71.6% respectively. In the case of PF, on the other hand, *vocabulary* (61.7%), *grammar* (55.6%), and *organization* (47.5%) were the top three ones. In contrast, fulfilling the word count required by the writing task was the least features that L2 writers were interested in, with percentages of selection at 28.4% in TF, and 19.8% in PF. Moreover, the *t*-test showed no significant difference between their selection of *vocabulary* and the *word count* features with *p*-values of .06 (> .05) for the former and .07 (> .05) for the latter. It is worth noting that there was a significant difference between TF and PF uptake in all writing features (i.e., grammar, punctuation, linking words, organization of ideas, responding fully to the writing task, and spelling) with their *p*-values all under .05.

**Table 13**

*The Perceptions of Writing Features as Interested in by L2 Writers in TF and PF*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th><em>p</em>-value</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking words</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to the writing task in full</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of words (i.e., The writing fulfils the word count)</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 81; p < .05*

Another element that factored in the uptake of TF and PF uptake was explicitness of feedback, i.e., whether it was direct, indirect, provided orally through conferencing, or given in a
commentary form. The questionnaire items that looked into that were items 21 and 30 presented in Table 14. The analysis showed that both direct written and oral through conferencing were the two most selected options. The percentages of selection were 90.1% for TF and 74.1% for PF in the case of the direct option, and the p-value showed .000 indicating a statistical significant difference. As for the feedback that is given orally in a one-to-one conferencing with the teacher/peer, the percentages recorded were 34.6% for TF and 28.4% for PF, but the p-value showed no significant difference (p = .169 > .05). Nevertheless, the least selected form of TF was the general commentary with no specific correction of errors at 16.0%, while from the peer, the least was the indirect form of feedback at 12.3%. It is worth indicating that there was a significant difference between TF and PF in the indirect option (p = .003 < .05), while no significant difference was generated in the t-test for the commentary option (p = .126 > .05).

Table 14

The Perceptions of TF and PF Forms as Preferred by L2 Writers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/30. You understand well the writing feedback that is *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- direct; the teacher/peer just gives the correction</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- indirect; the teacher/peer just highlights that there is a mistake and leaves you to find it out and correct it</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- given orally through a one-to-one meeting with your teacher/peer</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- commentary; the teacher/peer just provides comments about the overall quality of my writing but no specific mistakes are corrected</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 81; p < .05

Further scrutinizing of the differences of perceptions of TF and PF uptake was conducted
in Table 15: items 22 and 31. These two items gauged the perceptions of participants’ attitude towards TF and PF. When asked about their attitude when they received the writing feedback from their teacher, *tell yourself that the teacher is always right as these errors are something new you are learning* was the most selected at 86.4%, followed by *reject some corrections when they do not match the previous knowledge you have about the language* at 21.0%, and the least selected option was *feel there is no need for it because mistakes will be corrected by time* 6.2%.

**Table 15**

**The Perceptions of L2 Writers’ Reaction Towards Receiving TF and PF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>( p )-value</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/31. When you receive the writing feedback from your teacher/peer, you *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>tell yourself that the teacher/peer is always right as these errors are something new you are learning</em></td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>reject some corrections when they do not match the previous knowledge you have about the language</em></td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>feel there is no need for it because mistakes will be corrected by time</em></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 81; \( p < .05 \)*

Conversely, the attitude towards PF was different according to the results. The *reject some corrections when they do not match the previous knowledge you have about the language* was the most selected by participants at 58.0%, the *tell yourself that the peer is always right as these errors are something new you are learning* came next with a percentage of 45.7%, and as in the case of TF, the *feel there is no need for it because mistakes will be corrected by time* option came last as well at 4.9%. Further evidence for that difference in perceptions between TF and PF emerged in the \( t \)-test. The \( p \)-values of *tell yourself that the teacher/peer is always right as these errors are something new you are learning* was
errors are something new you are learning and reject some corrections when they do not match the previous knowledge you have about the language were both .000 (< .05) indicating the presence of significant difference, while there was no significant difference between TF and PF responses to feel there is no need for it because mistakes will be corrected by time option.

Moving to items 23 and 32 in Table 16, the participants’ attitude towards TF and PF was further investigated. The two items enquired about how L2 writers perceive TF and PF uptake in terms of their attitude towards receiving feedback. The items read When you receive your writing feedback from your teacher/peer, you ..., and it was a single choice question. With a p-value of .001 (< .05), there existed statistical difference between participant’s beliefs about TF and PF.

Table 16

The Perceptions of TF and PF Uptake by L2 Writers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23/32. When you receive your writing feedback from your teacher/peer, you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- generally know how to correct your mistakes in the future</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do not know how to avoid those mistakes in the future</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ask the teacher/peer about only those corrections that you do not understand</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- memorize the correction of the mistakes to use in future writing</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 81; p < .05

From the highest selection to the lowest, in case of TF, 48.1% of the sample of participants selected generally know how to correct your mistakes in the future, 25.9% chose memorize the correction of the mistakes to use in future writing, 19.8% opted for ask the teacher about only those corrections that you do not understand, and the least selected option was do not know how
to avoid those mistakes in the future with only 6.2% of the sample choosing it. By looking at the results in case of PF, the order of option selection was different. The highest percentage and the lowest percentage options in TF remained the same in PF at 43.2% and 8.6% respectively. However, do not know how to avoid those mistakes in the future and memorize the correction of the mistakes to use in future writing options followed an order opposite to that in case of TF (34.6% & 13.6% respectively).

**Table 17**

*The Perceptions of Motivation Upon Receiving TF and PF*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/33. When you receive a lot of correction on your writing from your teacher/peer, you …</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- feel encouraged to work on reducing the number of errors in the following tasks</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- feel demotivated to work on your mistakes because they are many</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 81; p < .05*

In addition to beliefs and attitude, motivation as well plays a role in the intensity of feedback uptake. L2 writers’ perceptions of uptake from the perspective of motivation were measured in items 24 and 33 (Table 17). To study their perceptions of the motivation, the two items asked the participants: *When you receive a lot of correction on your writing from your teacher, you ...* Both items were a single choice question, the percentages for TF and PF scored identically for the most part as illustrated in the table. Furthermore, the *t*-test showed the value of 1.00 (> .05) proving no significant difference between TF and PF. Looking at the figures in item 24 that addressed TF, a predominant percentage of 80.8% of the participants selected *feel encouraged to work on reducing the number of errors in the following tasks*, and 19.2% elected
to pick feel demotivated to work on your mistakes because they are many. The results of the PF in item 33 were almost identical; the aforementioned options received 81.0% and 19.0% respectively.

Table 18 illustrates how the influence of motivation on feedback uptake was further tested through items 25 and 34. The questionnaire items read The teacher’s/peer’s words like "good job", "well done" & "excellent" on your writing task ... to gauge the effect of these verbal-like phrases of motivation when included in the written feedback.

**Table 18**

*The Perceptions of TF and PF Expressions of Encouragement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25/34. The teacher’s/peer’s words like &quot;good job&quot;, &quot;well done&quot; &amp; &quot;excellent&quot; on your writing task ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- motivate you to do better in future tasks</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do not make any difference to you</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are usually ignored by you and you do not notice them</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are a waste of the teacher’s time; you just need the feedback to push you to do better</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 81; p < .05*  

Designed as a single choice question, the percentages of choosing the options indicated that the participants believed that expressions of motivation did encourage them to perform better. The p-value generated was .01 (< .05); an indication that there was a significant difference between TF and PF in that respect. In more precise detail, motivate you to do better in future tasks option was the most favorable in TF (97.5%) and PF (82.7%); and do not make any difference to you option followed the first one in terms of the percentage of L2 writers selecting it with 1.2% for TF and
12.3% for PF. As for the third option: *usually ignored by you and you do not notice them*, none of the participants chose it in TF, while 2.5% of them chose it in PF. The last option: *are a waste of the teacher’s time; you just need the feedback to push you to do better* was an interesting case in both TF and PF; in TF, it scored identically to the second option (1.2%); however, in PF, it scored identically to the third option (2.5%).

Table 19 illustrates further scrutiny of beliefs, and how that impacted the participants’ perceptions of uptake. That was carried out in item 26: *You see that receiving writing feedback from your teacher ....* Four options were provided for them to check all the ones that applied. The first option was *helps you to improve*, the second was *only justifies the grade you received*, the third was *is considered part of the teacher’s duty*, and the last option was *is not that important as you only want to pass the course*.

**Table 19**

*The Perceptions of TF and PF Effect on Writing Improvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>PF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. You see that receiving writing feedback from your teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- helps you to improve</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- only justifies the grade you received</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is considered part of the teacher’s duty</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is not that important as you only want to pass the course</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. You see that receiving writing feedback from your peer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- helps you to improve</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- does not help you to improve</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 81*
The first option was the most checked with 100% of participants checking it. That was followed by the third option with a few over one quarter of them (27.2%) choosing it, the second option was selected by a marginal 3.7% of the participants, and finally, the fourth option was not selected by any of the participants. Similar to the previous item, item 35 also collected data about the participants’ beliefs towards feedback, but with respect to PF. The items required choosing either of two options. The item read *You see that receiving writing feedback from your peer …*, and two options were provided: the first was *helps you to improve*, while the second was *does not help you to improve*. A sweeping 90% of participants selected the first, while 10% selected the second.

To validate the quantitative analysis carried out on the questionnaire data, the perceptions of uptake were investigated qualitatively through interviews as well. Questions 5 and 6 in the interview were utilized to gather data from participants about their reactions towards feedback received from the peer and from the teacher. From the responses of the seven participants to their reactions towards PF, it was quite explicit that they exercised caution towards the use of it. Five of the participants who took part in the interviews reported their acceptance of PF, and incorporating the peer’s comments in future writing tasks. That agrees with questionnaire item 27 that showed that L2 writers used PF in the same way they use TF (close mean values of 1.0 for TF and 1.2 for PF). Some L2 writers highlighted the importance of the teacher’s validation of the peer’s comments before they could use those comments: “I wait for the teacher to correct it for me to be sure” as reported by Othman. The others expressed acceptance of PF and revising their writing accordingly should they find that the peer’s comments were valid. Two participants (Mayar and Yara) said they preferred to listen carefully to the feedback of the peer for the purpose of learning from it as, according to them, the peer
provided feedback from a perspective different to theirs, and thus, it was beneficial to listen to the peer. An interesting view was expounded by one of the participants (Yara) who explained how accepting feedback relied significantly on the peer’s character and the strength of their relationship with that peer: “I think it depends on the character that I can accept this.” The participants referred specifically to the traits of flexibility or stubbornness displayed by some peers in providing feedback, and how that influenced the acceptance of the feedback from them in the first place. Amgad, for instance, was of the opinion that “I don't like classmates judging me . . . classmates don't have the way to handle things”. Nevertheless, two participants specifically vocalized their rejection of PF. They said that they did not take PF seriously, and they both mentioned the trait of being judgmental. For them, the peer expressing a personal judgement on their writing in a way that was not sufficiently tactful made them reject it entirely. Both also said that the teacher was more skilled in that aspect.

Moving from the L2 writers’ reactions towards PF, detailed views and reactions towards TF were also provided. The participants’ categorical acceptance of TF was quite manifest. All seven participants agreed on the immense value of TF, and this is identical to the results obtained from the questionnaire; all participants read TF carefully to use it in future writing. Their responses included views in favor of TF as it helped them make progress in their writing owing to its accuracy, and addressing the core of the learner’s weaknesses. The participants also praised TF on account of the teacher’s genuineness and honesty in delivering feedback as the teacher, according to them, always wanted what was in their best interest: “I totally accept it because the teacher always wants what is in my best interest to become much better in the writing” (Mayar). The participants as well mentioned the unique way that the teacher usually has in delivering feedback and being resourceful, i.e., having various techniques for feedback provision. Some
participants stressed the fact they felt encouraged to return back to their teacher with questions should they need clarification on the feedback they received (Abdallah).

4.4 RQ4: Differences in Perceptions of PF and TF by Female and Male L2 Writers

The last research question in the current study attempted to uncover any gender differences in how PF and TF were perceived. To achieve that, the researcher employed the questionnaire—including all questions—and the interviews. As previously mentioned, 81 mixed gender participants filled in the questionnaire: 35 males and 46 females, and their demographic data are show in Table 2. The results of the analyses are presented hereunder.

A t-test was undergone using SPSS software to compare between genders in their perceptions of PF and TF, which writing features both genders believed the peer and the teacher prioritized in feedback, and their perceptions of uptake of PF and TF. The results of the t-test are arranged in Table 20 and Table 21 below. Table 20 displays the M and SD of male and female participants’ choices, in addition to the p-value to indicate the presence of a significant difference between genders, and hence the invalidity of the null hypothesis, or the absence of a significant difference and the plausibility of the hypothesis. On the other hand, Table 21 illustrates the percentages of the options selected, and the p-value of the participants’ choices by gender. From the values presented in the tables, it was concluded explicitly and evidently that there was no significant difference between male and female participants in (a) their perception of PF and TF, (b) the writing features they perceive to be prioritized by the peer or by the teacher, and (c) their perception of PF and TF uptake. Nevertheless, a negligible number of items showed a significant difference. Six items to be exact showed that genders perceive PF and TF dissimilarly. Only those six items are highlighted and explained hereunder.
Table 20

**Means, Standard Deviations and p-value of The Perceptions of PF and TF by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. It is only the teacher who can give you feedback on your writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Strongly agree - Agree – Neutral – Disagree - Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Your writing can improve through feedback from your peer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Strongly agree - Agree – Neutral – Disagree - Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Giving feedback to a peer needs training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Strongly agree - Agree – Neutral – Disagree - Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. You accept your teacher feedback on your writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Always – Often – Sometimes – Rarely – Never</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. You use your teacher feedback on your writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Always – Often – Sometimes – Rarely – Never</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. You accept your peer feedback on your writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Always – Often – Sometimes – Rarely – Never</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. You use your peer feedback on your writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Always – Often – Sometimes – Rarely – Never</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. After receiving your teacher feedback on your writing, you discuss the feedback with your teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Always – Often – Sometimes – Rarely – Never</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>After receiving your peer feedback on your writing, you discuss the feedback with your peer. <strong>Always – Often – Sometimes – Rarely – Never</strong></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>You believe in your peer feedback ability to correct your writing. <em>Strongly agree - Agree – Neutral - Disagree - Strongly disagree</em></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>If you repeat an error more than once, you believe that highlighting the error every time it happens is <em><strong>Useful - Somehow useful - Neutral - Somehow useless - Useless</strong></em></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 81; p<.05; M = Males; F = Females

* Strongly agree = 1; Agree = 2; Neutral = 3; Disagree = 4; Strongly disagree = 5

** Always = 1; Often = 2; Sometimes = 3; Rarely = 4; Never = 5

*** Useful =1; Somehow useful = 2; Neutral = 3; Somehow useless = 4; Useless = 5

Item 13 *After receiving your teacher feedback on your writing, you discuss the feedback with your teacher* was the first to record a significant difference: While the mean value of the males’ selection was 2.1 (SD = .9), that of females’ selection was 2.6 (SD = 1.2), and the p-value was at .011<.05. Moreover, in this item, almost two thirds of the male participants (65.6%) opted for Always and Sometimes options, 60.8% of the females chose the Sometimes, Rarely and Never options, which showed that males were more interested in discussing the TF they receive with their teacher. Figure 9 provides graphic illustration of that gender difference.

**Figure 9**

*L2 Writers’ Gender Difference in Terms of Discussing TF With the Teacher*
Note. The percentages illustrated are round numbers

Table 21

Percentage of Choices and p-value of The Perceptions of PF and TF by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. How do you find the teacher feedback on your writing versus your peer feedback?*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher feedback is important</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Both teacher feedback and classmate feedback are equally important</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Peer feedback is important</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Which is easier for you to understand? *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Your teacher feedback</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No difference in clarity and ease of understanding between both</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Your classmate feedback</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. As soon as you receive the writing feedback from your teacher, you ...*
- read it carefully to use it in future writing 91.4% 100.0%  .022
- do not generally use all that feedback in future writing 8.6% 0.0%
- just look at the grade and do not read the feedback 0.0% 0.0%

19. Generally, you like the writing feedback you receive from your teacher to be ... *
- in a paragraph 43.0% 28.2%  .088
- in long sentences to provide detailed explanation 57.0% 56.5%  .478
- in bullet points 50.0% 43.5%  .327
- including words like ‘you’ & ‘your’ as if the teacher/peer is talking to you personally 23.0% 22.0%  .453

20. You become interested in your teacher feedback that focuses on ... **
- Vocabulary 80.0% 65.2%  .074
- Grammar 94.3% 74.0%  .008
- Punctuation 71.5% 56.5%  .086
- Linking words 82.8% 69.5%  .087
- Organisation 60.0% 73.9%  .094
- Responding to the writing task in full 40.0% 52.1%  .141
- Spelling 54.3% 43.5%  .171
- Number of words (i.e., The writing fulfils the word count) 31.4% 26.0%  .301

21. You understand well the writing feedback that is ... *
- direct; the teacher/peer just gives the correction 88.6% 91.3%  .344
- indirect; the teacher just highlights that there is a mistake and leaves you to find it out and correct it 25.7% 24.0%  .427
- given orally through a one-to-one meeting with your teacher 37.1% 32.6%  .338
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- commentary; the teacher just provides comments about the overall quality of my writing but no specific mistakes are corrected</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. When you receive the writing feedback from your teacher, you … **

- tell yourself that the teacher is always right as these errors are something new you are learning | 85.7% | 87.0% | .437    |
- reject some corrections when they do not match the previous knowledge you have about the language | 22.8% | 20.0% | .361    |
- feel there is no need for it because mistakes will be corrected by time | 5.7%  | 6.5% | .441    |

23. When you receive your writing feedback from your teacher, you …*  

- generally know how to correct your mistakes in the future | 51.4% | 45.6% |
- do not know how to avoid those mistakes in the future | 2.8%  | 8.6%  | .418    |
- ask the teacher about only those corrections that you do not understand | 20.0% | 19.5% |
- memorize the correction of the mistakes to use in future writing | 25.7% | 26.0% |

24. When you receive a lot of correction on your writing from your teacher, you …*  

- feel encouraged to work on reducing the number of errors in the following tasks | 82.8% | 80.4%  | .379    |
- feel demotivated to work on your mistakes because they are many | 17.2% | 19.6% |
25. Teacher’s words like "good job", "well done" & "excellent" on your writing task *

- motivate you to do better in future tasks 94.4% 100%
- do not make any difference to you 2.8% 0.0%
- are usually ignored by you and you do not notice them 0.0% 0.0%  .073
- are a waste of teacher’s time; you just need the feedback to push you to do better 2.8% 0.0%

26. You see that receiving writing feedback from your teacher ... **

- helps you to improve 100% 100% n/a
- only justifies the grade you received 2.8% 4.3% .364
- is considered part of the teacher’s duty 34.3% 21.8% .107
- is not that important as you only want to pass the course 0.0% 0.0% n/a

27. As soon as you receive the writing feedback from your peer, you ...*

- read it carefully to use it in future writing 88.6% 80.5% .165
- do not use it 11.4% 19.5%

28. Generally, you like the writing feedback you receive from your peer to be ... **

- in a paragraph 34.3% 30.4% .359
- long sentences to provide detailed explanation 31.4% 36.9% .305
- in bullet points 57.1% 32.6% .014
- including words like ‘you’ & ‘your’ as if the classmate is talking to you personally 25.7% 28.2% .401

29. You become interested in your peer feedback that focuses on ... **

- Vocabulary 71.4% 54.3% .060
- Grammar 54.3% 56.5% .422
- Punctuation 42.8% 43.4% .478
- Linking words 51.4% 41.3% .186
- Organisation 42.8% 50.0% .304
- Responding to the writing task in full 34.2% 32.6% .438
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Spelling</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of words (i.e., The writing fulfils the word count)</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. You understand well the writing feedback that is … **

- direct; the peer just gives the correction                       | 68.5%| 78.2%| .165    |
- indirect; the peer just highlights that there is a mistake and leaves you to find it out and correct it | 11.4%| 13.0%| .415    |
- given verbally from your peer                                      | 28.5%| 28.2%| .488    |
- commentary; the peer just provides comments about the overall quality of your writing but no specific mistakes are corrected | 31.4%| 15.2%| .042    |

31. When you receive the writing feedback from your peer, you … **

- tell yourself that the peer is right as this error is something new you are learning | 40.0%| 50.0%| .189    |
- reject some corrections when they do not match the previous knowledge you have about the language | 62.8%| 54.3%| .224    |
- feel there is no need for it because mistakes will be corrected by time | 2.8% | 6.5% | .229    |

32. When you receive your writing feedback from your peer, you …*

- know how to correct your mistakes in the future                   | 42.8%| 41.3%|         |
- do not know how to avoid those mistakes in future writing tasks   | 8.7% | 10.8%| .463    |
- ask the classmate about only those mistakes that you do not understand | 34.2%| 34.7%|         |
- memorize the correction of the mistakes to use in future writing  | 14.3%| 13.2%|         |

33. When you receive a lot of correction on your writing from your peer, you … *

- feel encouraged to work on reducing the number of errors in the future | 77.2%| 82.6%| .189    |
- feel demotivated to work on your mistakes because they are many    | 22.8%| 17.4%|         |
34. Peer's words like "good job", "well done" & "excellent" on your writing task …* 
   - motivate you to do better in future tasks: 74.4% Males, 85.0% Females, p = .409
   - do not make any difference to you: 17.1% Males, 8.6% Females
   - are usually ignored by you and you do not notice them: 8.5% Males, 2.1% Females
   - are a waste of the classmate time: 0.0% Males, 4.3% Females

35. You see that receiving writing feedback from your peer …* 
   - helps you to improve: 91.5% Males, 91.4% Females, p = .356
   - does not help you to improve: 8.5% Males, 8.6% Females

*Single choice item

**Participants could check more than one choice

The second item indicating gender difference was item 18: As soon as you receive the writing feedback from your teacher, you … The p-value recorded was .022 < .05. All female participants selected unanimously the first option: read it carefully to use it in future writing, whereas only 91.4% of males did. Additionally, 8.6% of males reported that they do not generally use all that feedback in future writing (the second option) while none of the females selected it. Those values illustrated that females were keener than males on using TF in future writing tasks. The gender difference is presented in Figure 10.

**Figure 10**

L2 Writers’ Gender Difference in Terms of Using TF in Future Writing
Note. The percentages illustrated are round numbers.

The third item in that short list of items that generated significant differences between genders was the Grammar option in item 20 You become interested in your teacher feedback that focuses on .... For males, 94.3% of them selected Grammar, while only 74.0% of females selected it. With a p-value of .008, that showed that males particularly were interested in grammatical features and the TF on that. The comparison of percentages is shown in Figure 11.

**Figure 11**

*L2 Writers’ Gender Difference in Terms of Interest in the Grammar Writing Feature*
Note. The percentages illustrated are round numbers.

Following the previous item, item 21 as well signaled gender differences. Item 21 asked mixed gender participants *You understand well the writing feedback that is ...* i.e., direct feedback, indirect feedback, one-to-one oral meeting with the teacher, and overall comments on the quality of writing. The last option, *commentary*, was perceived uniquely different among male and female L2 writers. The data analysis provided a *p*-value of \( p < .05 \), as nearly one quarter of males selected that option in comparison to only 8.7% of females who chose it. Therefore, it can be inferred that males were more interested than females in the teacher’s provision of overall comments on the quality of their writing. The data showing the difference between genders is illustrated in Figure 12.

**Figure 12**

*L2 Writers’ Gender Difference in Terms of TF Type*
Note. The percentages illustrated are round numbers

Receiving PF in bullet points was another option discriminating between genders. Option 3 (in bullet points) of item 28 that read *Generally, you like the writing feedback you receive from your peer to be ...* recorded .014 in its *p*-value, which is <.05. More than half of the males who participated in this study (57.1%) chose the bullet points option; however, fewer than third of the females (32.6%) chose it. Those values indicated that male participants preferred the PF that was in bullet points, but females did not prefer that form of feedback from their peer. The chart in Figure 13 illustrates that clearly.

**Figure 13**

*L2 Writers’ Gender Difference in Terms of TF Form*
Note. The percentages illustrated are round numbers.

Finally, and for the second time, the *commentary* option in item 30 *You understand well the writing feedback that is...* recorded a significant difference in the case of PF as well ($p = .042 < .05$). The percentages of choice of that option also showed that males were more interested than females in the peer’s provision of overall comments on the quality of their writing, as was the case with TF in item 21. The percentages recorded were 31.4% for males and only half of that percentage (15.2%) for females. Figure 14 hereunder is provided for illustration.

**Figure 14**

*L2 Writers’ Gender Difference in Terms of PF Type*
Note. The percentages illustrated are round numbers.

The transcribed interviews that were conducted were coded and analysed to identify patterns of answers. As mentioned earlier, four male- and three female-adult learners were interviewed. One single question was included in the interview: *Do you believe all learners of your gender have the same idea about peer feedback and teacher feedback like you do? And if not, what are the differences between genders?* to discover whether participants believed gender differences had any influence in their perception of PF and TF.

Although the questionnaire data analysis yielded no significant differences between males and females, it was quite interesting to find that the interview responses illustrated different perceptions. Overall, female interviewees believed that gender was not a variable in how L2 writers perceive PF and TF. Two out of the three female interviewees reported that the learner’s personality was a more contributing factor than gender: “It depends on the personality” as reported by Yara. For her, learners are different in their acceptance of feedback, and their reaction to it, either from the peer or from the teacher. She added that some are open to feedback
while others feel shy to receive it from a same- or an opposite-gender peer. In that respect, both females and males feel and behave similarly. Another female L2 writer (Hala) emphasized the fact that gender was not a deciding factor as learners’ main goal was to learn in a safe environment that would not discriminate between female and male, or young and old, and that learners—female and male alike—ought to accept feedback more openly to develop their language proficiency. Nonetheless, one female participant (Mayar) adopted an opposite stance: She expressed the sentiments of shyness that some female learners might have when receiving feedback from the peer. She said that “To receive feedback from a female, it's a little bit acceptable, it's acceptable than from a guy or from a man . . . But from a girl to a girl, it's easier or acceptable. So we are more comfortable with the same gender, and accept feedback easily.”

By looking at the transcription of the males’ interview, opposite beliefs were discernible. Overall, males reported that gender indeed factored in how L2 writers perceive PF and TF. Out of the four interviewed males, only one participant, Abdallah, showed mixed opinions: no agreement that gender was a variable in the perceptions of feedback, and at the same time, he believed that the same gender interacts better. For that participant, he agreed that gender difference was not impactful as the learners’ personality and cultural background had more weight in how PF and TF were perceived: “I think this depends on the individuals and their cultures.” According to him, some L2 learners are more tolerant towards feedback than others owing to how they were educated and nurtured by their families. Furthermore, Abdallah adopted the opposite view: the gender was a significant variable as the level of acceptance of feedback from the peer of the opposite gender varied from a learner to the other. Additionally, he cited the ease of discussion between the same gender learners as another reason why gender was a key factor in how PF and TF were perceived.
The other three male interviewees believed quite decisively in the impact of gender differences. One of the three participants, Haitham, attributed the disparity in accepting PF and TF to the lack of social interaction with the opposite gender. He expounded by saying that ‘... they [(learners)] lose the ability of [interacting] with others, I think, due to the lack of experience that the students have.’ He also added: ‘[O]ur community is very shy or a little bit shy. So women or girls tend to speak with girl[s]. [The] man will talk with [a] man. They feel comfortable with the same gender.’ Another male interviewee, Othman, explained that gender differences originated from the fact that females rejected being given comments on their writing; males were more flexible than females in that respect. However, he expanded his answer by saying: “I think females may accept feedback from males better than other females while males may accept feedback from the males better than the females.” Moreover, he added: “But they [(females)] may accept the opinion of males better. I think so. Actually, sometimes males accept the opinion of females also. But female and female, they [do] not accept each other’s opinion.” The third participant in the sample that was interviewed, Amgad, emphasized further the aspect of flexibility and tolerance in receiving PF and TF. From this transcribed interview, it was inferred that males were more flexible than females on account of males’ earlier involvement in social and professional experiences.

4.5 Conclusion

To conclude, the main objective of this chapter was to report the results of the analysis performed on the data collected from the data collection instruments employed in this study, namely the questionnaire, the interviews, and the writing samples. The results of the descriptive and inferential analysis were displayed according to the research questions guiding the study. The results indicate that there is slightly more inclination towards preferring and trusting the
effectiveness of TF than PF; however, the levels of trust and willingness to use PF are significant. That finding was not presented only through the quantitative data of the questionnaire, but was also revealed and supported in the multiple interviews. The interview responses provided further evidence for that as their evaluation of the teacher’s and the peer’s feedback advantages and disadvantages was nearly balanced; the participants critiqued PF and TF objectively. Nevertheless, they yet believed in the teacher’s role as a figure of authority who ought to validate the feedback received from the peer before it could be used. As for the writing features that were prevalent in PF and TF, most of the participants agreed that TF was more structured, and more focused on all writing features, including feedback on the sentence, paragraph, and essay level. The writing samples collected for the study emphasized the results of the questionnaire analysis, as, although the teacher and the peer highlighted the same types of writing features, there was an explicit difference between the count of those features focused on in PF and TF, especially coherence and prepositions where TF highlighted twice as many instances of errors. The non-presence of significant differences between PF and TF in this study can be attributed to the proficiency level of the study participants: The fact that they were regular learners at the LD explains their familiarity with the practice of peer feedback, and having practiced it for more than one level at the LD makes them realize its value, and the possibility of relying on it for L2 writing improvement. It is also worth noting that the teachers themselves encouraging and promoting PF increases the L2 writers’ awareness of PF worth.

Moreover, in terms of perceptions of uptake, no major differences were yielded between PF and TF. Participants read the TF and PF carefully for use in future assignments; both TF and PF were equal in their clarity for the learner to improve their L2 writing skills; both PF and TF helped them to improve their writing proficiency; the vocabulary and grammar were the top two
writing features that L2 writers benefited from and retained for future writing assignments; the probability of feedback rejection was higher in case of PF than TF; the participants believed that both direct and oral feedback through conferencing were beneficial than other feedback forms, and both PF and TF motivated them to improve. However, in interviews, L2 writers mentioned that they used PF, with the caveat that it needed validation from the teacher before using it in future writing. Finally, it was concluded that there was no significant difference between male and female participants in their perceptions of PF and TF except in a quite limited number of questionnaire items. Furthermore, the interviews showed that females had more tendency than males in believing that there was no difference between genders. Therefore, the results of the fourth research question emphasized what was aforementioned; the study participants’ perceptions of the value of PF was clear owing to their experience with the practice, and having their teachers allow PF practice consistently.
Chapter Five: Discussion

5.1 Introduction

This research study was designed to explore the perceptions of adult Egyptian L2 writers of peer feedback as opposed to teacher feedback. Within this overarching objective, other objectives were established for a profounder comparison between these two types of feedback. Other objectives included: Comparing between the writing features that were the focus of peer feedback as opposed to those that were the focus of teacher feedback; the perceptions of PF and TF uptake as viewed by the L2 writers; and finally, attempting to explore any differences between male and female L2 writers in their perceptions of peer and teacher feedback. The results of the study showed that L2 writers, for the most part, have positive perceptions towards peer feedback, and are keenly aware of its value, but teacher feedback is yet perceived as slightly better than peer feedback. The statistical analyses of the quantitative data collected from the questionnaire and the writing samples, and the textual analysis of the qualitative data collected from the interviews, indicated no significant differences in how PF and TF were generally perceived, except for quite a few items, namely in how L2 writers preferred the peer and the teacher to provide feedback. Nevertheless, there were differences between the writing features that the peer and the teacher focused on when providing writing feedback, and in how L2 writers perceived the uptake of PF and TF. Finally, although the questionnaire showed no substantial differences between males and females in their perceptions of PF and TF, the qualitative data from interviews indicated that males perceived the existence of differences between genders more than females.

The data collection instruments employed in the current study were three different tools. The researcher used (a) a questionnaire comprising 35 items of different question types, and
adapted from previous studies to enquire about the general perceptions of PF and TF, the perceptions of PF and TF uptake, and the impact of gender on those perceptions; (b) an interview containing seven questions to investigate qualitatively the general perceptions of PF versus TF, the writing features that L2 writers found to be the most focused on in PF and TF, and the differences in how genders perceive PF and TF; and (c) 16 writing samples from three various proficiency levels to discover the difference in what PF focused on as opposed to TF.

The numbers of L2 writers who participated in this study changed in accordance with the research tool. Through convenience sampling, in the case of questionnaire, 81 L2 writers from three different proficiency levels filled in the online form, while seven L2 writers, from two proficiency levels, were interviewed for the qualitative data collection. With respect to the writing samples, 16 writing samples from three levels were collected after being provided with feedback twice: Once by the peer, and a second time by the researcher.

The discussion of the results obtained from the data analysis is presented in this chapter. The alignment or misalignment of these results with the results found in the literature on that topic is highlighted. In addition, the implications, study limitations, and recommendation for further research are provided.

5.2 General Perceptions of PF Versus TF

The first research question that this study was designed to investigate was the general perceptions of peer feedback in comparison to teacher feedback. As was observed from the questionnaire data, the participants believed in the importance of TF slightly more than PF. They praised TF as being more accurate, more systematic as it followed a rubric, and more reliable as the teacher is well trained to provide structured feedback that targets the core of the error. Consistent with the literature, this finding aligns with Tsui and Ng’s (2000) study indicating that
“[The teacher] is a figure of authority that guaranteed quality” (p. 149). Furthermore, this finding is consistent with that of Yang et al.’s (2006) response received in an item in their questionnaire: “Students said that the teacher was more professional, experienced and trustworthy than their peers” (p. 189). L2 writers did not believe that PF was more important; however, some of them were of the opinion that both were equally valuable in the course of improving their writing. That was also evident through the interviews as the responses pointed out balanced views of both feedback types. This view is corroborated by the findings of Gibbs (2009) and Yang et al. (2006) who acknowledged the worth of PF by saying that PF is “a useful adjunct to teacher feedback” (p. 193) as it promotes learner autonomy. Additionally, that view was further emphasized when participants’ responses oscillated between agree and neutral in whether they perceived the teacher as the only source of feedback provision. Furthermore, they did not decide rather conclusively that their writing proficiency could improve through the feedback they received from the peer as their choices ranged as well between agree and neutral. Those results indicate that awareness of the importance of PF does exist, but not yet fully. Adding to that, those interview questions regarding the benefits and drawbacks of PF and TF resulted in that the participants’ critical views of the merits and demerits were in favor of TF.

As for the importance of training a classmate to provide feedback, the participants agreed to that, but not strongly, which is an indication to a realization of its importance, but the lack of understanding of the components of that training made it not strongly agreed upon; the questionnaire did not provide an explanation about what the training would entail. Furthermore, another item that enquired about their perceptions of the peer’s ability to give feedback, the views were almost neutral, and this is a general indication that the absolute confidence in PF is still lacking. In addition, interviewees believed that the peer was not qualified to give feedback
as: They were learners themselves; the peer tended to provide superficial comments, not targeting the core of the writing process; some peers were not careful with their choice of words, and thus, some negative comments would be discouraging to some writers; and some peers tended to be adamant that their feedback was correct without showing tolerance towards other opinions. Those reported responses share some similarities with Liu and Carless (2006) who claimed that “some students may feel that their classmates are not qualified to provide insightful feedback” (p. 7).

In addition to the above, the acceptance and use of PF and TF were also investigated. Acceptance of TF was slightly higher than PF. The results showed that, while L2 writers always accepted their teacher’s feedback, and always used it to improve their writing proficiency, the acceptance of peer feedback was often, and they sometimes used it. Therefore, this may indicate that TF is more relied upon as a source of feedback than PF. Nevertheless, the participants replied in the interview that they still found that PF was useful as it was a way for them to exchange knowledge, to benefit from mistakes, to acquire new skills, and to learn from others’ perspectives about their own writing. Furthermore, L2 writers did not seem to feel shy to have their mistakes highlighted by the peer, and that aligned with those responses received in Van Lier’s (1988) research as their participants, as well, said that they were there to learn, and that would not cause them any embarrassment. One participant, Othman, reflected on especially the level of comfort and confidence when receiving feedback from the peer by saying: “We are colleagues together, there’s no problem.”

However, when asked whether they would discuss the feedback after receiving it from their peer or their teacher, L2 writers had the same opinion regarding both types, and their choices oscillated between often and sometimes. This result reflects a general reaction towards
feedback, whether received from the peer or the teacher, and reflects medium frequency of challenging the peer or the teacher with further discussion regarding the feedback they receive. This indicates that either the feedback is quite clear to understand, or a prevalent behaviour of not discussing the feedback received. This can be also explained in the same way that Zhao (2010) explained their research outcome by saying that some learners are unwilling to challenge the teacher, and to investigate more about the error in question (due to the conventional dominant role of the teacher that many students believe in). However, this finding can be also interpreted differently. As replied in their interviews, one of the disadvantages of TF was the poor skills of few teachers in providing feedback, and other few who might sound sarcastic when conferencing with them over the feedback they received. Therefore, some L2 writers would not feel encouraged to pursue more feedback from their teacher in that case.

Comparing the ease of understanding was also investigated. The results of that aspect showed more leaning towards TF than PF. Nonetheless, almost 75% of the participants opted for TF while one quarter of them reported no difference in clarity and ease of understanding between both. This means that while TF is still better for L2 writers, some of them are starting to perceive PF as equally clear and easy to understand. Therefore, this supports the results of the previous questionnaire items that awareness of PF exists, but not quite profoundly.

5.3 The Peer’s Versus The Teacher’s Prioritization of Writing Features in Feedback

The comparison between the peer and the teacher in this study extends to encompass what they focus on in their feedback provision. To locate those writing features that both parties prioritize, the sample of L2 writers were interviewed, and writing samples from real in-class tasks were analysed.
As mentioned earlier, 16 writing samples from A2, B1 and B2 levels were garnered for this study. Each writing sample was in two copies: One for the peer and one for the teacher (i.e., the researcher) to provide feedback. A count of the instances of errors was carried out for each of the two copies to pinpoint how PF and TF differed in their focus of feedback attention. As illustrated in Table 6, in Chapter 4, PF and TF focused on the same writing features. This finding was also reported in Nelson and Murphy’s (1993) research that indicated that in 50% of the cases, the peer and the teacher provided feedback on the same areas. However, the instances of highlighting an error varied quite significantly: TF’s instances of error highlighting were by far higher than PF, but the vocabulary feature was the only exception where the instances of error highlighting were almost similar. For the rest of writing features, profound differences were recorded, and this goes in line with Ayachi’s (2017) research findings that there were sharp differences between PF and TF in the highlighted writing features. Interview responses collected from some L2 writers further supported that; some L2 writers believed that the peer and the teacher prioritize different writing features in their feedback. Upon the textual analysis and coding of the transcribed interview responses, PF inclined towards superficial feedback, i.e., PF focused on spelling, vocabulary use, tenses, and simplifying the sentence structure. By contrast, the TF was perceived as profounder in terms of focusing simultaneously on several criteria, i.e., the teacher typically has a rubric to follow, and that helps in reviewing learners’ writing rather comprehensively. They added that TF was distinguished by looking at the word, the sentence, the paragraph and the essay level, and thus, feedback on coherence, cohesion and relevance of writing were some writing features that made TF more unique. This definite distinction between PF and TF in the writing features can be explained by the fact that those L2 writers, who were interviewed in this study, are in high proficiency levels, and they have the knowledge about the
teacher using grading rubrics; therefore, they expect teacher feedback to be inclusive of more aspects than peer feedback. This still accords with slight awareness of PF, and more inclination towards TF. These results corroborate the findings of a great deal of the previous work in Linden-Martin (1997) and Zhang (1995) who concluded that TF was more preferred by learners owing to the teacher’s ability to balance between language-level and content-level feedback. Moreover, these results reflect those of Newkirk’s (1984) who indicated big gaps between how the peer and the teacher viewed the quality of an essay owing to a significantly different criteria set by the peer than those set by the teacher when providing writing feedback. In addition, the research findings broadly support Villamil and De Guerrero (1996) who identified the same problem of the narrow focus of PF.

It is worth mentioning that the writing features followed the same descending order of instances count in case of PF and TF; coherence and spelling were an exception. To explain, in terms of PF error count, the features descended in that order: vocabulary, punctuation, grammar, capitalization, linking words, spelling, coherence and prepositions. On the other hand, in terms of TF error count, the descending order was vocabulary, punctuation, grammar, capitalization, linking words, coherence, spelling, and prepositions. This reflects the peer’s ability to highlight errors, and the significant similarity between the prioritization of both parties. This further implies that PF has the potential to be as valuable as TF provided that the peer was trained adequately on that. This outcome is contrary to what some researchers reported in the literature. For instance, Hyland (2000), Leki (1990), Lockhart and Ng (1993), Mendoca and Johnson (1994), and Nelson and Murphy (1993) claimed that students adopt a strategy of giving formulaic, irrelevant and over-critical comments, or they focus excessively on surface errors.
However, the writing samples collected for this study indicated that adults L2 writers focus on the same types of errors that the teacher does.

Furthermore, the participants were interviewed about those writing features worthy of more attention from the peer and the teacher. The participants requested both the peer and the teacher to give more attention to the same writing features. For instance, they requested that the peer and the teacher focus on: Suggesting more high level vocabulary items in their feedback; commenting more on the complexity of grammatical structures; explaining some advanced usage of punctuation marks; and clarifying how to acquire the skill of writing more directly and concisely. These responses show that requesting more focus from the peer and the teacher on the same writing features does reflect the areas of writing that participants feel weak at, and their need for improvement. This, in turn, reflects an awareness of the value of PF and TF alike.

5.4 Perceptions of Uptake of PF Versus TF

As expounded in Chapter 2 of this study, uptake is a concept that was first researched in the seventies of the twentieth century. Some of the earliest researchers in the field, such as Chaudron (1977), Ellis et al. (2001), Loewen (2004) and Lyster and Ranta (1997), defined uptake by positing that uptake is what an L2 learner does, and how they react towards the feedback received following a flawed linguistic utterance that they produced. Several variables factor in and affect learners’ uptake of feedback, namely, their beliefs about feedback, the way they react towards feedback, the way the feedback is provided, and the level of motivation they feel after receiving the feedback.

5.4.1 The Effect of Beliefs on Learner Uptake of PF Versus TF

This section compares between the beliefs that L2 writers had about PF compared to those of TF as generated from the quantitative results of the questionnaire. Referring to the
literature of uptake and its relation with L2 learners’ beliefs about feedback, Storch and Wigglesworth (2010) stated that “research that looks more closely at how learners’ beliefs and goals impact their decisions is needed to understand how and why learners respond to different forms of CF [(classmate feedback)]” (p. 304). Interestingly in this study, while more L2 writers believed that the teacher was always right and that the TF they received highlighted errors that were new for them to know about, they were inclined towards rejecting PF that did not match the previous knowledge they already had about the language. This specific finding supports evidence from previous research, such as that of Hyland (1998) who reported learners’ rejection of feedback that contradicted with previous knowledge that they had about the language. On the contrary, a very small number of participants believed that both PF and TF were not needed as errors would be corrected by more practice and time. Those results represent some beliefs in the value of PF because both PF and TF recorded the same mean value when asked to choose whether there was no need for PF and TF.

Two other items in the questionnaire asked participants to provide their beliefs about the efficacy of PF versus TF. Participants’ views about the efficacy of both types were not balanced, a statistically significant difference was detected, and although the most selected option (generally know how to correct your mistakes in the future) and the least selected one (memorize the correction of the mistakes to use in future writing) were identical for PF and TF— but with a higher percentage recording in TF—the other two options: do not know how to avoid those mistakes in the future, and ask the teacher/peer about only those corrections that you do not understand were significantly different in the order in which they were selected, and there was a sharp difference in the percentages that each of these two options recorded. These results confirm rather strongly that the belief in the efficacy of PF is not as strong as that of TF.
More investigation of L2 writers’ beliefs about PF and TF, and the influence of that on uptake was pursued in two other items in the questionnaire. Those two items looked into whether the participants believed feedback helped them to develop their writing proficiency. Consistent with other results in this section, both PF and TF yielded nearly the same results as 100% of participants believed that TF improved their writing, while 90% believed that PF did. This is an increased support to all results, thus far, that TF is believed to be superior to PF, but the gap between them is not unbridgeable.

5.4.2 Reactions Towards PF and TF

The second factor playing a role in the uptake of feedback is how L2 writers reacted towards PF versus TF. Two items in the questionnaire examined reactions, and asked participants whether they read carefully the feedback they received for the purpose of incorporating it in future writing tasks, or they did not generally use it. The data analysis recorded no significant difference between PF and TF with respect to that factor. However, the mean value showed slight numerical difference indicating that PF is marginally behind TF in that respect. The participants’ choice of reading TF carefully for future use was more conclusive than the choice of reading PF carefully, but the difference in percentages was quite minimal (i.e., 88.6% TF, and 80.5% for PF). This finding is consistent with Wu’s (2006) study finding: Wu reported that both sources of feedback generated the same results in a study focusing on L2 adult learners, i.e., learners’ reaction towards both PF and TF on their writing composition was similar.

To provide further evidence that TF is perceived slightly more advantageously that PF, questions 5 and 6 in the interview (as shown in Chapter 4) explored reactions towards PF and TF respectively. The two questions were posed consecutively to help participants draw a direct
comparison between both types of feedback. The responses showed unrivalled acceptance of TF owing to—according to them—its directness, and the fact that it is the teacher’s duty to provide comprehensive feedback to learners: “I totally accept it because the teacher always wants what is in my best interest to become much better in the writing” as responded by one of the participants (Mayar). Another participant (Hala) said: “I accept it completely because I think it’s more honest because the teacher sees us as students . . . It gives me trust and makes me feel powerful because I want to learn more.” On the contrary, L2 writers were rather conservative in their responses to the PF question; they expressed some caution in using it on account of some reasons, namely, the way that the peer provides feedback, and the need for the teacher’s validation on that feedback before using it. This gives more evidence that TF is yet in the lead, and that PF is slowly gaining L2 writers’ trust. This finding accords with the findings of Zhao’s (2010) study, who found that learners perceived TF as a requirement while PF a suggestion, and believed as well that the teacher’s validation of PF was crucial prior to acknowledging it.

5.4.3 The Effect of Feedback Provision on the Uptake of PF and TF

The form in which the feedback is provided is the factor examined here in this section. The questionnaire covered that factor by enquiring about it in six items: three targeted PF, and the other three targeted TF. Whether preferring to receive the writing feedback in a paragraph commenting on the overall level of writing, short bullet points, or long sentences explaining the error in detail, were the three feedback forms enquired about. A fourth option was provided and was about the preference of tone in which the feedback was written (i.e., the teacher is addressing the learner directly with the second person subject and object pronouns you and your). That item produced significant differences between PF and TF. Although the participants opted for PF to be in short bullet points, they chose long detailed sentences in TF. Incorporating
a rather informal tone in drafting the feedback recorded approximately the same mean value for PF and TF, but was more selected in the PF item. These results were generated in that way owing to the greater trust they have in TF than PF, and that they need more details about their written production from the teacher. Choosing short bullet points in the case of PF may indicate their concern that long detailed sentences from the peer might be hard to comprehend. Furthermore, the nearly balanced mean scores of the option of including you and your in the feedback signals their preference of an informal feedback that may facilitate its comprehension either from the peer or from the teacher.

Two other items in the questionnaire (20 & 29) examined the effect of the feedback form on its uptake. These two items targeted measuring which writing features raised their interest in the feedback received and helped them pay more attention to it. It is interesting to mention that these two items recorded two statistical significant differences between PF and TF. Out of the eight writing features enquired about in these two items, the results indicated no significant differences in the selection of grammar, punctuation, linking words, organization, addressing the requirement of the writing task fully, and spelling. It is worth noting that the mean scores of these features were always higher in TF than PF. However, significant differences were recorded for vocabulary, and achieving the word count. These results can be interpreted by the fact that L2 writers, at large, have more trust in TF than PF when it comes to these two features specifically, and thus, receiving feedback from the teacher on these writing features draws their attention to elements that they need urgently to address in order to improve their writing skills.

The last two items in this section are items 21 and 30 in the questionnaire. These two items investigated various forms of feedback, namely, the direct, the indirect, the oral through conferencing, and the general comments on the overall quality of writing without providing
details. These two items as well generated statistically significant differences between PF and TF. The data analysis pointed out differences in the mean scores of the four forms of feedback, with the TF higher in mean score than PF except in the commentary option. In both PF and TF, the direct feedback was in the lead (90.1% for TF; 74.1% for PF) followed by the oral feedback (34.6% for TF; 28.4 for PF). The gap in percentages between the direct feedback and the oral is remarkably clear, which indicates that direct feedback is yet the ultimate feedback form for L2 writers. This outcome is contrary to previous research studies. For example, in Brown’s (1994) research study, he found that the advanced students preferred the indirect TF. On a different vein, the commentary option scoring lower in TF than PF reflects a weak desire from L2 writers to receive feedback that is rather holistic; they need detailed feedback from the teacher to assist them in learning the skills of writing.

5.4.4 The Role of Motivation in the Uptake of PF and TF

The uptake of feedback relies on the level of motivation of L2 writers. This section discusses the results of the questionnaire items that collected data about motivation. Items 24 and 33 gauged how motivated and encouraged to write better the participants felt after receiving PF and TF. Interestingly, both items scored the same percentage (81%), which indicated a high level of motivation and encouragement to incorporate the feedback received from either the peer or the teacher in future writing tasks (The $t$-test showed no significant difference between PF and TF in that respect). The results of these two items also provide supporting evidence that PF is gaining traction and is considered as valuable as TF. Two more items, 25 and 34, looked into motivation, and investigated the effect of encouraging commentary, such as good job, well done, and excellent, on the uptake of PF and TF. The percentage of choice of TF (97.5%) showed stronger tendency towards the option that reflected their motivation to do better in future tasks. In
contrast, PF recorded a different percentage (82.7%), and that indicated a slightly less ability for those positive commentary phrases to motivate L2 writers. A possible interpretation of those results can be the fact that those phrases of motivation are typically expected from the teacher, and are inherently a part of their notion of feedback from the teacher, and not from the peer.

5.5 Gender Differences and the Perceptions of PF and TF

The fourth and the last research question in this research study aimed at exploring any differences in how male and female L2 writers perceive PF and TF.

Table 9 in Chapter 4 displayed the segregated mean and standard deviation values of all questionnaire items for male and female participants. As explained in Chapter 4, no significant differences between males and females were recorded in (a) their general perceptions of PF and TF, (b) the writing features they perceive to be prioritized by the peer or by the teacher, and (c) their perceptions of uptake of PF and TF except in six items that behaved statistically different. Those balanced perceptions of PF and TF broadly support the view of Noroozi et al. (2020) who found that females and males benefitted similarly from feedback.

The first, in those items generating gender differences, is item 13 After receiving your teacher feedback on your writing, you discuss the feedback with your teacher: The results of mean scores indicated that female participants were less encouraged to discuss TF than males who did that more often. A few possible interpretations could be: Due to diversity in personality, the ability of females to independently understand the feedback without querying it, or that in a conservative society, such as Egypt, the large power distance between the teacher and the learner may cause learners to be hesitant to approach the teacher to discuss the feedback (Nelson & Carson, 1998).
The second item indicating gender difference was item 18: *As soon as you receive the writing feedback from your teacher, you ...*. The data analysis illustrated that females were more keen that males on using TF in future writing tasks; therefore, that might reflect females’ greater ability to internalize the feedback than males, and thus, they might be able to incorporate it in the following writing tasks more frequently than males.

Males were particularly more interested than females in the TF on grammatical features as pointed out in the *Grammar* option in item 20 *You become interested in your teacher feedback that focuses on ...*. No one plausible explanation to that can be offered; it may be quite coincidental that the male participants in the sample are keen on learning grammar. Another interpretation might be males’ interest in being technically correct.

Furthermore, males were more interested than females in the teacher’s provision of overall comments on the quality of their writing as the results of item 21 signaled. This item asked participants *You understand well the writing feedback that is ...* i.e., direct feedback, indirect feedback, one-to-one oral meeting with the teacher, and overall comments on the quality of writing. It is worth noting that this was a multiple choice item where participants could choose more than one feedback form. Male and female participants chose other forms of feedback in addition to the *commentary* one; however, more males chose *commentary* than females. It seems possible, therefore, that males prefer that the teacher uses all available forms of feedback for male participants to comprehend TF in the best way possible.

Another gender difference was manifest in option 3 of item 28. The item asked participants: *Generally, you like the writing feedback you receive from your peer to be ...*, and option 3 was *in bullet points*. According to the results, male participants preferred the PF that was in bullet points, but females did not prefer it from the peer. These results are likely to be
related to males’ preference of short remarks that are organized in points for ease of understanding.

Finally, and as mentioned earlier, the *commentary* option in item 30 *You understand well the writing feedback that is...* was also discriminating between males and females in PF as was the case in TF. Therefore, it can be interpreted that this item provides further evidence that males opt for obtaining more forms of feedback from the peer and the teacher, for them to gain optimal understanding and benefit from it.

Although the quantitative data suggested no significant gender differences, the qualitative data illustrated otherwise. As presented in Chapter 4, females and males reported diverse responses to that question. It was also illustrated that although female participants generally were of the opinion that L2 writers perceive feedback differently owing primarily to personality differences and not to gender, males’ perspective was that the gender factor did make a difference in that respect. The reason for this is not quite clear, but it may be due to what males feel innately that they are more flexible and tolerant to feedback and critique than females. As one participant (Amgad) responded: “Females are not flexible in accepting feedback. However, males have toleration because they face a lot of situations so they can be flexible.” It could be that females do not innately feel the same.

**5.6 Study Implications**

Following the analysis of the data, presenting the results, and putting plausible interpretations on those results, it is essential to study how those results can impact teaching practices. The study carries implications of use that L2 educators and all concerned stakeholders can benefit from, so this section will explore those implications in detail.

**5.6.1 The Potential of Peer Feedback**
Through the analysis of data and the discussion of results, the most obvious finding to emerge is that there is a noticeably high level of awareness among L2 writers of the importance of PF. The results did not detect massive gaps in the comparison of perceptions of PF versus TF. It is acknowledged that teacher feedback is still in the lead, but the gap between PF and TF can be bridged. As recorded by participants, the peer needs training on how to provide feedback, and that signals their acceptance of the peer giving them feedback provided that adequate training is done. This is a positive outcome for L2 educators as having a considerable level of acceptance of PF among learners means that they are prepared to become more autonomous, and they prove to be increasingly willing to interact and exchange knowledge. The results also imply that this readiness to accept PF can be boosted if the teacher validates PF more in the future, and show learners that PF does have value. In the same vein, with more promotion of PF, the teacher can have some of the workload lightened and shared with learners, and the valuable teacher’s time can be invested in better lesson preparation, and in professional development as argued by Yang et al. (2006).

Furthermore, the results of this research imply that learners can benefit from PF to become better writers. As posited by Liu and Carless (2006) and Yu and Lee (2014), more consistent practice of PF can give impetus to the quality that L2 writers provide in their writing, and can encourage them to exert more effort when they know that their piece of writing will be reviewed by the peer.

5.6.2 The Impact on Curriculum Design

Upon realizing that awareness of peer feedback is increasing, and that the gap between it and TF is becoming narrower, curriculum designers—a major stakeholder—can potentially include writing practice activities that encompass L2 writers critiquing each other’s production.
Furthermore, they can allocate sections in language textbooks for the teacher to train learners on how to give peer feedback through activities that the teacher performs with learners to engage them in the practice. Furthermore, textbook can include more of error identification and correction activities to train L2 learners in general, and L2 writers in specific, on that.

5.6.3 Diversifying Forms of Feedback

As was inferred from the data analysis results, there appears to be an inconsistency in how L2 writers perceive the benefit of different forms of feedback from the peer and from the teacher. Whether being in the form of bullet points, long sentences, and commentary, or being direct, indirect, and verbal one-to-one conferencing, that implies the necessity that the teacher diversifies their feedback forms, and encourage their learners to provide peer feedback in diverse forms accordingly. Achieving that can narrow the gap between PF and TF perceptions, which will in turn increase the acceptance of PF; an outcome that would benefit all concerned stakeholders.

5.6.4 Encouraging Gender Interaction

One of the issues that emerge from the study findings is how genders view their opposites in terms of preference of communication. An implication of this is the possibility that the teacher encourages mixed gender group work. More collaboration between genders in class activities as a whole, and in L2 writing tasks specifically, can dispel any misconception or misperceptions learners have about how the opposite gender thinks. From the interviews conducted, it was surprising that even though the interviewed participants were in upper intermediate levels, which means that they have been navigating their way in the English language learning journey for a considerable span of time, they have not had enough experiences with a tolerant and a flexible peer to make them believe otherwise. This implies that more needs to be done by educators, from
beginner levels, to train learners on receiving feedback more openly and enthusiastically from the same and opposite gender.

5.7 Study Limitations

This study was an attempt to draw a comparison between peer feedback and teacher feedback from diverse perspectives: general views of adult L2 writers in Egypt, the prioritization of writing features in feedback, the uptake of peer and teacher feedback, and gender difference. The study was conducted under its unique conditions, and targeted the use of a certain sample of participants. The researcher cannot claim that this study is generalizable owing to some study limitations.

First and foremost, the age group that the study targeted was unique. The sample of participants comprised adult L2 learners in Egypt. The youngest participants who took part in the study were in senior high school, and the majority were university graduates. The sampling adopted was convenience sampling, and the participants were all doing general English courses at AUC. These conditions do limit the study as other age groups are not represented; therefore, younger age groups require their own studies that can be more representative of their unique perceptions, beliefs, reactions and motivation towards feedback from the peer or from the teacher. Moreover, the participants were all doing English courses at a large international university; other L2 learners in different instructional settings, i.e., in language centres of public universities, and in private language centres that Cairo abounds with, are also in need of studies that represent their special settings. In addition to that, it is worth mentioning that other cities and governorates in Egypt did not participate in this study. Perceptions, beliefs and reactions towards feedback are certainly different than participants who live in a metropolitan city such as Cairo.
Another recognized limitation is related to the data collection instruments, namely, the questionnaire and the interviews. As for the questionnaire, since it was administered remotely, through an online platform, the optimal format for it was an online Google form, which comes with its own shortcomings. The layout of Google forms does not allow for questionnaire items to be positioned horizontally, i.e., next to each other; however, the only available format is the vertical one, where participants scroll down to respond to the following question. The researcher believes that, since this study is a comparison between PF and TF, it could have been more practical and rather effective if the PF and TF questions were adjacent on the same row for participants to better perceive the purpose of the study. Even though the study objectives were clearly displayed at the top of the form, it is believed that placing the same questions that measure the same aspect adjacent to each other would affect the selection of participants. In different conditions (i.e., in the absence of a pandemic virus hindering in-person communication such as the case with COVID-19), where the researcher could meet the participants face-to-face, the questionnaire could be an MS Word file for the adjacency of items to be fulfilled manually. On the other hand, the interview as well had its limitations. Inviting participants for an interview consumed a considerable amount of time as very few learners gave their consent to be interviewed. That has consequently led to a lack of diversity of interviewees; the interviewed sample represented only B1 and B2 L2 writers.

A third limitation has to do with the third research question that investigated the perceptions of uptake. Although that research question yielded interesting findings and has direct implications for teaching practices, it could have been also quite insightful to gauge the uptake through administering an experimental writing task to a group of participants, making two copies of those, assigning some peers to provide their feedback on one copy while the researcher
provides feedback on the other, handing the writing task back to the group to study the feedback, then administering another writing task to the same group and measuring the uptake of PF and TF. However, as the overarching construct in this study is the perceptions of feedback, the researcher opted for investigating uptake from the perspective of its perceptions.

5.8 Recommendations for Further Research

With the study implications and limitations underpinning this section, some recommendations are provided here to address more gaps in the literature of analogy between PF and TF studies in Egypt.

One area where studies are quite limited in number is the analogy between PF and TF in elementary and secondary education. It will be of immense value to scrutinize the perceptions of school students of peer feedback as opposed to teacher feedback. The results of such line of research could have far-reaching implications for teaching in the elementary and secondary stages where the large number of students puts an onerous burden on the class teacher to provide feedback on all the writing tasks that students produce. Encouraging peer feedback practice in classroom can also be of considerable benefit to L2 students as it can enhance their critiquing and error noticing skills, which in turn will positively impact the development of their writing skills in the long run as posited by Cheng and Warren (1997). Curriculum designers can also include peer feedback activities in the school textbooks, and push students to develop the habit of providing and receiving feedback at a young age. Consequently, this will maximize interaction, and will foster learner autonomy.

Further research should be undertaken to investigate ways to make L2 writers better feedback providers. One question, that was enquired about in this study, but was not targeted in the research questions, is the effectiveness of training to develop the peer’s ability to provide
feedback. The results of the questionnaire indicate the agreement that the peer needs training on feedback provision, so there is a potential for more studies into the area of the effectiveness of training learners to provide better quality PF.

Another area that can be recommended for more investigation is the effect of highlighting an error every time it occurs as opposed to highlighting it once. An item in the questionnaire touched on that practice, and the data results were not quite conclusive. Therefore, more research can explore the effect of highlighting an error several times on the uptake of feedback versus highlighting it only once. A research study of that nature can guide the L2 teacher to better feedback practices, and can save their time.

In addition, future studies in Egypt can focus on the writing features. The current study showed that PF and TF are different in terms of those writing features that L2 writers are, for the most part, interested in receiving more feedback on. Therefore, with more research into that, the teacher can have the knowledge about which writing feature errors that L2 learners believe they are able to notice and rectify on their own, and those that the teacher’s input is still significant for.

An area of further research that cannot be overlooked is the dynamics of providing feedback. More research is indeed required to explore the process with which feedback is provided by the peer versus by the teacher, and the differences in negotiations that take place in each case. Exploring those dynamics can expose any flaw in how those negotiations are conducted, and consequently, the peer and the teacher can benefit from that by bettering their feedback provision and receiving skills. This can eventually lead to more PF practices, and more learner autonomy.
Lastly, one fascinating area of research that it is believed to be of paramount importance is the effect of using learners’ L1. It is interesting to know whether L1 is a variable that influences L2 writers’ perceptions of feedback received from the peer and from the teacher in L1 during the one-to-one conferencing on the writing feedback. Also, this can indicate whether the receipt of PF in L1 can impact the level of feedback uptake.

To sum up, it is crucial to note that conducting more research into PF and its relation to TF in Egypt can definitely raise the awareness of all stakeholders of the potential of PF, how it can greatly complement TF, and how promoting it with different age groups and in different instructional settings can yield positive results.

5.9 Conclusion

The principal aim of this study was to compare between the perceptions of peer feedback and teacher feedback as viewed by adult Egyptian L2 writers. That aim was pursued to seal a gap in the literature of that area, which is the lack of abundancy of that line of research in Egypt, and particularly targeting adult L2 writers. As mentioned previously— in Chapter 2, earlier researchers, such as Yang et al. (2006), urge other researchers around the world to conduct more research in different countries to further explore the perceptions of peer feedback in different settings. Consequently, the study was guided by four RQs enquiring about general perceptions of PF versus TF, how PF and TF prioritize feedback on writing features differently, the perceptions of PF and TF uptake, and differences between genders in their perception of PF and TF. Adopting a mixed method, a questionnaire, an interview, and writing samples were the three data collection tools employed in the study to collect quantitative and qualitative data. The data analysed indicated a considerable awareness of the importance of PF in comparison with TF. L2 writers understand the value, use and benefit from PF, but not at the same extent of using TF.
Furthermore, the data showed that the peer prioritizes almost the same writing features that the teacher does in their feedback; however, there is a large gap in the instances of highlighting those features except for the vocabulary feature, where the peer and the teacher highlight them nearly in the same way. As for perceptions of PF and TF uptake, adult L2 writers at AUC in this study in Egypt believe, react, and feel motivated towards PF and TF in roughly the same way. They also have the same preference of feedback form from the peer and from the teacher in nearly the same fashion; however, very slight differences in perceptions, especially in how they prefer to receive PF and TF form, do exist, but those differences are limited in number. Finally, the investigation of gender differences and the effect of that on the perceptions of PF and TF yielded no significant differences quantitatively, but the interviewed sample indicated that male participants, in particular, see differences in accepting feedback from the peer; according to them, males show more tolerance in embracing feedback from same and opposite gender. These results imply that peer feedback practices ought to be maintained and encouraged. Teachers need to train learners on how to provide feedback in a structured and constructive manner in order to obtain more effective results from the practice. In addition, educators are advised to raise more awareness of the importance of practicing peer feedback, especially in large classes, to promote more interaction, and create communities of learning among learners.
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Appendix A

Questionnaire

https://forms.gle/e9FZHE4J1zkaBLCh9

This questionnaire includes questions that collect information about how learners of English in Egypt see the peer's (classmate's) writing feedback in comparison to their teacher's feedback.

The information you provide in this questionnaire is anonymous and will be used only in a research study. No names, addresses, contact numbers or email addresses will be needed. Do you agree to answer this questionnaire? *

- Yes
- No

1. What is your gender?
   - Female
   - Male

2. What is your English language level?
   - A1
   - A2
   - B1
   - B2

3. What is your educational level?
   - High school student
   - College student
   - University graduate
   - Master's degree holder
   - PhD holder

4. How motivated are you in your English learning journey?

Not motivated

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How do you find the teacher feedback on your writing vs your peer feedback?
- Teacher feedback is more important
- Both teacher feedback and peer feedback are equally important
- Peer's feedback is more important

6. It is only the teacher who can give you feedback on your writing.

7. Your writing can improve through feedback from your peer.

8. Giving feedback to the peer needs training.

9. You accept your teacher feedback on your writing.
- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

10. You use your teacher feedback on your writing.
- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

11. You accept your peer feedback on your writing.
- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never
12. You use your peer’s feedback on your writing.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

13. After receiving your teacher feedback on your writing, you discuss the feedback with your teacher.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

14. After receiving your peer’s feedback on your writing, you discuss the feedback with your peer.
   - Always
   - Often
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

15. Which is easier for you to understand?
   - Your teacher’s feedback
   - No difference in ease of understanding between both
   - Your peer’s feedback

16. You believe in your peer’s ability to give feedback on your writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Strongly agree

17. If you repeat an error more than once, you believe that highlighting the error every time it happens is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   useful

18. As soon as you receive the writing feedback from your teacher, you
   - read it carefully to use it in future writing
- do not generally use all that feedback in future writing
- just look at the grade and do not read the feedback

19. Generally, you like the writing feedback you receive from your teacher to be (You can check more than one box)
- in a paragraph
- long sentences to provide detailed explanation
- in bullet points
- including words like ‘you’ & ‘your’ as if the teacher is talking to you personally

20. You become highly engaged in your teacher feedback that is focused on (You can check more than one box)
- vocabulary
- grammar
- punctuation
- linking
- organization of ideas & paragraphs
- how to fully answer the writing question
- spelling
- number of words if fewer than the word limit in the question

21. You understand well the writing feedback that is (You can check more than one box)
- direct; the teacher just gives the correction
- indirect; the teacher just highlights that there is a mistake and leaves me to find it out and correct it
- given orally through a one-to-one meeting with my teacher
- commentary; the teacher just provides comments about the overall quality of my writing but no specific mistakes are corrected

22. When you receive the writing feedback from your teacher, you (You can check more than one box)
- tell yourself that the teacher is always right as this error is something new you are learning
- reject some corrections when they do not agree with the previous knowledge you have about the language
- feel there is no need for it because mistakes will be corrected by time

23. When you receive your writing feedback from your teacher, you
- generally know how to correct your mistakes in the future
- ask the teacher about only those feedback points that you do not understand
- do not know how to avoid those mistakes in future writing tasks
- memorize the correction of the mistakes to use in future writing

24. When you receive a lot of correction on your writing from your teacher, you
- feel encouraged to work on reducing the number of errors in future writing tasks
- feel demotivated and discouraged to work on your mistakes because they are many

25. The teacher’s words of encouragement ("good job", "you did a good job", "excellent") on your writing task
- motivate you to do better in future tasks
- do not make any difference to you
- are usually ignored by you and you do not notice them
- are a waste of the teacher’s time; you just need comments on your mistakes to push you to do better

26. You see that receiving writing feedback from your teacher (You can check more than one box)*
- helps you to improve
- only justifies the grade you received
- is considered part of the teacher’s duty
- is not that important as you only want to pass the course

27. As soon as you receive the writing feedback from your peer, you
- read it carefully to use it in future writing
- do not generally use all that feedback in future writing

28. Generally, you like the writing feedback you receive from your peer to be (You can check more than one box)
- in a paragraph
- long sentences to provide detailed explanation
- in bullet points
- including words like ‘you’ & ‘your’ as if the peer is talking to you personally

29. You become highly engaged in your peer feedback that is focused on (You can check more than one box)
- vocabulary
- grammar
- punctuation
- linking
- organization of ideas & paragraphs
- how to fully answer the writing question
- spelling
- number of words if fewer than the word limit in the question

30. You understand well the writing feedback that is (You can check more than one box)
- direct; the peer just gives the correction
- indirect; the peer just highlights that there is a mistake and leaves me to find it out and correct it
- given orally from my peer
- commentary; the peer just provides comments about the overall quality of my writing but no specific mistakes are corrected

31. When you receive the writing feedback from your peer, you (You can check more than one box)
- tell yourself that the peer is right as this error is something new you are learning
- reject some corrections when they do not agree with the previous knowledge you have about the language
- feel there is no need for it because mistakes will be corrected by time

32. When you receive your writing feedback from your peer, you
- generally know how to correct your mistakes in the future
- ask the peer about only those feedback points that you do not understand
- do not know how to avoid those mistakes in future writing tasks
- memorize the correction of the mistakes to use in future writing

33. When you receive a lot of correction on your writing from your peer, you
- feel encouraged to work on reducing the number of errors in future writing tasks
- feel demotivated and discouraged to work on your mistakes because they are many

34. The peer’s words of encouragement ("good job", "you did a good job", "excellent") on your writing task
- motivate you to do better in future tasks
- do not make any difference to you
- are usually ignored by you and you do not notice them
- are a waste of the peer’s time; you just need comments on your mistakes to push you to do better
35. You see that receiving writing feedback from your peer (You can check more than one box)
   - helps you to improve
   - does not help you to improve

Do you agree to be contacted via Zoom meetings for a short discussion about the topic?
   - Yes
   - No

If yes, please provide the most convenient way to contact you to set an appointment for the Zoom meeting.
Appendix B

Interview Questions

1. From your point of view, name one most important advantage, and one most serious disadvantage in classmate feedback on your writing. Why?

2. From your point of view, name one most important advantage, and one most serious disadvantage in teacher feedback on your writing. Why?

3. Do your classmate and your teacher focus on the same types of error in your writing? How?

4. What types of errors do you wish to have more feedback on from your peer and your teacher?

5. How do you react to the writing feedback you get from your classmate? Why do you react that way?

6. How do you react to the writing feedback you get from your teacher? Why do you react that way?

7. Do you believe all learners of your gender have the same idea about classmate feedback and teacher feedback like you do? Why?
### Appendix C

#### Coding of Interviews Textual Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PFA</td>
<td>Peer feedback advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFD</td>
<td>Peer feedback disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFA</td>
<td>Teacher feedback advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFD</td>
<td>Teacher feedback disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFF</td>
<td>Peer feedback focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>Teacher feedback focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFW</td>
<td>Wishes for more focus of writing features from peer feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFW</td>
<td>Wishes for more focus of writing features from teacher feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFR</td>
<td>Peer feedback reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFR</td>
<td>Teacher feedback reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>Gender differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGD</td>
<td>No gender differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D

### The Counts of Error Instances of Eight Writing Features as Highlighted by The Peer Versus The Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency level</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Voc</th>
<th>Gr</th>
<th>Punct</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Coh</th>
<th>Cap</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Sp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* S = Sample; Voc = Vocabulary; Gr = Grammar; Punct = Punctuation; Link = Linking; Coh = Coherence; Cap = Capitalization; Prep = Preposition; Sp = Spelling
Appendix E

Interview Transcriptions

Interview One: Yara

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one important advantage, and one most serious disadvantage in the feedback that is given by a classmate on your writing.

Participant: I think when we come correct to each other the grammar mistakes

Interviewer: Okay, so this is an advantage?

Participant: Yes, this is an advantage. And the disadvantage, I think maybe when someone insists on his point, and maybe it's actually wrong.

Interviewer: And how do you handle the situation then? What do you do?

Participant: Well, sometimes, maybe I give him a chance. Maybe he's correct. And I wait for the teacher’s feedback.

Interviewer: So you don't get involved in any arguments or anything with that classmate. You just wait for the teacher?

Participant: Yes. Maybe he's going to be right. I wait for the teacher’s feedback.

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one most important advantage and one most serious disadvantage in the teacher’s feedback on a piece of writing that you have just done?

Participant: I think the most important thing is the punctuation and how to write the article. Sometimes simple things we just forgot it and the teacher keep on reminding us about it several times.

Interviewer: Any disadvantages in receiving feedback from a teacher?

Participant: I don't have any disadvantage right now.

Interviewer: So maybe in terms of feedback that is contradicting with another thing that a previous teacher told you in a previous level? Have you ever faced a situation like this: a contradiction of correction or a contradiction of information?

Participant: Maybe sometimes when we come to read our writing that we need to focus more on the pronunciation of some words.
Interviewer: Which is not the focus of this activity. It's not about pronunciation. It's about writing.

Participant: But actually, even if it's about writing, I think it's very important also to take care of the pronunciation of students.

Interviewer: So this is an advantage in this case, or is this a disadvantage?

Participant: This is a disadvantage.

Interviewer: Yes, because this is not the scope. The scope is not pronunciation. The scope is writing simply.

Participant: But I think we need to work with the skill in a parallel way.

Interviewer: Do your classmate and your teacher focus on the same types of errors when they correct your writing, or they have different areas that they focus on? And tell me how please.

Participant: I think that the teacher has got criteria that she needs to focus on: the structure, the vocab, the idioms, and maybe the classmates, their points of view will be a little bit different because they are going to focus on the maybe the sentence structure only, or maybe the tense that we are using.

Interviewer: What types of errors that you wish to have more feedback on, either from your classmate or from your teacher?

Participant: Maybe the vocab that we are using it, maybe to use more difficult words then. So we can let the sentence to be more difficult. Not so simple.

Interviewer: This is from both the teacher and the classmate?

Participant: Yes, the teacher and the classmate.

Interviewer: How do you react to the writing feedback you get from your classmate? And why do you react that way?

Participant: Well, I listen to them and try to get his point. And maybe I'll check again what did I write and I feel it's okay with me when the classmates gives me their opinion, it's okay with me. I think it depends on the character that I can accept this. It's okay with me. Maybe if you are stubborn or something like this, you won't be able to accept the other's point of view.

Interviewer: But for you personally, you just let listen attentively, and you give the person a chance?
Participant: Sometimes, when I write a sentence then someone suddenly said, ‘But it's better to write this vocab’, so it’s okay to wait and I'll see the teacher’s feedback after this.

Interviewer: How do you react to the writing feedback you get from a teacher? And why do you react that way?

Participant: Well, I think that no one is perfect. So I think that's why that you don't stop on things. When you do your writings, you forgot something, so it's a good chance for you to have someone that is correcting you.

Interviewer: So, you accept it, you don't argue, you don't go back to the teacher and say why this is wrong? And why this is not in the correct place?

Participant: I do it rarely when I tried to read the feedback and I couldn't understand something, so I return back to the teacher when I think yes, I know that this my mistake, so it's okay.

Interviewer: Do you believe all learners of your gender have the same idea about classmate feedback and teacher feedback like you do? And if not, what are the differences between people?

Participant: Well, I think each one has got his own charisma and how he is going to accept it or no. I think it's from his character or personality. As for me, I don't like to go through lots of negotiations. I like to work in peace. That's why I don't like to negotiate. But even when I talk, I just give only my feedback, and I'll stop because I don't like to enter lots of negotiations.

Interviewer: And you think all English language learners who are females act the same way?

Participant: It depends. Each one has got his own personality. So it's different.

Interviewer: So it does not depend on the gender?

Participant: No, actually depends on their personality.

Interview Two: Haitham

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one important advantage, and one most serious disadvantage in the feedback that is given by a classmate on your writing.

Participant: In my in my opinion, we have a lot of concerns that we are shy to make mistakes during our classes. The most important thing that I noticed is that there are many classmates that copy from Google, so that is not their real level as they copy from Google and paste it in our chat or in our Google document. So, our teachers correct them. But honestly, that’s not my level, I think it's a big issues that that I see during
our classes. I am doing that to be honest, but I tend to revise it again and learn from it, not just to copy and paste it and that’s it. I have to learn from it.

Interviewer: When it comes to receiving feedback from a classmate, what is the most important advantage in this?

Participant: You learn from it. You can correct your knowledge and you can build another knowledge or new knowledge from them. I think everyone [have] a special manner or a special advantage. You can take this advantage and work on it, and you can improve this to make a great point or a good thing. I think so.

Interviewer: Do you see any disadvantage in receiving feedback from your classmate?

Participant: I think it's a great thing to receive feedback from classmates to correct our mistakes and make progress in our learning journey. I think as you know, you can learn from your mistakes. It's better to learn from your mistakes. So, you should receive feedback from others to learn new things, and you can improve it and enhance it.

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one most important advantage and one most serious disadvantage in the teacher’s feedback on a piece of writing that you have just done?

Participant: I learn to receive feedback from teachers. It's a turning point in your life, if you have a good teacher or a great teacher who is knowledgeable or [have] a wide range of information. He can feed you with this information so you can be affected by him. Receiving feedback from teachers is the most important thing while you are learning something; you should be all ears all the time, you can take notes or you should take notes, you can revise them [in] a daily basis, you can save them for your life not just for this moment. You can save it and you can revise it on a daily basis or on a weekly basis. I do that.

Interviewer: Do your classmate and your teacher focus on the same types of errors when they correct your writing, or they have different areas that they focus on? And tell me how please.

Participant: I think we should all make mistakes. It depends on the type of mistakes. For example, I make mistakes in [the] question mark or capitalization, so my teacher will correct them. But the most important thing is that I recommend that every teacher should focus on [the] weaknesses that the students or classmates have to strengthen that I think.

Interviewer: Is there a difference between what the teacher focuses on and what the classmate focuses on when they give you feedback on a piece of writing that you have done?
Participant: I think there is a big difference. [The] teacher will focus on just our classmates’ mistakes. But, they do not try to add something new all the time. Also, teachers correct mistakes [and] do not add something new. I feel that or I noticed that most of the time. And I think the most important thing is that every teacher should talk with his students to know their weaknesses, so they focus on them and make progress on them all the time not just to correct their mistakes.

Interviewer: What types of errors that you wish to have more feedback on, either from your classmate or from your teacher?

Participant: I think I wish to have more focus on grammars. I think we have a lot of vocab, but we are losing more practice. We need more practice.

Interviewer: How do you react to the writing feedback you get from your classmate? And why do you react that way?

Participant: I doubt it every time. But there is something that I have knowledge about it, so I take it and I use it, but there is something else that I doubted and I ignore or tend not to use it.

Interviewer: How do you react to the writing feedback you get from a teacher? And why do you react that way?

Participant: I feel great when I receive feedback from my teacher. I feel that he should focus on my mistakes, and I save it in my laptop or my document so I revise it on a daily basis. I think [it] make[s] a progress in my life.

Interviewer: Is gender difference a big factor in this. For example, can I say that males like to receive only feedback from males and females only from females? Can I say that there is no gender difference?

Participant: It [does] not depend on the gender, it depends on the efficiency, I think.

Interviewer: Can you tell me how efficiency is a factor?

Participant: Yes, I think I meet a lot of teachers [during] my learning journeys as I learn English from A1A. There are a lot of teachers that affected me. There are a lot of teacher that not affected me. I think they have not efficiency or adequate efficiency to affect me or to make me more interested in English. I think the character of teacher is very important or very essential. When you are charismatic, you can affect the others easily and effectively. I think I never forget a Miss, her name is really difficult but it affected me. I think it is the most beautiful teacher I meet in AUC. There is a lot of information that [s]he sent to us. I think it was [the] first time to see this information. I think I feel appreciate for this Miss or this doctor. Another teacher, it
was a woman too, but it doesn't have any effect. I think it was spend time, three hours with us. Just to spend the time not to learn something useful or something fruitful, I think. So I think it does not depend on the gender, it depends on efficiency, or the competency.

Interviewer: And when it comes to the classmate, can I say, for example, that male students like to receive feedback from male students,[and] they don't like to receive from females. And the same for female students?

Participant: I think classmates tend to receive feedback from the same gender. Yes, I noticed that a lot of time[s].

Interviewer: Why you think the same gender likes to receive feedback from each other not from the opposite gender? Why?

Participant: Because they lose the ability of reacting with others, I think, due to the lack of experience that the students have. [However], our teachers are old and knowledgeable, charismatic. As you know, AUC will not choose any teacher, they have to be knowledgeable and charismatic and highly experienced, but our students are young, so they lose the experience of life, the ability of reacting with others, and they don’t have the soft skills. I think all of [these] factors will affect their behavior. So they feel shy to receive feedback from other gender. As you know, our community is very shy or a little bit shy. So woman or girls tend to speak with girl[s]. [The] man will talk with [a] man. They feel comfortable with the same gender.

Interview Three: Abdullah

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one important advantage, and one most serious disadvantage in the feedback that is given by a classmate on your writing.

Participant: When you receive feedback from your colleagues, you will benefit from their knowledge and skills and you will get your mistakes to avoid using them again. Maybe the only disadvantage is that some students they may feel some negative things like embarrassment, but overall you can benefit from your colleague.

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one most important advantage and one most serious disadvantage in the teacher’s feedback on a piece of writing that you have just done?

Participant: I think from the teacher is more acceptable because he is your school teacher and you will benefit from his experience and knowledge and that is what you want. And this time you will not feel any embarrassment. For the disadvantages in this, I see there is no disadvantage unless the teacher [does] not fulfill his duty.
Interviewer: Do your classmate and your teacher focus on the same types of errors when they correct your writing, or they have different areas that they focus on? And tell me how please.

Participant: Yes, I think the first one when you get feedback from your colleague, you may feel some embarrassment and that can make you not accept the whole feedback, but when you receive from your teacher, that is his duty and you will accept the comment from your teacher because you trust him, your trust his experience and knowledge. And that is normal.

Interviewer: Is there a difference between what the teacher focuses on and what the classmate focuses on when they give you feedback on a piece of writing that you have done?

Participant: Yes, there is big difference, because the teacher knows all this criteria well, and what one use it or what one does not use it, but my colleague doesn't know how to use this criteria perfectly.

Interviewer: So what does the classmate usually focus on?

Participant: I think he focuses on vocabulary and the grammar.

Interviewer: And what does the teacher focus on?

Participant: The teacher focuses on the whole package of this criteria; pronunciation, grammar, cohesion, and spelling.

Interviewer: What types of errors that you wish to have more feedback on, either from your classmate or from your teacher?

Participant: First from your teacher, you will need feedback for all areas: pronunciation and grammar and cohesion and the spelling. All these issues. But from your colleague, maybe you need more vocabulary, and I think spelling.

Interviewer: How do you react to the writing feedback you get from your classmate? And why do you react that way?

Participant: If feedback touches on the valid point, I accept it, and I thank my colleague, but in many times maybe your colleague does not give you the valid point. And that is because of his experience, it's not enough and I think the whole situation depends on if he touched on a valid point or not.

Interviewer: And if you feel that your colleague is not touching on a valid point, how do you react: you reject it, you ignore it, you say thank you, you speak back to him or to her and you tell him your point is valid?
Participant: Yes, I will act directly and I will express my point of view from my side, and explain the issue from my angle. And this will be discussion between me and he or she yes because this is not the accurate thing, as a teacher.

Interviewer: How do you react to the writing feedback you get from a teacher? And why do you react that way?

Participant: Yes, the only difference will be the level of acceptance will be highly. And I think I will discuss with my teacher from the issues. I think I have other views. And I think the teacher will explain this for me more. And in other words, I will ask my teacher [for] more explanations and interpretations.

Interviewer: Do female and male students view the feedback from a classmate or from a teacher differently? Or the same in your opinion?

Participant: I think this depends on the individuals and their cultures. And I think it's no different but in some societies and communities, they may not accept female opinions. It's related to the cultures.

Interviewer: You mean a male will not accept a feedback from a female?

Participant: Yes, in some societies.

Interviewer: How about among the same gender: males from males, and females from females. How do you think the process goes?

Participant: I think the process in this situation is better. So same gender is better than from a different gender or from the opposite gender in [the] level of acceptance and discussions.

**Interview Four: Mayar**

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one important advantage, and one most serious disadvantage in the feedback that is given by a classmate on your writing.

Participant: I think sometimes it's actually hard to accept a feedback from a colleague because he is not, or she is as learning as you are or as I am. And I find that a little bit not helpful. Actually, even if he praises me, or she praises me. I don't think it's, like, useful. But one advantage, let me think about the question. I think it doesn't add much of progress to my work or to my thinking, even because I don't even remember it. If a teacher gives me feedback, it stuck in my head, or in my mind. But a classmate, I can I hear him and, and I thank him or her, but I don't work with the advice she or he gives me.
Interviewer: From your point of view, name one most important advantage and one most serious
disadvantage in the teacher’s feedback on a piece of writing that you have just
done?

Participant: Teachers’ feedback is very important. Feedback is very important because teachers
are very knowledgeable and more knowledgeable than the students and educated.
They are trustworthy to accept their opinions or their comments on your work
because when you learn new things, or new skills teachers give you help give you
advice and guidance, how you are doing or how's your work. And what is most
important is the behavior of the teacher according to the student’s mistakes, like if
he or she makes fun of the work, it's not helpful. This is frustrating and never helps
the student. And also, it motivates us, this is an advantage, it motivates us because it
helps us to write more and to be careful in our writing in the future. And our
classmates feedback, it's not like I don't take it seriously, but teacher’s feedback [is]
more important than the student’s.

Interviewer: Do your classmate and your teacher focus on the same types of errors when they
correct your writing, or they have different areas that they focus on? And tell me
how please.

Participant: The teacher focuses on all writing features. So the teacher gives feedback about all
the features: the punctuation, the grammar, while classmates may help you give a
simple idea, or to discuss your idea in a simpler way. As for the classmate, they
have mistakes; they don't give feedback about the grammar. Only about the idea
itself: how to explain it to be more simple. But the teacher gives feedback about
everything in the paragraph or in the essay.

Interviewer: What types of errors that you wish to have more feedback on, either from your
classmate or from your teacher?

Participant: The same idea that I mentioned before; students give feedback about how to explain
the idea. This is very important. Sometimes I explain it, the sentences become too
long. And so the teacher or the reader gets lost. So I need to have help on how to
write more simple sentences, or to explain straight to the point, that the idea is
explained straight to the point.

Interviewer: How do you react to the writing feedback you get from your classmate? And why
do you react that way?

Participant: Like I said, I can hear from them their feedback, but I don't take it seriously. I just
accept their opinion, but I prefer the teacher’s feedback. Sometimes they
(classmates) are judgmental, or sometimes you can you get the feeling that maybe
it's vulgar, a little bit. So I don't like it. That depends on the personality of the
student who gives feedback. Some of them are respectful and they try their best to not be judgmental, and not tell you that you are wrong. No, they explain it to you, like if you did this, it's much better than doing that than what you did or what you wrote.

Interviewer: How do you react to the writing feedback you get from a teacher? And why do you react that way?

Participant: I totally accept it because the teacher always wants what is in my best interest to become much better in the writing or in speaking. I accept it because, like I said, he's educated, [and] he wants me to be a better student. Also, because it's helpful and useful; it will help me to progress in the future and my studies in the future.

Interviewer: In your opinion, do female and male learners view the feedback from a classmate or from a teacher differently? Or they view it the same way?

Participant: There is difference. To receive feedback from a female, it's a little bit acceptable, it's acceptable than from a guy or from a man or from a male classmate. And because personally, I am a shy person, and I get a little too shy when I hear a comment from a man or a guy. But from a girl to a girl, it's easier or acceptable. So we are more comfortable with the same gender, and accept feedback easily. And I respect all the feedback as long as the classmates are respectful to me also; they are not judgmental.

Interview Five: Othman

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one important advantage, and one most serious disadvantage in the feedback that is given by a classmate on your writing.

Participant: I will start with the disadvantages that some of them maybe not fluent enough or maybe not good enough to give me a comment. He may give a wrong answer and I may think that it is a right answer even if it was a wrong answer. So, it will be a bigger problem for me. So, that that is the disadvantages. The advantage of such thing [is] that I can have corrections from my colleagues in a better way, then the teacher. We are colleagues together, there’s no problem. He told me [it is] better to say that and it depends on the teacher and I will prefer from my classmate over the teacher, and sometimes no, I like the teacher and I may benefit more from the teacher.

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one most important advantage and one most serious disadvantage in the teacher’s feedback on a piece of writing that you have just done?
Participant: It may be the opposite of the previous answer. Actually, for correction I will be sure that is right. I could follow his correction. And I will be sure that that's the right answer not a wrong answer. The problem sometimes I may feel that the teacher may judge me that I am bad in English, something like that. The thing is his correction is judgemental maybe I’ll be affected by his judgment towards me.

Interviewer: Do your classmate and your teacher focus on the same types of errors when they correct your writing, or they have different areas that they focus on? And tell me how please.

Participant: Sometimes there are many differences. Actually, it's based on the quality of my classmates. Sometimes they are high quality, so there will be no difference between what they are focusing on and what the teacher focuses on. But sometimes they focus on something not important. The teacher focuses on the punctuation while most of my colleagues not focus on such things. He focuses on the correct building of the statement or the building of the paragraph, and he sometimes may find it is better to be written like that. My colleagues cannot say that. They can give some comment that the spelling of this word is not correct. Something very small, not the majors, but the teacher is able to focus on these small things, and he can see [them] well.

Interviewer: What types of errors that you wish to have more feedback on, either from your classmate or from your teacher?

Participant: Actually punctuation because I don't care about punctuation. That's for me. I don't know a lot about punctuation. During my course with you I paid more attention to the punctuation because I [was] totally wrong. But now I start to think about punctuation, like apostrophe or something like. That actually makes a big difference for me.

Interviewer: How do you react to the writing feedback you get from your classmate? And why do you react that way?

Participant: I consider their correction of course. Sometimes I agree sometimes I disagree. Sometimes I need to trust him to consider his correction for me. And sometimes I wait for the teacher to correct it for me to be sure because I felt that he is on my level and so what make him know more.

Interviewer: How do you react to the writing feedback you get from a teacher? And why do you react that way?

Participant: I considered it of course, and especially when it is written feedback like the feedback that is sent to me after the assessment. I consider it especially I like it
when it is just in bullets and I read the words marked in red. I will consider it very well because it looks very simple and accurate. And I wish it to be more like if sometimes you change the world and tell me it's better to say that or to write it like that. I like it very much.

Interviewer: Do female and male learners view the feedback from a classmate or from a teacher differently? If yes how?

Participant: Before I thought that they are both but actually after I finished the class, no females asking more. Sometimes they reject to be told that they are wrong. But males [are] maybe more flexible. I hear some of my female classmates negotiate too much: ‘no I want to repeat it.’ Males are okay with it ‘I want to learn, I just want to learn nothing more.’ Females like to talk too much and like to negotiate too much I don't know why. Some of them I felt that they respond to the correction as if it's a correction in a school or high school as they say ‘Oh no, I can't accept some corrections.’ But overall they are close to each other. But there are little differences.

Interviewer: In terms of accepting feedback from the same gender or from the opposite gender are some Can I say that females accept only feedback from females and males from males? Or you think there is no difference? What's your opinion?

Participant: I think females may accept feedback from males better than other females while males may accept feedback from the males better than the females.

Interviewer: Any reason behind that?

Participant: I heard actually something like that during the small group discussion. I think when a female gives her opinion, I found ‘No I think that's better’, become a little not fighting but negotiation and discussion. But they may accept the opinion of males better. I think so. Actually, sometimes males accept the opinion of females also. But female and female, they [do] not accept each other’s opinion.

**Interview Six: Amgad**

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one important advantage, and one most serious disadvantage in the feedback that is given by a classmate on your writing.

Participant: I can see it from a student's perspective. This is one of the advantages. And they can spot, things that are different in a way, everyone has shared a little bit of experience from a lot of places. So I think they can have a different perspective, not the best perspective, or the best point of view or anything, but it can be at least different. And from the perspective of a student, so it can be related to the situation. And one of the disadvantages that most of students around all the courses because I started the course from the seventh level, so I took a lot of them. So that's the common
thing that they want to get to move on. Any doctors ask, 'What do you think? Oh, it's good. Let's move on. Let's keep going.' So sometimes it's very quick or running over them to look twice. So that's one of the disadvantages. And I think sometimes they like to talk a little bit because of the students is, nothing very specific as the teacher, the teacher will be very specific in the feedback, however, the student will be over there and over here. So it's a little bit difficult to understand that some of them make sense. And some of them can get to special points, and some of them talk too much. So this is like the advantages and disadvantages.

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one most important advantage and one most serious disadvantage in the teacher’s feedback on a piece of writing that you have just done?

Participant: Well, the teacher is, the advantage is, he is straight to the point. He is the best of all the people in the group. Yes, students won't have the same experience or never same. Like they won't be genuine, the teacher will be more genuine and more specific on the problem and how to solve it. And he will have the tools to deliver the information regarding of how the student can understand it. Because each one of us has a way to understand things. Teachers have this potential; they have this skill to make students understand. And I saw it in a lot of teachers and a lot of doctors and especially doctor, you know how to handle the student. Like you, if you if this way didn't work, you just simplified more and more like take it on an example give an example or two so you can you have this skill. And this is very rare, especially these days from people don't read or don't have any knowledge. So this is something rare. Okay, for disadvantage, I think there is no disadvantage. I don't know maybe in some situation for some doctors, it might be that sometimes not always, but a few times, maybe the lack of skill or lack of couple of information, or sometimes teachers like to move on. For example, she was not enthusiast about the session, like she didn't give feedback that much. So she's just like something heavy on her heart. It's not something good because she will take responsibility of it.

Interviewer: Do your classmate and your teacher focus on the same types of errors when they correct your writing, or they have different areas that they focus on? And tell me how please.

Participant: The students most likely will like it's very rare for, for students to spot something that is beneficial to me, they spot only the things that make the line look bad, or look like it's not correct. They want to make you like look bad or something. But it's not like that; they just like to spot the bad things or the wrong words are the incorrect lines: the punctuation, the ED or the ING, or the grammar. They spot only the wrong things. However, the teacher spots the things that you are mistaken, and they give us the feedback that improves us, like, you need to do this and they
correct it. They don't just say that's wrong; we could say we could add, we can do this. They don't directly point fingers. They don't have the skill to deliver the information that this was not correct. The teachers have this skill and it's very unique and makes people like accept it [as] it gives them more acceptance for their mistakes.

Interviewer: What types of errors that you wish to have more feedback on, either from your classmate or from your teacher?

Participant: Grammar. Sometimes I get lost in the grammar a little bit. This stuff like makes me like get confused or like I don't like fully get it. One doctor told me you just don't have to keep learning the grammar like ABC. You just have to learn just like talking, like Arabic, when you start talking, we don't learn Arabic but we can understand the Arabic so it's the same in English. She told me that you just have to see if the sentence makes sense to you. Sometimes I had situations in which things mix up a lot with me and I already talked to you about this, like I have problems with ‘has’ and ‘have’. Sometimes but this is very rare: the ED, the ING the grammar is sometimes I get mistaken but most of the time I look at the sentence if it's not right. The quotations, yes, I'm still like not getting the hang of them 100%, but I work myself like a lot. And there was a doctor in a previous level that helped me a lot, and especially doctor, you helped a lot with the quotations like when to use them, when to do them. So from the students, I don't think that students can get me the errors that I want to improve on my writing. But I really wish that they can help me with simple things like to improve the language because sometimes you as you told us before that you can use the same sentence but in a better and a shorter way. So students, yes, they can help me with this because they have very good words that can summon the whole situation in one word for teachers I would like them to focus on my grammar, and on the quotation especially like the important things like to summon things that the teacher I want them like, in my writing to focus on the important things and the students to focus on alternatives. Students can think on alternatives, like when you have three or four words that can describe the same thing, but like, in more fancy or classier way. This is from the students it will be good. And from teacher, the basics and the important things and the quotations and like grammar.

Interviewer: How do you react to the writing feedback you get from your classmate? And why do you react that way?

Participant: Well, like I said before, that the students don't have the way to handle things. So just like, you’re bad, you do this in a bad way. It feels like this. They don't say it like this, but feels like it; however, the teachers say it indirectly that students say directly, and it's a nature of humans that they don't like feel pointed at with the
finger. And like, seeing that you did this wrong, not all people can swallow this pill. However, the teacher can use a smoother method to tell them ‘you have done this wrong. If we could do this way, if I were you’; the things that the teachers taught us, but the students, however, unfortunately, don't use this stuff.

Interviewer: So in this case, do you reject the classmate’s feedback completely, and you accept the teacher feedback completely? Is it that way?

Participant: Well, I accept the teachers, like 95%, or 90%. The students sometimes feel like, I don't like him judging me. But I don't think people do this. But for myself, I say it's okay. We all do mistakes, like I just take it for the good way. I'll think of a bad way that he's pointing finger and he's saying that I'm not good enough. Now I'm thinking like take it and swallow it. And so but like I said that the teacher’s feedback is more accurate, and I'm going to say more genuine, like, just go straight to the point. Even if I don't understand the situation, he will make me understand the situation.

Interviewer: Do male and female learners view the feedback from a classmate differently, or in the same way. Can we say, for example that a female accept feedback from females, not males? And males accept for males only not from females? Can we say that?

Participant: There's a difference because sometimes the gender can affect the feedback sometimes because there was a time I was at a level and the teacher was a female. There was a student who was talking about the mosquito and he said ‘her’ so she said: 'Why were you guys always saying her? It can be it or him.' So sometimes females think that it's a man's world, but actually, it's not like that. So I just wanted to correct the situation that only female mosquitoes feed on blood to produce eggs, males, vegetables. I wasn't meant to be rude or anything, but just stating facts. Okay, so, yes, and one of the times in our last session, I said something about the female gender and the male gender that triggered one of the female students. I don't remember situation, but I think it was about like, we had a session about, business, I said something about the gender and she was triggered, like, ‘Why are you saying this like this, you know, females don't do and do this, and we are not different.’ The problem I see that there's a problem that people don't know what's right for the men and what's right for the women and what's wrong for them. We just get the concept of equality from the foreigners. Unfortunately our traditions and our religion especially the division show each one, but they think that men control them, it's like a man’s world, but most likely that every percentage say that women occupy more jobs than we do. Okay, so they get triggered a lot when we talk about them. So yes, it does affect them. When we talk about them or say anything about them or even make a small innocent joke, they get like angry and especially the feminists.
Interviewer: So we can see that there is a difference between how a female accepts feedback and how a male accepts feedback especially on writing; there is a difference between them, can I say that females only accept feedback from females, and they don't accept it from males can I say that?

Participant: Sometimes females can see the paragraph, in their nature, they like to see things organized. And I saw it because most people, not just females, they cast an idea, and they just want people to put that idea in action. They are not flexible and especially that females these days the right thing is not to go out that much and socialize that much because to preserve the woman or the girl itself, so they just like cast the idea and don't tolerate. However, the guys have a little bit of toleration because they face work situations and a lot of situations, so they can be flexible. Sometimes some of them are hard-headed. So you just like, put the idea, you put this, here and here and we can do this. Sometimes we can, it's easier for us to be flexible with men and cast your ideas at ease than females, which sometimes it's a little bit difficult. But there's also flexible females, but it's not genuine; the highest percentage is that it's a little bit difficult for females. But the higher percentage of easy to open up is for the men.

Interview Seven: Hala

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one important advantage, and one most serious disadvantage in the feedback that is given by a classmate on your writing.

Participant: I really get benefit from hearing the feedback and I may let the other colleagues learn from your feedback on my writing. I have no problem with this because I learned too from the others feedback. When you give feedback to others, I get notes and, and get benefits too. For disadvantages. I think I may feel insecure. A lot of people see or translate this feedback, like it's against them or annoy them or put them in a bad situation. So my vision or my view for my colleagues is maybe not good. Or maybe they remember I think it's not true, but some people may think that way.

Interviewer: From your point of view, name one most important advantage and one most serious disadvantage in the teacher’s feedback on a piece of writing that you have just done?

Participant: From a teacher is the main point from the course, I am here because I want to receive your feedback because you're a specialist. So, I am here to just learn and hear from your experience and your knowledge. So receiving a feedback from my teacher is the main point here to learn this advantage, maybe misunderstanding happens about a point, like I mean something and you translate it into another thing. So you give me wrong feedback because you misunderstand me. But I think the
Interviewer: Do your classmate and your teacher focus on the same types of errors when they correct your writing, or do they have different areas that they focus on? And tell me how please.

Participant: I think as you always taught us, we must focus on a lot of things: structure, relevance, and other points. I think we are as colleagues, we just focus on how much or how many words I write not the value of the written subject.

Interviewer: What types of errors that you wish to have more feedback on, either from your classmate or from your teacher?

Participant: The first problem that I noticed is that I wasn't using a lot of expressions or new words; just was using my dictionary, so the dictionary in my head. So I need to improve a lot of more new words and the trendy things to be connected with the language. [This is from the classmate and from the teacher].

Interviewer: How do you react to the writing feedback you get from your classmate? And why do you react that way?

Participant: Actually, I like this. When you made us to comment on the others topics and writing, I really enjoyed this because I just not focus on my topic. No, I learn more. It's not only my topic now the topics of the others. So I wanted the knowledge. I like to learn from others. So I have no problems. They may see something I can see or understand something more than me. So why not?

Interviewer: When you receive writing feedback from a teacher, how do you react to that feedback? And why do you react that way?

Participant: Actually, I think it’s more honest because the teacher sees us as students; we’re here to learn, so you pay attention to this point because we’re not perfect. So, you consider that we’re still learning; however, you give us a satisfying degree. It doesn’t mean that you compliment us, but you understand that I’m trying, and I’m good at my stage. So receiving feedback from a teacher is an honour for me because when I get a high degree from a specialist, I think it gives me trust and makes me feel powerful because I want to learn more, even though the feedback is negative because the teacher says ‘must’ or ‘have to write in another way’, that makes me want to learn more because the main point as I mentioned before is learning. If I don’t make mistakes I’m not learning.

Interviewer: Do male and female learners view the feedback from a classmate or the teacher differently, or in the same way?
Participant: In the same way I think. Here in the learning environment, there’s no difference between boy or girl, young or adult. At the SCE we’re just saying our names. In the real life, I’m still a student, but I’m talking to a manager, I’m a CEO of a company. But we are the same in the class. We’re here to learn so there’s no difference between males and females.
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