THE EFFECT OF TEACHER, PEER, AND SELF-CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK TOWARD ENGLISH WRITING QUALITY OF EFL UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

BY
Didi Pitoyo, Patuan Raja, Ari Nurweni
FKIP Universitas Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr Soemantri Brojonegoro No.1
E-mail : didi.pitoyo@gmail.com; Telp : 082280167891

ABSTRACT

The current research was to find out the effect of different types of feedback on the students writing quality. The quasi-experimental research used is one group pre-test post-test design. The subject were 108 students taken from three classes. The data were analyzed by SPSS. The result showed that there is an improvement in students' writing by using teacher, peer and self-corrective feedback but peer corrective feedback gives more effective improvement than the others. The students mostly focused on meaning not form. Besides these points, peer feedback encouraged students to write reader-based meaningful texts. Therefore, this suggested that the teachers need to be aware, and do the experiment with a wider range of feedback and error-correction strategies appropriate for different levels and students.
Keywords: Corrective Feedback, Quality, Writing

Penelitian saat ini adalah mengetahui pengaruh berbagai jenis umpan balik terhadap kualitas menulis siswa. Penelitian quasi eksperimen yang digunakan adalah one group pre-test post-test design. Subjek penelitian adalah 108 siswa yang diambil dari tiga kelas. Data dianalisis oleh SPSS. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ada peningkatan dalam tulisan siswa dengan menggunakan umpan balik guru, teman sebaya dan koreksi diri tetapi umpan balik korektif teman memberikan peningkatan yang lebih efektif daripada yang lain. Para siswa kebanyakan berfokus pada makna bukan bentuk. Selain poin-poin ini, umpan balik rekan mendorong siswa untuk menulis teks bermakna berbasis pembaca. Oleh karena itu, ini menyarankan bahwa para guru perlu waspada, dan bereksperimen dengan berbagai umpan balik dan strategi koreksi kesalahan yang sesuai untuk berbagai tingkat dan siswa
Kata kunci: Koreksi Umpan Balik, Kualitas, Menulis

INTRODUCTION

Compared to the other language skills, writing is normally regarded as one of the most complex processes to acquire English language because this activity stimulates thinking and facilitates them to develop some language skills simultaneously. Linse & Nunan (2005) agreed that "it is easier to learn to speak than to write no matter if it is a first or second language". It means that to achieve writing skills is difficult task to do. On the other hand, Dehkordi and Hadi (2015) state that writing requires L2 to not only focus on planning and organizing skills in a higher level but also on spelling, punctuation, word choice skills in a level.

Learning English (especially writing) as a foreign language is a gradual process. Brown (2000) describes that there are three stages of writing process, those are prewriting to write, drafting, and revising. He summarizes the process of writing as follows: (1) prewriting or invention activities (brainstorming, group discussion, assessing the idea); (2) drafting, seeking feedback from peers or the instructor; (3) revising on the whole text; (4) publishing.

During this process, mistakes are to be expected in all stages of learning. It is important for both teachers and students to accept the fact that errors are an inevitable part of the learning process. Through students' errors we can see their struggling, what concepts they have misunderstood and what extra work they might need (Chandler, 2003). Therefore, errors are often a sign of learning in language acquisition process. This condition particularly happens to the students of Islamic Studies Institute of Ma'arif Nahdlaul Ulama (IAIMNU) Metro.

As second-language errors begin to be perceived as a necessary and natural process of language learning, learner' errors and feedback to errors have been of great interest to language teachers and researchers (Diab, 2005, Wang, 2010; Katayama; 2007). Most of the studies give more attention to the importance of feedback, ways of providing and receiving feedback as well as the effect of feedback on students' writing (Lee, 2005; Noora, 2008).

Truscott (1996) suggested that attention was given to investigate which methods, techniques, or approaches to error correction lead to short-term or long-term improvement, and whether students made better progress in monitoring for certain types of errors than others.

Corrective feedback has been acknowledged by many researchers to be significant in assisting learners' writing development. Many studies including Ferris (2007) indicate that CF is useful to all learners, because it makes them notice their own flaws and reconsider a better writing style. CF makes students aware of their writing performance and indirectly encourages them to improve their writing from time to time. Without CF from readers like teacher and peers, learners would be confused and unaware of their aspects of writing that need to be reconsidered. This gives them a longer time to revise their own piece of writing. They might also believe that their writing has conveyed the intended message and never thought of doing correction. Teachers may also benefit from CF as it shows them the challenging areas in learners'

writing, and this allows them to create better teaching and learning practices related to writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2001). The purpose of feedback as cited in Hadiyanti by Lee (2005), feedback is like the way for telling the students about progress which they make and also facilitate them in the area of improvement. Further, Lewis has listed some of the research-based purpose that has been suggested for giving feedback in the language class. Some of the purposes are motivational and some have to do with providing students with information.

Hendrickson (1978) stated that error correction improved the proficiency of ESL/EFL learners, if they were errors that inhibited communication, stigmatized the learners, and occurred frequently. Even Truscott changed his mind, and came to recognize the positive role of feedback in improving the students' writing ability. However, it is not clear yet who should give the feedback.

In some classes, teacher provides the correct form for the students. Most of students prefer to be corrected by their teachers, because the teacher is seen as the authority and the source of knowledge in the classroom. There are, however, some counter-arguments. Walz (1982) pointed out that by giving the students correct answers did not establish a pattern for long term memory.

The next active participants in the process of language learning are the learners. The learners can do the correction individually, or in grouping. Self- correction and Peer-correction are the methods that are used in the more learner-centered approaches these days. Both of the methods seem to be promising and effective. The students' Self-correction can have a long-lasting effect on their memory, because they are involved in the process directly and actively, and this can activate the operations necessary for long-term retention. Krashen and Pan (1975, as cited in Walz, 1982) found that advanced learners could correct 95% of their errors.

Peer-correction is another way to involve students in the teaching and learning process. This strategy can be informative, because it comes from someone who has had the same experience.

Now with such a diversity of ideas regarding the treatment of errors, teachers come to class with no predetermined decision as to how to correct students' errors. Furthermore, teachers are not patient enough to correct the students' errors all the time carefully. Even if we are so optimistic about the situation, and think that teachers will correct the errors thoroughly, it is the students who do not use the opportunities offered. After receiving the papers peppered with discouraging red pen, they just have a look at the score, and fold the paper desperately, and put it in their bag, and never look at it again. Some scholars (Semke, 1984; Truscott, 1996) have cautioned us against the devastating effect of demoralizing red pen on the motivation of students, and have suggested that we look for more humanistic approaches to correction that do not discourage students.

On the one hand, teaching theorist and practitioners (Cross, 2000; Gardner, 1999) unanimously believe that we should look at the

learning side of the coin more seriously, and involve our students in the process of learning. Most of the methods are nowadays learner-centered, and students are expected not to be passive participants. On the other hand, De Guerrero and Villamil (1998) believed that peer-correction fitted into Vygotsky's theory of cognitive development, because he put emphasis on the social origin of language and thought. It is clear that Vygotsky's concept of "Zone of Proximal Development" (Vygotsky, 1978) in particular suggests that "communicative collaboration with adults and peers contributes to the development of self-regulation, which is the capacity for independent problem solving".

Some of the researches conducted in past compared at least two of these methods of giving feedback, that is, self versus teacher, self versus peer, or teacher versus peer. These studies are reviewed chronologically. Lalande (1982) compared the effects of self-correction versus teacher-correction on compositions in fourth-quarter college German classes. The self-correcting group had statistically fewer errors at the end of the experiment than did the control group, who received teacher correction and rewrote their work. Lalande concluded that the combination of one's errors and rewriting with problem-solving techniques was significantly beneficial for developing writing skills in German.

Bitchener, Young, and Cameron(2005) investigated the effect of different types of corrective feedback (CF) on ESL student writing. They said that debate about the value of providing corrective feedback on L2 writing has been prominent in recent years as a result of Truscott's study which claim that it is both ineffective and harmful and should therefore be abandoned (Truscott, 1996). A growing body of empirical research is now investigating the agenda proposed by Ferris (1999) which investigated whether the type of feedback (direct, explicit written feedback and student–researcher 5 minute individual conferences; direct, explicit written feedback only; no corrective feedback) given to 53 adult migrant students on three types of error (prepositions, the past simple tense, and the definite article) resulted in improved accuracy in new pieces of writing over a 12 week period. The study found a significant effect for the combination of written and conference feedback on accuracy levels in the use of the past simple tense and the definite article in new pieces of writing but no overall effect on accuracy improvement for feedback types when the three error categories were considered as a single group. Significant variations in accuracy across the four pieces of writing support earlier SLA discoveries that L2 learners, in the process of acquiring new linguistic forms, may perform them with accuracy on one occasion but fail to do so on other similar occasions.

Erfanian (2002) studied the efficacy of self-correction strategy on the development of Iranian EFL learners' linguistic competence. He compared self-correction with the traditional teacher-correction. The study came to the point that self-correction was a good way of providing feedback on written work,

and led to the development of linguistic competence of Iranian learners. One year later, Chandler (2003) studied the effect of four types of feedback on the writing accuracy of 36 music students at an American university. The criterion for accuracy was the number of errors per one hundred words. He argued that underlining with description was the most beneficial type of feedback. Teacher-correction was the second most efficient strategy, but the other two techniques of only underlining and description did not have any significant impact on students writing ability.

Other study was done by Nakanishi (2007) who compared the effect of four different types of feedback on the essay writing of 40 Japanese intermediate EFL learners. A total of 40 Japanese female second-year college students majoring in music participated in the study. They were divided into four groups: self-feedback, peer-feedback, teacher-feedback, and teacher-and-peer feedback. Group D who was required to revise after peer and teacher feedback gained higher scores than any other group. On the other hand, Group A which was required to revise after self-feedback gained lower scores than any other group. However, there was no significant difference between the four different methods. Ninety percent of Group D students considered that peer-and-teacher feedback was useful. On the other hand, only 25% of Group A students considered self-feedback was useful.

Even though peer and self-correction enjoy solid theoretical and empirical support, there are still questions about the learners' capacity to help each other in solving linguistic problems in their text (Palloff& Pratt, 1999; Topping, 1998). Among practitioners, there seems to be a lingering feeling that L2 students are not knowledgeable enough to detect and correct errors in the target language. Furthermore, some of the problems of peer and self-revision may be attributed to the cultural values and social differences among societies, that is, some like to learn individually, while others want to learn in groups.

Based on the discussion above, the previous researches proved that it was necessary to use any kinds of feedback especially in improving the quality of English writing. However, it is still debated which types of feedback give better correction in all aspects of writing. Most of the researches also focused more on the children and young learners, while the research on adult learners was limited. Therefore, more research on the effects of teacher, peer and self-revision on L2 writing was needed in order to help teachers choose the most effective type of feedback, especially for adult learner.

In line with the background of research above, the researcher states the objectives of this research as follows: 1) to find out the difference on students' English writing quality of EFL university students before and after the implementation of teacher-corrective feedback; 2) to find out the difference on students' English writing quality of EFL university students before and after the implementation of Peer-corrective feedback; 3) to find out the difference on students' English writing quality of EFL university students before and after the implementation of Self-corrective

feedback; 4) to find out which feedback gives the best result on the English writing quality of EFL university students.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study was quantitative research with experimental design. The researcher used writing test in collecting the data the difference on students' English writing quality and open – ended observation to implementation of corrective feed back. The population was the second year of English Education Study Program in IAIM NU Metro. The subject was 108 students.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Difference of Students' English Writing Quality of EFL University Students before and after the Implementation of Teacher-Corrective Feedback

The first objective of the research was to find out whether the teacher-corrective feedback affects the students' English writing quality of EFL university students. The researcher conducted t-test to prove the hypothesis proposed toward the result of posttest. The criteria for this hypothesis test were accepted if t-observed was higher than t-table at the certain level of significant, in this case the researcher used 0.05.

The pretest of writing which consisted of 36 students had mean score 72.17 and the posttest had mean score 75.33. Table 2 showed that sig (2 tailed) is 0.000. It meant that sig (0.000) < α (0.05=2.03). It could be concluded that H_0 was rejected and H_a was accepted that there was difference on students' English writing quality of EFL university students before and after

the implementation of teacher-corrective feedback. Students' mean score of posttest (75.33) was higher than that of pretest (72.17). In short, implementing teacher-corrective feedback gave significant difference on the students' English writing quality of EFL University.

The student's writing skill before using teacher-corrective feedback was low. On the other hand, student's writing skill after using teacher-corrective feedback was getting better, the students felt easier to understand and marked some of the confusion on their writing. The used of the teacher-corrective feedback in the process of improving the students' writing skill brought positive response for the students. It could be shown on the use of teacher-corrective feedback that can improve students' writing quality. Additionally, by using teacher-corrective feedback in teaching and learning process, it also assisted teachers in the delivery of the material so it was easier to be understood by students.

Based on the calculation between pretest and posttest, it was known that the mean score for pretest was 75.33 and the mean score for posttest was 75.33. Sig (2 tailed) is 0.000. It meant that sig < α (p<0.05;p=0.000). It could be concluded that there was difference of students' English writing quality before and after the implementation of teacher-corrective feedback.

The Difference of Students' English Writing Quality of EFL University Students before and after the Implementation of Peer-Corrective Feedback

The second objective of the research was to find out whether the

peer-corrective feedback affected students' English writing quality of EFL university students. The researcher conducted t-test to prove the hypothesis proposed toward the result of posttest. The criteria for this hypothesis test were accepted if t-observed was higher than t-table at the certain level of significant, in this case the researcher used 0.05.

The pretest of writing that consisted of 36 students had mean score 71.89 and the posttest had mean score 77.67. Table 4 showed that sig (2 tailed) is 0.000. It meant that sig $(0.000) < \alpha$ $(0.05=2.03)$. It could be concluded that H_0 was rejected and H_a was accepted and there was difference on students' English writing quality of EFL university students before and after the implementation of Peer-corrective feedback. The students' mean score of posttest (77.67) was higher than that of pretest (71.89). In short, implementing peer-corrective feedback gave significant difference on the students' English writing quality of EFL University.

The assumption of researcher that peer correction was effective. It could be shown by doing a quick comparison between students' score of pretest and posttest. It helped the students to get an understanding in making a coherent piece of paragraph, commented on other's work about how ideas should join together and improve writing skill by reviewing each other's work. This statistical finding verified the theories of teaching writing by using peer correction can increase the students' English Writing quality. The findings of the study verified the statement that peer correction helped to develop students' editing skill and established a social context for writing.

The Difference of Students' English Writing Quality of EFL University Students before and after the Implementation of Self-Corrective Feedback

The third objective of the research was to find out whether the self-corrective feedback affected the students' English writing quality of EFL university students. The researcher conducted t-test to prove the hypothesis proposed toward the result of posttest. The criteria for this hypothesis test were accepted if t-observed was higher than t-table at the certain level of significant, in this case the researcher used 0.05.

Based on the pretest of writing that consisted of 36 students had mean score 72.06 and the posttest had mean score 74.19. Sig (2 tailed) was 0.000. It meant that sig $(0.000) < \alpha$ $(0.05=2.03)$. It can be concluded that H_0 was rejected and H_a was accepted that self-corrective feedback significantly affected the students' English writing quality of EFL university students. Students' mean score of posttest (74.19) was higher than that of pretest (71.06). In short, implementing self-corrective feedback gave significant difference on the students' English writing quality of EFL University.

The implementation of self-corrective feedback gave some improvements on students' quality in their writing quality. The improvement could be seen by comparing the mean score between the pretest (71.83) and posttest (73.99). It meant that the third hypothesis was accepted. It was also assumed that self-correction helped the students to improve their writing

quality. The result of this research also showed that the used of self-correction improved the students' skill in writing. Some students were seen to be seriously revised their work, and it could be seen that their responsibility and independence toward their task were increasing.

Type of Feedback that Gives the Best Result on the English Writing Quality of EFL University Students

The last objective of the research was to find out which feedback gave the best result on English writing quality of EFL university students. The researcher compared the result of gain score from t-test to prove the hypothesis proposed. he gain of writing score in teacher-corrective feedback was 2.944, in peer-corrective feedback was 5.514 and in self-corrective feedback was 1.931. It could be said that there was certain type of feedback that gave the best result on students' English writing quality of EFL university students. Table 7 indicated that students' mean score in peer-corrective feedback (5.514) was higher than teacher-corrective feedback (2.944) and self-corrective feedback (1.931). In short, there was certain type of feedback that gave the best result on students' English writing quality of EFL university students. Implementing peer-corrective feedback gave significant difference on students' English writing quality of EFL University.

DISCUSSION
The Difference on Students' English Writing Quality before and after the Implementation of Teacher-Corrective Feedback

Student's writing skill before using teacher-corrective feedback was low. Some students faced some difficulties in writing English paragraphs. It seem like writing was an activity which made them confused. It might happen since the students did not have ideas to develop a paragraph. There were some factors influences the case such as the limitation of vocabulary, less understanding about grammar.

Student's writing skill after using teacher-corrective feedback was getting better, the students felt easier to understand and marked some confusion on their writing. The used of the teacher-corrective feedback in the process of improving the students' writing skill brought positive response for the students. It can be shown on the used of teacher-corrective feedback that could improve students' writing quality. Additionally, by using teacher-corrective feedback in the teaching and learning process, it also assisted teachers in the delivery of the material so it was easier to be understood by students.

Based on the calculation between pretest and posttest, it was known that the mean score for the pretest was 75.33 and the mean score for posttest was 75.33. Table 3 showed that sig (2 tailed) was 0.000. It meant that sig$<\alpha$(p<0.05;p$=0.000$). It could be concluded that there was difference of students' English writing quality before and after the implementation of teacher-corrective feedback.

Language structures are an essential foundation of language proficiency and thus often in the main focus in foreign language teaching. Textbooks are filled with exercises concerning grammar and vocabulary and these issues are typically examined in foreign

language tests. Therefore, from this perspective the feedback of the present data is however successful, as it admittedly focuses on what has been taught and practiced in the classroom. Ferris (2007) reinforces the success of the present data's feedback by stating that there is no sense in addressing every single aspect in every single essay and Ferris puts an emphasis on "a selective and prioritized approach to responding". Montgomery and Baker (2007: 93) have discovered that students are actually pleased with receiving feedback on only local issues and that they are not bothered if global issues are neglected. Thus based on the statements of Ferris (2007) and Montgomery and Baker (2007), one could consider the feedback of the present data as adequate and satisfying

However, when it comes to teacher written feedback my biggest concern is the unbalanced image of language that for instance the present data seems to represent. The structure-orientated feedback may be due to the facts that firstly, the teacher focuses on giving feedback on language structures, since teaching them is emphasized in the syllabus and mastering them is highly valued by the Finnish matriculation committee. Secondly, the students are taught from the beginning to mainly strive for correct language structures in second language writing and the students are basically guided to prioritize accurate language even at the cost of other language aspects, such as creativity or content. Thus it is no wonder that also the students value feedback on local issues.

The Difference on Students' English Writing Quality of EFL University Students before and after the Implementation of Peer-Corrective Feedback

The result of second hypothesis showed that students who were taught using peer corrective feedback got higher score than the score of their pretest. It was proved by the mean score of the students who were taught using peer corrective feedback got 71.89 and 77.67. It indicated that there was significant improvement between pretest and posttest scores. It was also proved by the result of hypothesis test calculation; Table 5 showed that sig (2 tailed) was 0.000. It meant that sig (0.000) < α (0.05=2.03). It could be concluded that H_0 was rejected and H_a was accepted that there was difference on students' English writing quality of EFL university students before and after the implementation of Peer-corrective feedback.

The findings of the study verified the assumption of researcher that peer correction was effective. It could be shown by doing a quick comparison between first drafts and final drafts of students. It helped the students got an understanding to make a coherent piece of paragraph, commented on other's work about how ideas should join together and improved writing skill by reviewing each other's work. This statistical finding verified the theories of teaching writing by using peer correction could increase the students' English writing quality. The findings of the study verified the statement that peer correction helped develop students' editing skill and established a social context for writing.

Peer corrective feedback for teaching writing is used to get a reader's opinion about the student writing. A reader can tell that the writer should add more details or explanation, something is not organized clearly, some information that is not relevant or there is something that is hard to understand, these comments could help the writer to write the next draft. Thus, it could enhance students' writing awareness and promote their participation in the classroom as Hyland & Hyland (2001) who said that peer feedback promotes student participation in the classroom and makes student less teacher-dependent. Hence, the students were more careful when writing in future and can help the students sort out careless mistakes. The students can learn a lot from their mistake, and also in those activities they feel confident and relaxing.

Thus, they can comfortably improve their writing ability. Dealing with this, Walk (1996) stated that receiving comments from their friends can bring students more inspiration and confidence which helps them write more and better afterwards.

Peer feedback is pitched more at the learner's level of development or interest and is therefore more informative than teacher feedback as Ganji's (2009) and Katayama's (2007) study. Furthermore, it enhances audience awareness and enables the writer to see egocentrism in his or her own writing. In addition, learners' attitudes towards writing can be enhanced with the help of more supportive peers and their apprehension can be lowered. Learners can learn more about writing and revision by reading each other's drafts critically and their awareness of what makes writing successful and effective can be enhanced and, lastly learners eventually become more autonomous writers.

The Difference on Students' English Writing Quality of EFL University Students before and after the Implementation of Self-Corrective Feedback

In most educational systems today, one of the basic pedagogical principles is that good conditions for learning are best achieved if learners are actively involved in all phases of the educational process, which is maintained by proponents of cognitive and constructive theories of learning (Birjandi & Hadid, 2011). Self along with peer correction is also valued in the teaching process. Buchanan (2004) acknowledges that self-correction can be a force that pushes students to engage more actively in their own learning process. Shunk (2000, cited in Buchanan 2004) also states that, "developing self and peer evaluation strategies help students gain control over their learning, ….and allows them to focus more effort in studying those areas where they need more time".

Involving the students in correcting of their own errors gives them confidence and helps them to be the judges of their own works. Kavaliauskiene (2003) has stated that learners must have the opportunity for the self-correction of their work individually; however, their work should be previewed by the teachers and their errors should be indicated.

The result of this research showed an improvement in students' writing score in the posttest. The improvement could be seen by comparing the mean score between the pretest (71.83) and posttest (73.99). It meant that the third hypothesis was accepted. It was also assumed that self-correction helped the students to improve their writing quality. The result of this research also showed that the use of self-correction improved the students' skill in writing. Some students were seen to be seriously revised their work, and it could be seen that their responsibility and independence toward their task were increasing.

Types of Feedback that Gives the Best Result on the English Writing Quality of EFL University Students

The result of gain score demonstrated that self-corrective feedback was less effective in developing students' writing quality than the other two types of feedbacks. In other words, the two feedbacks of peer-corrective and teacher-corrective were very effective in improving the writing quality and vocabulary of students. It was suggested that teachers employed these two effective techniques in their writing courses, and made their classes much more active and fruitful. Furthermore, it was shown that students could be trained to appreciate revision, and develop a global approach to writing.

However, teachers need to take consideration on the notion that Peer feedback is pitched more at the learner's level of development or interest and is therefore more informative than teacher feedback (Ganji, 2009, and Katayama, 2007).

Peer feedback encouraged students to write reader-based meaningful texts. Therefore, teachers need to be made aware of, and experiment with a wider range of feedback and error-correction strategies appropriate for different levels and students.

Furthermore, some students in self-corrective feedback class were not able to understand what they needed to do, and because of that, they were not doing the self-correction wholeheartedly. It could be seen as the researcher observed the students while they were doing the self-correction. The researcher found out that some students were not doing self-correction; they were doing peer-correction instead. When the researcher asked them why they were doing that, they simply answer that they did not know what their errors were if they were reading their own text. This finding suggested that the students, even though they had been given time to reflect as if their text was not theirs, still felt ill equipped to do the self-correction. Even though they felt ill equipped with themselves, the scores showed that they made improvements. The improvements also covered in all aspects of writing.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the data analysis, the researcher concludes that the use of the teacher-corrective feedback in the process of improving the students' writing skill brings positive response for the students

The findings of the study verified the assumption of researcher that peer correction is effective. It can be shown by doing a quick comparison between first drafts and final drafts of students. This

statistical finding verified the theories of teaching writing by using peer correction that can increase the students' English writing quality. The findings of the study verified the statement that peer correction help develop students' editing skill and established a social context for writing.

Involving the students in correcting of their own errors give them confidence and helps them to be the judges of their own works. In self-corrective feedback learners must have the opportunity for the self-correction of their work individually; however, their work should be previewed by the teachers and their errors should be indicated.

The result of this research also shows that the use of self-correction improves the students' skill in writing. Some students were seen to be seriously revised their work, and it could be seen that their responsibility and independence toward their task were increasing.

Students in peer-correction group seemed that, in their discussions, they mostly focused on meaning not form. Besides these points, peer feedback encouraged students to write reader-based meaningful texts. Therefore, teachers need to be aware, and experiment with a wider range of feedback and error-correction strategies appropriate for different levels and students.

It could be seen as the researcher observed the students while they were doing the self-correction. The researcher found out that some students were not doing self-correction; they were doing peer-correction instead. This finding suggested that the students, even though they had been given time to reflect as if their text was not theirs, still felt ill equipped to do the self-correction.

It is suggested that the lecturers should employ these two effective techniques in their writing courses, and make their classes much more active and fruitful. Lecturers need to consider before implementing self-corrective feedback. It was due to some students in self-corrective feedback class who were not able to understand what they needed to do, and because of that, they were not doing the self-correction wholeheartedly. The findings showed that some students were not doing self-correction; they were doing peer-correction instead.

REFERENCES

Bitchener, J., Young, S., and Cameron, D. (2005).The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing 14 (2005), pp. 191–205.*

Brown, H. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching,4th ed.* New York: Longman.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol.* 12, No. 3, pp. 267-296.

Cross, K.P. (2000). *Cross paper 4: Collaborative learning 101.* Mission Viejo, CA: League for innovation in the community college.

Dehkordi, S.A.S and Hadi.(2015). Impact of Explicit Vocabulary Instruction on Writing

Achievement of Uppur.*International Education Studies: Vol. 9 No. 4.*

Diab, R.L. (2005). EFL university students' preferences for error correction and teacher feedback on writing.*TESL Reporter, Vol.1, No. 38, pp. 27-51.*

Erfanian, M. (2002).The *effect of self-correction strategy on the development of learners' linguistic competence.*Unpublished master's thesis, Tehran: AllamehTabatabaei University.

Ferris, D. (2007). Preparing teachers to respond to student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing 16, 165–193.*

Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott. *Journal of Second Language Writing, Vol. 1, No.8,pp. 1-10.*

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century.* New York: Basic Books.

Hendrickson, J. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research and practice. *Modern Language Journal, Vol.1, No. 62,pp. 387-398.*

Hyland, F. and Hyland, K. (2001).Sugaring the Pill: Praise and Criticism in Written Feedback.*Journal of Second Language Writing.Vol. 1, No.10, pp. 185-212.*

Katayama, A. (2007). Japanese EFL Students' Preferences toward Correction of Classroom Oral Errors.*The Asian EFL Journal.Vol. 9. No. 4, pp. 19-28.*

Lalande, J. (1982). Reducing compositions errors: An experiment.*The Modern Language Journal,Vol.1, No. 66, 140-149.*

Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 writing classroom: What do students think? *TESL Canada Journal,Vol.2, No. 22. pp. 156-171.*

Linse, Caroline T, &Nunan, David. (2005). *Practical English Language Teaching: Young Learners.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nakanishi, C. (2007). The effects of different types of feedback on revision.*The Journal of Asia TEFL,Vol.4, No. 4,pp. 213-244.*

Noora, A. (2008). Iranian Non-English Majors' Language Learning preferences: The Role of Language Institutes. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, Volume 8(2) 2008.*

Palloff, R. M.,& Pratt, K. (1999). *Building learning communities in cyberspace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Semke, H. (1984). The effects of the red pen.*Foreign Language Annals,Vol.1, no.17, pp. 195-202.*

Topping, K., Smith, E., Swanson, I., and Elliot, A. (2000).Formative peer assessment of academic writing between postgraduate students.*Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 149-169.*

Truscott (1996).The Case against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes.*Language*

Learning.Vol.1, No.46, pp. 327-369.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walz, J. (1982). *Error correction techniques for the foreign language classroom.*Washington: Prentice Hall.

Wang, P. (2010).Dealing with English Majors Written Errors in Chinese Universities.*Journal of Language Teaching and Research,Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 194-205.*