

Students' uptake and perspectives on teacher and peer feedback on written assignments

Teacher and
peer feedback

Mohammed Abdullah Alharbi and Abdulrahman Nasser Alqefari
*Department of English, College of Education, Majmaah University,
Majmaah, Saudi Arabia*

107

Received 20 February 2021
Revised 30 April 2021
10 October 2021
14 December 2021
Accepted 7 October 2022

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this study is to examine the uptake of peer vs. instructor feedback provided on written essays by undergraduates in a writing course at a public university in Saudi Arabia.

Design/methodology/approach – This was a classroom intervention exploratory study with 16 pairs of students attending a writing class over a period of 14 weeks.

Findings – Analysis of feedback and uptake indicated that the students incorporated a high rate (85.21%) of feedback in revising their essays. The results also showed that the quantity of students' uptake of instructor feedback (88.77%) was higher than that of peer feedback (82.17%). In terms of the rate of uptake of global feedback focusing on content and organization vs. local feedback focusing on language and formatting, the rate of uptake of local feedback (85.34%) was slightly higher than the uptake of global feedback (84.90%). The current results also showed that the quality of feedback (peer vs. instructor feedback and global vs. local feedback) also varied. Students' perspectives on feedback underlined their perceived value of feedback on writing, their preference for instructor feedback and the perceived benefits of providing and receiving feedback.

Originality/value – This study investigated an area that has been under-researched in the Saudi higher education context and it has direct implications for the provision of feedback in writing classes.

Keywords Feedback, Student feedback uptake, Peer feedback, Peer assessment, Instructor feedback

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Over the past few decades, the provision of feedback has attracted considerable attention in the field of English as a second or foreign language (ESL/EFL). One way to measure the effectiveness of feedback is to determine students' uptake of feedback, which is defined as students' responses to feedback (Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001; Linares & Lyster, 2014; Loewen, 2004; Sheen, 2004; Wu & Schunn, 2020). In other words, uptake is known as ESL/EFL students' incorporation of feedback into their language production. In the context of formative feedback on student writing, uptake is the extent to which students integrate such feedback into revising their texts (Dressler, Chu, Crossman, & Hilman, 2019).

There has been limited empirical evidence on the interaction between feedback and uptake to confirm its effectiveness on students' writing of assignments where they are required to develop their academic writing (Dressler *et al.*, 2019; Landry, Jacobs, & Newton, 2015). Studies comparing students' uptake of two feedback sources (teacher and peer) are scant (Dressler *et al.*, 2019; Ruegg, 2015a). Such research is important, especially in the context of Saudi Arabia where EFL learners may find teacher feedback difficult to understand and, consequently, may fail to take up

© Mohammed Abdullah Alharbi and Abdulrahman Nasser Alqefari. Published in *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives*. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/legalcode>

Competing of interests: The authors declare that he has no competing of interests.



such feedback in revising their academic writing. This necessitates an investigation of Saudi learners' uptake of teacher and peer feedback. Therefore, the present study sets out to examine Saudi university students' uptake of and perspectives on peer and teacher feedback in an academic writing course during one academic semester.

Literature review

Theoretical perspective

Research on feedback and uptake is grounded on different theoretical perspectives, most important of which are the sociocultural theory by Vygotsky (1978) and the Output Hypothesis by Swain (1995). In terms of Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory, feedback is viewed as a kind of assistance or support provided by more capable individuals to learners (e.g. Hanaoka & Izumi, 2012; Hyland, 2010; Lee, 2014; Tang & Liu, 2018). Such assistance plays a role in students' successful accomplishment of written tasks that they may not be able to complete independently.

Swain's (1995) Output Hypothesis assumes that comprehensible input alone may not lead to the desired improvement of learners' second language acquisition (SLA) because it needs to be accompanied by modified output which is the result of feedback (Suzuki, 2004). This suggests that learners' production of the language can be manifested as their uptake of feedback (Ellis *et al.*, 2001; Santos, López Serrano, & Manchón, 2010). Both of these theoretical perspectives have guided this study in examining the extent of students' uptake of both peer and instructor's feedback in their revised writings.

Formative feedback and uptake

Researchers have argued that uptake of feedback plays a role in facilitating learners' language development as it allows them to notice, understand and correct their errors (Ellis *et al.*, 2001; Kerr, 2017; Llinares & Lyster, 2014; Loewen, 2004; Merkel, 2018; Steen-Utheim & Wittek, 2017; Sheen, 2004). Uptake is an indicator of the effectiveness of feedback. Research studies have examined the extent to which learners integrate peer feedback into their text revisions (McConlogue, 2015; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Saeed & Ghazali, 2017; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010; Villamil & Guerrero, 1998). One common finding among these studies is that learners could incorporate more instances of peer feedback when revising their writing.

Other studies focused on students' uptake of teacher feedback in writing (Ene & Upton, 2014, 2018). In a recent study, Ene and Upton (2018) found that the rate of students' successful uptake of teacher feedback was high. The amount of uptake of teacher asynchronous feedback (i.e. there is a delay between giving and responding to feedback) was higher than that of chat or synchronous feedback (i.e. feedback provided and responded to simultaneously). In an earlier study, Ene and Upton (2014) found that the rate of uptake varied according to the number of feedback sessions and type of teacher feedback. For example, in the first feedback session, students' uptake of direct feedback was higher than in the second feedback session.

There are also studies which have compared students' uptake of peer and teacher feedback (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Paulus, 1999; Tian & Zhou, 2020; Tsui & Ng, 2000). These studies found that students' uptake of teacher feedback was higher than that of peer feedback. Similar results were reported by Ruegg (2015b), who showed that teacher feedback played a crucial role in pushing students to modify their input, which is necessary for their language development (Swain, 1995). This was attributed to the fact that teachers are more experienced than students in giving feedback, they have full authority and they may also provide better quality comments with clear clarification, guidance and suggestions.

Other studies (Allen & Mills, 2016; Chaudron, 1984; Eksi, 2012; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992; Dressler *et al.*, 2019) found that the students' rate of uptake of peer feedback was almost equal to the rate of uptake of teacher feedback. In a recent study, Dressler *et al.* (2019) found

that the students' uptake of both peer and instructor feedback was almost 85%, with the uptake of instructor feedback slightly higher than that of peer feedback. Moreover, the uptake of feedback focusing on surface issues (e.g. grammar and language mechanics) was higher than that of feedback focusing on meaning.

Students' perspectives on teacher and peer feedback

Students' perspectives on teacher and peer feedback is an issue that demands attention as it can affect the uptake of feedback. For instance, in a recent study (Kazemi, Abadikhah, & Dehqan, 2018), it was found that teacher feedback was more highly valued by students than peer feedback. The teacher was also perceived as a more beneficial and valuable source of feedback than peers (Ene & Upton, 2014, 2018; Leki, 1991; Tian & Zhou, 2020). By and large, teacher feedback appears to be more desirable when compared to peer feedback, while peer feedback is not perceived by students as efficient as teacher feedback as students would rather follow teachers' suggestions than peers' suggestions on how to improve their writing (Nelson & Carson, 1998; Tian & Zhou, 2020; Tsui & Ng, 2000). In other studies, students were found to have a positive view of peer feedback. For example, in Kwok (2008), students expressed their appreciation of peer feedback on their writing, while Ion, Martí, and Morell (2018) found that students valued providing and receiving peer feedback for its role in enhancing students' learning and improving their written tasks.

Few studies reported on students' views on the combination of both teacher and peer feedback. Maarof, Yamat, and Li (2011) reported that most students appreciated a combination of teacher and peer feedback on their writing. In a recent study (Bader, Burner, Iversen, & Varga, 2019), students found teacher formative feedback helpful, valuable and supportive in revising their work and appreciated good and long feedback. Despite the positive views on formative feedback, some students felt initially frustrated by teacher feedback and questioned their peers' ability to provide valuable feedback and their knowledge about the issues addressed in the feedback. Therefore, they viewed teacher feedback as more reliable than peer feedback.

From the above studies, it is evident that research on learners' uptake of feedback is important. Yet, research comparing the uptake of teacher and peer feedback has produced mixed results. Further studies are necessary to understand whether and why students pay more attention to teacher feedback than to peer feedback in revising their writing (Dressler *et al.*, 2019; Ruegg, 2015a). This is particularly important in the context of Saudi Arabia where students learn in an EFL environment and their learning needs to be supported in every way possible. Such a study may provide valuable direction as well as suggestions to instructors, curriculum designers and students in the Saudi context to improve feedback provision and uptake. The following research questions guided the present study:

- (1) To what extent do undergraduate Saudi students incorporate feedback into their revised written tasks?
- (2) How does the uptake of feedback differ according to its providers (peers vs. teachers) and its focus (global feedback that focuses on content and organization vs. local feedback that focuses on language and formatting)?
- (3) How do undergraduate students perceive peer and teacher feedback on their written assignments?

Methodology

Research design

The current study is an exploratory classroom intervention examining the effectiveness of peer and teacher feedback on undergraduate students' writing. The case study reported in

this paper is context-bound since it focuses on a particular undergraduate course in a Saudi public university.

Participants

The current study was carried out with 32 EFL undergraduate students from the English Department in a Saudi public university. Purposive sampling was used in selecting this particular writing course because it represents a typical classroom in most Saudi universities. Participants were third-year students in an academic writing course that introduces them to different genres of essay writing varying from descriptive essays to narrative essays. The students were all native speakers of Arabic and EFL learners. The writing course was delivered to the students through face-to-face lectures (each class for 3 h a week) over a period of 14 weeks. The online Blackboard course was also used as a platform for online activities supplementing the face-to-face lectures. The students' performance in the course was assessed out of 100 (i.e. 30 marks for pair essay writing, 20 marks for mid-term exam and attendance and 50 marks for the final exam).

Intervention

The study was conducted in six stages. In the pre-writing stage (1 week), the students were informed of the course activities, divided into 16 pairs and asked to select the topics for their writing. In the second stage (1 week), each pair of students was asked to plan their essay and write the first draft. The third stage (3 weeks) involved providing peer feedback (i.e. each pair provided and received feedback from another pair). This was followed by the fourth stage, revision (2 weeks) during which each pair was asked to revise their essay in response to peer feedback and upload the revised draft to the Blackboard site. The fifth stage was the instructor feedback (3 weeks), during which the instructor read each pair's revised draft and provided written feedback. This was followed by the sixth stage, the final revision (2 weeks) during which all pairs had to revise their drafts and submit the final work.

Data collection

Data were collected from different sources: peer feedback, instructor feedback, student essays and follow-up focus group interviews with students. Each pair's data were organized in a separate file following a specific order: the first draft of the written essay, peer-written feedback, the first revised draft, instructor written feedback and final draft. This allowed the coders later to understand the intent of feedback in relation to the draft on which the feedback was provided and easily trace students' text revisions by comparing the drafts and by cross-referencing the text revisions to the peer and instructor feedback.

The final set of data from the follow-up focus group interviews were collected during the last week (Week 14) of the semester. The interview questions were stated in English in light of the literature review and also the feedback and revision activities in this course ([Appendix 1](#)). The students were informed of the purpose of the interview, i.e. to collect information about their views on the feedback provided and received by them during the semester. They were also ensured of the protection of their identity and confidentiality and they signed a written consent form. The interviews were conducted in English during a regular class. The students were divided into three groups of six students and two groups of seven students, and each group was interviewed for almost half an hour. Each group was given printed sheets with the questions and the instructor asked the questions and listened to them attentively and, sometimes, interrupted them to ask further questions (e.g. seeking their clarifications, justifications, elaborations, etc.). The interviews were recorded using a digital camera.

Data analysis

Each pair's data were coded by two independent research assistants. The codes were adopted from previous research studies (e.g. Dressler *et al.*, 2019; Saeed & Ghazali, 2017) with slight combinations and modifications to the codes and categories. Following the process of coding by Dressler *et al.* (2019), each feedback focusing on a single issue (e.g. Are you sure about the subject-verb agreement in this sentence?) was assigned a single code (e.g. inaccurate grammar). However, in cases when one feedback comment focused on several issues, it was assigned to several codes. During this stage, instances of feedback that were not revision-oriented (targeting issues in writing), such as praise, motivation and positive comments (e.g. I like your introduction of the essay) were excluded from the coding. The instances of feedback were categorized into global feedback (focusing on global issues in writing such as content and organization) and local feedback (focusing on issues related to language and formatting) (Appendix 2).

After the coding of the feedback, it was time to code the students' use or incorporation of peer and instructor feedback in their revised drafts. Based on the coding and analysis of students' uptake of feedback adopted from Dressler *et al.* (2019), the raters considered the quantity and quality of feedback uptake. For the quantity of uptake, the frequency counts of each peer vs. instructor feedback and their percentages were calculated in each pair's data and overall. The quality of uptake was determined by looking at whether and how the students address each instance of feedback: total acceptance of feedback, partial acceptance of feedback or rejection of feedback. Then, all these feedback comments were categorized into their respective categories. This was followed by calculating the percentage score for each category to represent the rate of the quality of uptake of feedback overall, in relation to its source (peer vs. instructor) and its focus (global vs. local). Chi-square test was performed to compare students' incorporation of peer and instructor feedback in their revised drafts. The analysis was done with R-studio version 1.1.456.

The follow-up interview data were analyzed using a deductive thematic analysis. First, each group's recorded interview was transcribed and coded. The coders read the transcripts carefully and coded the transcripts individually, and then held meetings during which they compared their coding and discussed the possible themes emerging from the interviews until they reached agreements on the meaningful categories: students' perceived value of feedback, preference for peer vs. teacher feedback and perception of peer feedback providing vs. receiving.

Results

Students' uptake of feedback

The various patterns of feedback were identified and coded into categories and the number of feedback instances addressed by students (uptake) were counted. Table 1 shows that the total percentage of uptake of all feedback (peer and instructor) was high (83.74%). Students received a total of 852 instances of feedback from their peers and instructors and they integrated 726 instances of feedback when revising their writing (Table 2). Overall, 85.21 % of the total feedback received was integrated by the students.

Results also revealed that for the global feedback, the average uptake of instructor feedback was higher than peer feedback in all coded categories. For local feedback, the average uptake of instructor feedback was higher in all but two coded categories: "Inappropriate formatting" and "Inaccurate sentence structure." The students' uptake of global feedback (78.05%) was higher than that of local feedback (62.06%), while the uptake of instructor feedback (95.60%) was higher than that of peer feedback (76.92%). Table 3 shows that students integrated 82.17% of peer feedback, whereas they integrated 88.77% of instructor feedback, which indicates that students relied on instructor feedback more than peer feedback. Overall, students integrated

Table 1.
Feedback uptake in the two essay drafts for each category (peer, instructor, global and local)

	Peer	Instructor	Peer-and instructor combined
<i>Global feedback</i>	70.91%	88.99%	78.05%
Insufficient details	72.79%	81.61%	76.15%
Irrelevance of ideas	91.29%	98.27%	82.40%
Clear expression of ideas	72.39%	88.49%	79.81%
Overall structure	68.30%	93.43%	82.19%
Paragraphing	49.81%	83.15%	69.71%
<i>Local feedback</i>	66.21%	72.75%	62.06%
Inaccurate grammar	32.60%	51.30%	42.18%
Inaccurate sentence structure	59.32%	57.61%	58.18%
Inappropriate vocabulary choice	31.11%	89.70%	51.74%
Misspelling	100%	100%	100%
Inappropriate use or missing punctuation	39.31%	60.62%	41.36%
Inappropriate formatting	80.93%	77.31%	78.92%
<i>Total</i>	76.92%	95.60%	83.74%

Note(s): Each of these percent averages were calculated using the weighted means formula

Table 2.
Local and global feedback identified and addressed in the two essay drafts

	Number of feedback instances identified	Number of feedback instances addressed	Percentage of feedback instances addressed
Global feedback	265	225	84.90%
Local feedback	587	501	85.34%
<i>Total</i>	852	726	85.21%

84.90% of global feedback, while they integrated a slightly higher percentage (85.34%) of local feedback in their writing. The rate of uptake of instructor global (92.25%) and local (87%) was also higher than that of uptake of peer global (76.42%) and local (84.27%) feedback.

To determine the significance of the association of the frequency of students' uptake of peer and instructor feedback, a Chi-squared test was conducted. As shown in Table 3, results revealed that there is a significant ($p = 0.002$) relationship between the identified and addressed peer and instructor feedback and the uptake of global and local instances of feedback ($X^2(1, N = 460, 392) = 8.886, p = 0.002874$) and ($X^2(1, N = 308, 384) = 13.828, p = 0.002003$). These results indicate that there is a significant relationship between the instructor feedback and the uptake of global feedback, the instructor feedback and the uptake

Table 3.
Feedback identified and addressed in the two essay drafts

	Peer feedback			Instructor feedback			Total
	Number of feedback instances identified	Number of feedback instances addressed	Percentage of feedback instances addressed	Number of feedback instances identified	Number of feedback instances addressed	Percentage of feedback instances addressed	
Global feedback	123	94	76.42%	142	131	92.25%	84.90%
Local feedback	337	284	84.27%	250	217	87%	85.34%
<i>Total</i>	460	378	82.17%	392	348	88.77%	85.21%

of local feedback, the peer feedback and the uptake of global feedback and finally the peer feedback and the uptake of local feedback.

Students' perspectives on instructor vs. peer feedback

The thematic analysis of the follow-up interviews revealed that all students acknowledged the importance of feedback in revising their written assignments. Specifically, their perceived value of feedback is owing to the support and directions provided by the instructor to them as this student comment shows: "I think feedback in this course gave us a sense of direction. Because we are new, we got lost so with feedback, we kept continuously improving our work" (Student 22). In addition, most of the students (20 out of 32) showed a higher preference for instructor feedback. This was because they perceived the instructor as a trusted and reliable source of knowledge, expertise and experience. One student stated: "I do prefer lecturer's feedback because they are qualified and experts and they spend a lot of time working hard to get their qualifications" (Student 8).

On the other hand, 12 of the students commented on the value of both peer and instructor feedback as being complimentary to each other. This statement by one of the students exemplifies this view: "I think both are important because lecturer's feedback is like a more learned one, and peer feedback is like understanding each other's issues" (Student 5).

The students were also asked about their roles as providers and receivers of feedback. This yielded interesting viewpoints. First, as providers of feedback, they felt that they learnt from the process of composing and providing feedback. As one student reported: "As a provider of feedback, I would consider it as a learning process because I point at some mistakes and I know something about that peer's work" (Student 31). As receivers of feedback, students reported having to give their viewpoints or evaluations of peer feedback on their written work, as this comment exemplifies: "Yes I read all of them and I replied to them as well. And I tried to make the changes in my proposal according to the comments" (Student 12). Furthermore, some students stated that they enjoyed reading their peers' evaluative comments and applied their suggestions in revising their tasks, whereas others ignored some suggestions provided by peers as they doubted the reliability of the feedback. A student reported: "I really liked to read my classmates' feedback on our assignment. I also used suggestions by them in editing it. Sometimes, I found my classmates' feedback like wrong, or not clear. So I did not use it in my writing" (Student 6).

Discussion

The current study aimed to identify the extent of students' uptake of both peer and instructor feedback in their revised essays, and the difference in the uptake of feedback according to its provider (peer vs. instructor) and its focus (global vs. local). It also aimed to explore students' perceptions toward the two types of feedback (peer vs. instructor). The findings of the current study are consistent with previous research on the extent of students' uptake of feedback into their revised writing whether it came from a peer (Baker, 2016; Saeed & Ghazali, 2017; Wu & Schunn, 2020; Xu & Zhu, 2019) or the instructor (Ene & Upton, 2014, 2018). The study findings align with the sociocultural theory of learning (Vygotsky, 1978), which stresses the role of feedback in mediating learners' text revisions. It further aligns with Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) which assumes that students can perform at a higher level when they receive support and scaffolding from others (Ortega, 2009). The study findings are also in line with Swain's (1995) Output Hypothesis which argues that feedback plays a role in students' modified output, which was manifested in this study through their successful text revisions (Ellis *et al.*, 2001; Santos *et al.*, 2010). The significant level of students' feedback uptake in the current study is also partly in agreement with Dressler *et al.* (2019)

who also reported that the rate of uptake of feedback in their study was significantly high (80%) but found that the difference in the quality of uptake of peer vs. teacher feedback was not high. The present study showed that the uptake of instructor feedback was slightly higher than the uptake of peer feedback, especially with regard to global feedback.

While the results in feedback uptake were not found to be statistically significant in the current study, the study still managed to extend the findings of previous research (e.g. Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Paulus, 1999; Ruegg, 2015b; Tian & Zhou, 2020; Tsui & Ng, 2000) by providing a more nuanced understanding of the higher uptake of instructor feedback compared to peer feedback. Based on the interviews, students in this study viewed the instructor as an expert (Wolsey, 2008) and the one that would be evaluating and marking their final drafts (Dressler *et al.*, 2019). In Saudi Arabia, most learners are still inclined to view the teacher as an expert and the authority in the class (Alqurashi, 2015). However, the interviews also indicated students' positive perspectives on both kinds of feedback. Specifically, students admitted and appreciated the assistance and scaffolding from both peers and instructors. This finding implies that incorporating different kinds of feedback increases the chances of uptake of feedback in academic writing. Therefore, creating an atmosphere for peer feedback where students are trained, prepared and encouraged to exchange peer feedback is very important and it has also been noted in previous studies (Bader *et al.*, 2019; Ion *et al.*, 2018; Kwok, 2008). The current study also showed that the majority of students learned from the process of composing and providing feedback, which corroborates the results of previous studies on the benefits of peer feedback for its providers, including reading their peers' writing, evaluating it, learning from its strengths and weaknesses and even applying the comments they provide to peers to enhance their own writing (see Ion *et al.*, 2018; Kwok, 2008; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Tsui & Ng, 2000). As indicated by Li and Zhang (2020), peer feedback could function as a more productive and multiple-reader source of revision in comparison with instructor feedback.

In relation to the foci or type of feedback provided on their assignments, an important finding was that students integrated a higher number of local feedback in their writing than global feedback, which is similar to Baker's (2016) and Dressler *et al.*'s (2019) findings. Students in this study received more feedback on local issues than on global ones. This indicates that Saudi students find revisions based on local feedback much easier than global feedback and as feedback providers, they are more likely to notice and provide feedback on local issues than global ones. This could be due to the context of the study and has also been confirmed by others (Alnasser & Alyousef, 2015; O AbuSa'aleek & Shariq, 2021).

Conclusion

A classroom intervention was conducted to identify the extent of students' uptake of both peer and instructor feedback in their revised writings and examine any differences in the uptake of feedback according to its provider (peer vs. instructor) and its focus (global vs. local). It also explored students' perceptions toward the two types of feedback (peer vs. instructor). The findings revealed that a combination of peer and instructor feedback in undergraduate writing courses plays a crucial role in improving students' writing. The findings also suggest that there is a need for instructors to look at how to maximize students' uptake of peer feedback in their writing. For instance, Saudi students could be trained and encouraged to exchange and value peer feedback when revising their written assignments.

The current study was limited to one group of students in an undergraduate writing course. It was conducted in a naturalistic setting. Future studies could carry out a similar investigation with a larger sample of students using an experimental or quasi-experimental design to compare different groups based on different types of feedback administered to them. This small

intervention study showed that the cultural and educational context of the EFL learners can affect their perceptions of feedback. In Saudi Arabia, where the instructor is still considered the sole feedback provider in the learning process, a more explicit approach is needed to help students develop an awareness of the benefits of peer feedback in their learning.

References

- Allen, D., & Mills, A. (2016). The impact of second language proficiency in dyadic peer feedback. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 498–513. doi: [10.1177/1362168814561902](https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814561902).
- Alnasser, S. M., & Alyousef, H. S. (2015). Investigating Saudi learners' preferences for giving and receiving macro and/or micro level peer feedback on their writing. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 8(6), 57–68. available from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1075417.pdf>
- Alqurashi, F. (2015). Perspectives of Saudi EFL learners towards teacher response in writing courses. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5(5), 37–46. doi: [10.5539/ijel.v5n5p37](https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v5n5p37).
- Bader, M., Burner, T., Iversen, S., & Varga, Z. (2019). Student perspectives on formative feedback as part of writing portfolios. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(7), 1017–1028. doi: [10.1080/02602938.2018.1564811](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1564811).
- Baker, M. (2016). Peer review as a strategy for improving students' writing process. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17(3), 179–192. doi: [10.1177/1469787416654794](https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787416654794).
- Chaudron, C. (1984). The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. *RELC Journal*, 15(2), 1–14. doi: [10.1177/003368828401500201](https://doi.org/10.1177/003368828401500201).
- Connor, U., & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(3), 257–276. doi: [10.1016/1060-3743\(94\)90019-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(94)90019-1).
- Dressler, R., Chu, M.-W., Crossman, K., & Hilman, B. (2019). Quantity and quality of uptake: Examining surface and meaning level feedback provided by peers and an instructor in a graduate research course. *Assessing Writing*, 39(1), 14–24. doi: [10.1016/j.asw.2018.11.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.11.001).
- Eksi, G. Y. (2012). Peer review versus teacher feedback in process writing: How effective?. *International Journal of Applied Educational Studies*, 13, 33–48.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51(2), 281–318. doi: [10.1111/1467-9922.00156](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00156).
- Ene, E., & Upton, T. A. (2014). Learner uptake of teacher electronic feedback in ESL composition. *System*, 46, 80–95. doi: [10.1016/j.system.2014.07.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.011).
- Ene, E., & Upton, T. A. (2018). Synchronous and asynchronous teacher electronic feedback and learner uptake in ESL composition. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 41, 1–13. doi: [10.1016/j.jslw.2018.05.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.05.005).
- Hanaoka, O., & Izumi, S. (2012). Noticing and uptake: Addressing pre-articulated covert problems in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 332–347. doi: [10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.008).
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(3), 255–276. doi: [10.1016/1060-3743\(92\)90006-B](https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(92)90006-B).
- Hyland, F. (2010). Future directions in feedback on second language writing: Overview and research agenda. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 171–182. doi: [10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119251](https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119251).
- Ion, G., Martí, A. S., & Morell, I. A. (2018). Giving or receiving feedback: Which is more beneficial to students' learning?. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(1), 124–138. doi: [10.1080/02602938.2018.1484881](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1484881).
- Kazemi, M., Abadikhah, S., & Dehqan, M. (2018). EFL students' perceptions of teacher feedback and intra-feedback in writing essays. *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 21(2), 26–49. doi: [10.5782/2223-2621.2018.21.2.26](https://doi.org/10.5782/2223-2621.2018.21.2.26).

- Kerr, K. (2017). Exploring student perceptions of verbal feedback. *Research Papers in Education*, 32, 444–462. doi: [10.1080/02671522.2017.1319589](https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2017.1319589).
- Kwok, L. (2008). Students' perception of peer evaluation and teachers' role in seminar discussions. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 5(1), 84–97. available from: <https://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/v5n12008/kwok.pdf>
- Landry, A., Jacobs, S., & Newton, G. (2015). Effective use of peer assessment in a graduate level writing assignment: A case study. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(1), 38–51. doi: [10.5430/ijhe.v4n1p38](https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v4n1p38).
- Lee, I. (2014). Revisiting teacher feedback in EFL writing from sociocultural perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(1), 201–213. doi: [10.1002/tesq.153](https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.153).
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 203–218. doi: [10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x).
- Li, W., & Zhang, F. (2020). Tracing the path toward self-regulated revision: An interplay of instructor feedback, peer feedback, and revision goals. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 3709.
- Llinares, A., & Lyster, R. (2014). The influence of context on patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake: A comparison of CLLL and immersion classrooms. *The Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 181–194. doi: [10.1080/09571736.2014.889509](https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.889509).
- Loewen, S. (2004). Uptake in incidental focus on form in meaning-focused ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 153–188. doi: [10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.00251.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.00251.x).
- Maarof, N., Yamat, H., & Li, K. L. (2011). Role of teacher, peer and teacher-peer feedback in enhancing ESL students' writing. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 15, 29–35.
- McConlogue, T. (2015). Making judgements: Investigating the process of composing and receiving peer feedback. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(9), 1495–1506.
- Mendonça, C., & Johnson, K. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 745–769. doi: [10.2307/3587558](https://doi.org/10.2307/3587558).
- Merkel, W. (2018). Role reversals: A case study of dialogic interactions and feedback on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 39, 16–28. doi: [10.1016/j.jslw.2017.11.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.11.007).
- Nelson, G. L., & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(2), 113–131. doi: [10.1016/S1060-3743\(98\)90010-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90010-8).
- O AbuSa'alek, A., & Shariq, M. (2021). Innovative practices in instructor e-feedback: A case study of e-feedback given in three linguistic courses during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on Covid-19*, 1, 183–198. doi: [10.24093/awej/covid.14](https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/covid.14).
- Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London: Routledge, Hodder Education.
- Paulus, T. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265–289. doi: [10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80117-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80117-9).
- Ruegg, R. (2015a). Differences in the uptake of peer and teacher feedback. *RELC Journal*, 46(2), 131–145. doi: [10.1177/0033688214562799](https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214562799).
- Ruegg, R. (2015b). The relative effects of peer and teacher feedback on improvement in EFL students' writing ability. *Linguistics and Education*, 29, 73–82. doi: [10.1016/j.linged.2014.12.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.12.001).
- Saeed, M. A., & Ghazali, K. (2017). Asynchronous group review of EFL writing: Interactions and text revisions. *Language Learning and Technology*, 21(2), 200–226. available from: https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/44618/1/21_02_saeedghazali.pdf
- Santos, M., López Serrano, S., & Manchón, R. M. (2010). The differential effect of two types of direct written corrective feedback on noticing and uptake: Reformulation vs. error correction. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(1), 131–154. doi: [10.6018/ijes/2010/1/114011](https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/1/114011).
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 263–300. doi: [10.1191/1362168804lr146oa](https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168804lr146oa).

- Steen-Utheim, A., & Wittek, A. L. (2017). Dialogic feedback and potentialities for student learning. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 15, 18–30. doi: [10.1016/j.lcsi.2017.06.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2017.06.002).
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing: Case studies. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 303–334. available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44488130>
- Suzuki, M. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classrooms. *Studies in Applied Linguistics and TESOL*, 4(2). doi: [10.7916/salt.v4i2.1592](https://doi.org/10.7916/salt.v4i2.1592).
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook, & B. Seidhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practices in the study of language*, 125–144. Oxford University Press.
- Tang, C., & Liu, Y. T. (2018). Effects of indirect coded corrective feedback with and without short affective teacher comments on L2 writing performance, learner uptake and motivation. *Assessing Writing*, 35, 26–40. doi: [10.1016/j.asw.2017.12.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2017.12.002).
- Tian, L., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Learner engagement with automated feedback, peer feedback and teacher feedback in an online EFL writing context. *System*, 61, 102247. doi: [10.1016/j.system.2020.102247](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102247).
- Tsui, A. B., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147–170. doi: [10.1016/S1060-3743\(00\)00022-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00022-9).
- Villamil, O., & Guerrero, M. (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 491–514. doi: [10.1093/applin/19.4.491](https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.4.491).
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society. In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Soubberman (Eds.), *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wolsey, T. (2008). Efficacy of instructor feedback on written work in an online program. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 7(2), 311–29.
- Wu, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2020). When peers agree, do students listen? The central role of feedback quality and feedback frequency in determining uptake of feedback. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 62, 101897. doi: [10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101897](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101897).
- Xu, Y., & Zhu, L. (2019). Online peer feedback in second language Chinese writing: From feedback, uptake, to perception. *Chinese as a Second Language. The Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 54(3), 257–287. doi: [10.1075/csl.19012.zhu](https://doi.org/10.1075/csl.19012.zhu).

Appendix 1

Follow-up focus group interview questions

- (1) What do you think of the written feedback on your assignments in this course?
- (2) How would you evaluate the quality of feedback?
- (3) Which did you prefer: peer feedback or instructor feedback?
- (4) What are the main reasons for your preference?
- (5) What do you think of being a provider and a receiver of peer feedback?
- (6) What did you do once you received the feedback from your peers and instructors?
- (7) Which feedback, instructor or peer feedback, you used more in revising your essay? Explain and provide reasons.

118

Code	Descriptor	Example
Content: Insufficient details/information	Feedback on students' inadequate details	Great work and I hope you can add 3–4 full sentences explaining these results in the diagram
Irrelevance of ideas	Feedback on students' irrelevant ideas or details	Remove this sentence since it is not related to your topic
Clear expression of ideas	Feedback on the issue of lacking clarity of idea expression and redundancies	This sentence seems confusing: "This study will inflectional morphemes". Can u re-write it clearly about what morphological features u found in the data?
Organization: overall structure	Feedback on the structure of the assignment	Please where is your conclusion? You should have one section as a conclusion of your assignment
Paragraphing	Feedback on issues related to the logical transition of paragraphs, order of sentences and use of cohesion devices	One important point is to move this paragraph after the 1 st paragraph
Inaccurate grammar	Feedback on grammatical errors/mistakes, such as the use of tense, subject-verb agreement, aspect, prepositions, articles and so on	Sure "expresses"? Why so while the subject is plural? Please, check it
Inaccurate sentence structure	Feedback on inaccurate sentence structures	You have 2 sentences not one sentence. You should either separate them or combine them
Inappropriate vocabulary choice	Feedback on students' choice of inappropriate vocabulary	Are you sure the grammatical function? or you mean the word class?
Misspelling	Feedback on inaccurate spelling	Correct spellings of this word
Inappropriate punctuation	Feedback on the misuse of punctuation	A missing full stop here
APA Formatting	Feedback on citation, references, quotations, headings, sub-headings, tables, space, page numbers, etc.	Change this sub-heading as Morphological Properties/Features Check your citation here (APA)

Table A1.
Code descriptors for feedback

Corresponding author

Mohammed Abdullah Alharbi can be contacted at: maalharbi@mu.edu.sa

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com