

Peer Feedback, Self-correction, and Writing Proficiency of Indonesian EFL Students

Bambang Yudi Cahyono

Universitas Negeri Malang, East Java, Indonesia

Rosyi Amrina

Graduate Program in English Language Teaching,
Universitas Negeri Malang, East Java, Indonesia

Abstract

This study investigated the effectiveness of peer feedback and self-correction based on guideline sheets on the writing ability of the Indonesian EFL students. It involved 71 Indonesian EFL students taking the Essay Writing course at Universitas Negeri Malang, an Indonesian university. The students were from three intact classes and they were given different types of treatment: The students from Class A were given peer feedback based on a guideline sheet, those from Class B were assigned to do self-correction based on a guideline sheet, and those from Class C were involved in a conventional editing process of writing. The results of the study showed that the students given peer feedback based on a guideline sheet (Class A) have better ability in writing essays than those who were not given peer feedback (Class C); the students conducting self-correction based on a guideline sheet (Class B) have better ability in writing essays than those who did not conduct self-correction (Class C); and both peer feedback based on a guideline sheet (given to Class A) and self-correction based on a guideline sheet (given to Class B) significantly improved the ability in writing essays of the students in the two experimental classes. Given that the two types of treatment were effective in increasing the students' scores in essay writing, peer feedback and self-correction based on guidelines sheets are recommended for practical use in EFL classrooms as well as for further research studies.

Keywords: Indonesian EFL students, peer feedback, self-correction, writing proficiency

Cite as: Cahyono, B. Y., & Amrina, R. (2017). Peer Feedback, Self-correction, and Writing Proficiency of Indonesian EFL Students. *Arab World English Journal*, 8 (1).

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol7no1.12>

Introduction

One of the language skills that need to be learned by students learning English as a foreign language (EFL) is writing. However, writing is not an easy task for many EFL students, including those from Indonesia. This is because writing demands adequate knowledge of content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics (Jacobs, Zinkraf, Wormuth et al., 1981). It also requires a responsibility in self-monitoring in the process of planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing (Cresswell, 2000). Given the fact that it is hard for EFL students to be independent in controlling the quality of their writing, the help of other people or an activity to raise their awareness for self-monitoring is needed. The help of other people that is given to someone in the process of writing is called *feedback*. Meanwhile, the activity in raising students' awareness to monitor their own writing can be conducted through self-revision (Srichanyachon, 2014), self-feedback (Wakabayashi, 2013), self-correction (Hajimohammadi & Mukundan, 2011), or guided-self correction (Yukio, 1998).

Literature Review

A number of research studies show that feedback on writing helps EFL students modify their essays to a better quality (e.g. Liu, 2008; Boughey, 1997; Dheram, 1995). Dheram (1995), for example, investigated how students responded to feedback on both language use and content. The first draft and the second draft of the students' essays were compared. The results showed that the students attempted to revise their first drafts. The revisions included syntactic, semantic, and stylistic modifications. They also added arguments with fresh details different from the ones used in their earlier drafts. In line with Dheram, Boughey (1997) examined the effect of feedback given to students working in groups to finish an academic essay. Examination of the first draft indicated that the essay contained claims that were not supported. In the second draft, the students tried to make links between propositions. The results of Liu's (2008) study strengthened the findings that feedback enabled EFL students to reduce errors and improve accuracy in the new piece of writing. From the research studies, it was evident that students used feedback as reference for adding, deleting, and rearranging ideas in their essays.

Teacher or students in the same classroom are frequently referred to as the ones who could give feedback to students' writing. Feedback given by the teacher is called *teacher feedback*. Research shows that teacher feedback can improve the quality of the students' writing. Hyland (1998), for example, conducted a study on six ESL writers' responses to feedback and the uses of teacher written feedback for revision in an English proficiency program course. The findings of Hyland's study revealed that the students tried to use most of the usable feedback for the revision since they valued the feedback. Moreover, students responded to the feedback in three different ways, namely by following the corrections based on the feedback, extending the revision beyond the suggestions addressed by the feedback, and deleting the problematic features to avoid the issues given in the feedback. Thus, based on the teacher feedback, the students have made some revisions for the better quality of their writing.

Feedback given by fellow students is called *peer feedback*. A number of studies showed that the students modified their essays on the basis of feedback given by their peers. Villamil and Guerrero (1998) investigated the impact of individual peer feedback on ESL students' final draft. The results showed that some points of revision during the interaction were incorporated into final versions of the students' writing. In contrast, Porto (2001) examined feedback given by

cooperative writing response groups. The students were assigned a topic to be written at home and required to bring their first draft for peer feedback. The members of the group gave the feedback in the group session. The results showed that cooperative writing response groups raised students' awareness about writing process and helped them focus their own strengths in writing. Furthermore, students not only get the benefit of peer feedback, they even prefer peer feedback to teacher feedback. This is evident from a research report conducted by Jacobs, Curtis, Braine and Huang (1998). Jacobs et al. (1998) discovered that the majority of the learners preferred peer feedback for they thought that peers could provide more ideas and locate problems they had missed.

In the case that peer feedback cannot be given in the classroom due to time constraint and students' personality factors, students might be asked to have self-correction (Hajimohammadi & Mukundan, 2011) which is also called self-revision (Srichanyachon, 2014) or self-feedback (Wakabayashi, 2013). Srichanyachon (2014) identified the methods used by EFL learners to improve their own writing. One of the methods was self-revision. She found out that in conducting self-revision, the students most frequently referred to a dictionary and checked whether their final draft covered all topics in their outline. She also revealed that students with high English background knowledge used more self-revision method than those with low English background knowledge. Wakabayashi (2013) carried out a study focusing on self-feedback involving advanced EFL learners. She found that students who reviewed their own drafts improved their final products with significant gain compared to the earlier drafts. Similarly, as reported in Hajimohammadi and Mukundan's (2011) study, students who conducted self-correction also improved their final writing products significantly.

One of the factors that need to be considered in giving feedback is the components of writing to be emphasized. As far as the components of writing are concerned, feedback can be given for all components of writing (Jacobs et al., 1981; Weigle, 2002), i.e. content, organization, and language use (i.e. grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics), or on a particular component of writing, for example grammatical errors, diction, or content. However, according to Porto (2001) for peer feedback in particular, emphasis should be given on content and meaning, not grammar or style. Zaman and Azad (2012) reported that students preferred feedback on the forms rather than content and they also liked to be given direct feedback rather than indirect feedback. However, it is important to note that the students in Zaman and Azad's study were EFL students with unsatisfactory language proficiency. In short, regardless of the different components of writing to be emphasized, the ultimate goal of providing corrective feedback is to help students develop their writing (Zaman & Azad, 2012; Liu, 2008; Porto, 2001).

It is clear that either the teacher or peers could give effective feedback for the improvement of the students' writing. The teacher and peer feedback may be used alternately or in combination in the process of writing. The teacher feedback will be of better values for it can cover all components of writing. However, peer feedback will be an important issue if the class is so big that it is just impossible for the teacher to provide feedback. It might be argued whether peers are capable enough in giving feedback. In this case, it is important that the teacher has to make sure that the peers know clearly what to do. Training the students in practice session (Cresswell, 2000) or giving a guideline sheet (Yukio, 1998) would overcome this shortage.

Another thing to be taken in mind is that feedback remains an alternative, and the student writer has his or her own authorial decision on what to take from the teacher or peer feedback.

There has been a debate on which types of feedback – teacher feedback, peer feedback, and self-correction – best contribute to the development of the students' ability in EFL writing. This debate has stimulated comparative studies on the effect of the types of feedback. Within this area of research, the present study is situated on the basis of the Indonesian context of EFL writing, following other research studies in the same area. One of the research studies that is worth mentioning is Ganji's (2009). In his research comparing the impacts of teacher-correction, peer-correction, and self-correction on Iranian students' ability in IELTS essay writing, Ganji (2009) found that there were significant differences in the results of the comparison of each of the three types of treatment. Among the three types of treatment, peer-correction was found to be the most influential, whereas teacher feedback was the least influential. Because the research was a comparison of types of feedback provision, without comparing the results from a control group, we are not sure if the differences in the results of the treatment reflect significant gain indicating the improvement of the students' IELTS writing competence. Meanwhile, earlier research on self-revision, for example the one conducted by Srichanyachon (2014), did not reveal the effect of self-revision on students' writing achievement as her focus of study was on the need of the students to do self-revision. Both Wakabayashi's (2013) study on self-feedback as well as Hajimohammadi and Mukundan's (2011) study on self-correction showed that the students who were involved in the research studies improved their writing significantly.

In Indonesia, writing is taught as one of the language skill courses in the English department of universities or teacher training colleges. At the Universitas Negeri Malang, one of the prominent universities located in the Province of East Java, writing is offered as a series of three courses: *Paragraph Writing*, *Essay Writing*, and *Argumentative Writing*. This study deals with the provision of feedback in the Essay Writing course in particular. The provision of teacher feedback into the students' writing might help the students improve the quality of their writing. However, due to the big classes of students attending writing courses, provision of teacher feedback is hard to do. Therefore, this study focuses on the provision of peer feedback. In addition, it examines the use of self-correction conducted by individual students. In order to help students to be aware of the areas of feedback that should be given to their classmates and to enable students to carry out the self-correction, the students were provided with a guideline sheet, a method of providing feedback which was also conducted by Yukio (1998). The guideline sheet covers the aspects of writing as shown by Jacobs et al. (1981) and Weigle (2002), which include content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

Research Questions

This study aims to investigate the effectiveness of peer feedback and self-correction each of which is based on a guideline sheet on the writing ability of the Indonesian EFL students. However, because of the hurdle regarding the big class, the present study focuses on peer feedback and self-correction. The term 'feedback' is used to cover feedback in the form of correction and remarks beyond correction. More specifically, the research questions are stated as follows:

- (1) Do the students given peer feedback based on a guideline sheet have better ability in writing essays than those who are not given peer feedback?

- (2) Do the students conducting self-correction based on a guideline sheet have better ability in writing essays than those who do not conduct self-correction?
- (3) Which among the two strategies (peer feedback based on a guideline sheet and self-correction based on a guideline sheet) shows a better result?

Method

The present study aims to investigate how peer feedback and self-correction, both are based on guideline sheet, affect Indonesian EFL students' ability in writing essays. This study involved 71 sophomore students who took Essay Writing course offered in the English Department of Universitas Negeri Malang. These students were taken from three intact classes of the Essay Writing course. The first class (Class A) consisted of 25 students. The second class (Class B) consisted of 25 students, while the third class (Class C) consisted of 21 students. These three classes of students used the same essay writing materials which were based on a textbook entitled *Refining Composition Skills* written by Smalley, Ruetten and Kozyrev (2001:103-211). In particular, the student had practiced in writing essays based on three types of development: exemplification, comparison and contrast, and classification. All the three classes were involved in the stages of process writing, commencing from planning, drafting, revising, to editing.

Prior to the treatment given to the students, the students in the three classes were given a pretest. The pretest was based on the exemplification essay and the students were asked to write an essay with a topic of their choice. In the treatment given to the students, the students underwent essay writing of two different types of development, namely comparison and contrast essay and classification essay. In the planning stage, the students were asked to find out a topic they were interested in. In the drafting stage, they wrote the introductory paragraph, the developmental paragraphs, and the concluding paragraph. Process of revision was conducted in an on-going way in the process of essay development. In the editing process in particular, the three classes have had different treatment. Students from Class A were given peer feedback based on a guideline sheet. Students from Class B were those conducting self-correction based on a guideline sheet. Unlike the students from the two classes, students in Class C were involved in a conventional way of editing without any guideline sheet. The conventional revision was conducted by reading the draft and checking for possible errors.

The guideline sheet used in this study was based on the debate of the important components that should be given in providing feedback as discussed earlier some authors emphasized one of a few components of writing (e.g. Porto, 2001; Zaman & Azad, 2012). We believe that the more complete the components of writing are included in guideline sheet, the better the students will be helped in developing their writing. In developing the guideline sheet, we were inspired by the editing and proofreading checklist developed by Sebranek, Kemper and Meyer (1999) and Fellag (2010). From Sebranek et al.'s (1999) checklist and Fellag's (2010) writing checklist, we learned that the items in the checklist can be responded by using "Yes/No" answer. However, we also added the option 'not sure' with an open-ended space to provide students with an option different from merely agreement or disagreement. With this third option, the students can write down their remarks or suggestions in case they have something to inform their peers (in peer feedback) or to remind themselves (in self-correction). From Fellag's (2010) writing checklist in particular, we learned that in terms of essay content and organization, the guideline sheet in this study should be designed by inserting the element of topic, thesis

statement and supporting sentences based on three main parts of an essay (i.e. introductory paragraph, developmental paragraphs, and concluding paragraph) in the items of the guideline sheet. With these formats, we then included the five components of writing as suggested by Jacobs et al. (1981) and Weigle (2002).

The guideline sheet consists of five components of writing, namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use (grammar), and mechanics. The content and organization deal with how the topic of the essay is developed in the introductory, body, and concluding parts of the essay. Grammar focuses on the use of tenses, subject and verb agreement, and plural agreement. Vocabulary requires the use of relevant vocabulary and transitional markers. Mechanics includes capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. The contents of the guideline sheet are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The contents of the guideline sheet for peer-feedback and self-correction

No	Components	Aspects	Number of items
1	Content and organization	Introductory paragraph	3
		Developmental paragraphs	9
		Concluding paragraph	2
2	Grammar	Tenses	1
		Subject and verb agreement	1
		Plural agreement	1
3	Vocabulary	Vocabulary related to the topic	1
		Transitional markers	1
4	Mechanics	Capitalization	1
		Punctuation	1
		Spelling	1
Total			22

The wording of the guideline sheet was made slightly different between the one for students in Class A (peer feedback) and Class B (self-correction). The difference can be seen in the use of expression such as “Does *the writer’s* introductory paragraph ...?” (Class A) and “Does *your* introductory paragraph ...?” (Class B). There are totally 22 items in the guideline sheet. The guideline sheet for peer feedback is shown in Appendix A, while the guideline sheet for self-correction in Appendix B.

In the process of writing all types of essays, the students were assigned to write five-paragraph essay of free topic. In order to provide feedback for their peers, the 25 students from Class A were assigned to work in pairs. There were eleven pairs of 22 students and the last three students were put in a small group. The essays of the students working in pairs and those working in small group were exchanged between the members of the pairs and among the members of the group, respectively. In the process of editing, the students read the guideline sheet and they responded necessarily to the items of the guideline sheet by ticking one of the options “Yes”, “No”, or “Not sure.” In addition, the students were allowed to provide feedback directly by writing on the peer’s essay or indirectly by writing remarks or suggestions for improvement. Students in Class B were given a guideline sheet and they were assigned to

respond to the items in the guideline sheet for self-correction by ticking one of the same options as those in the guideline sheet given to students in Class A. Similar to students in Class A, students in Class B were asked to respond to the items directly or indirectly for self-correction.

In the editing process, the students were given about 40 minutes and after they completed the editing, the students in Class A were asked to return the essays to the writers. The students in Class B were asked to keep the corrected essays. All of the students, both in Class A and Class B, were asked to revise their essays and submit 2 printed essays (the old and the new versions) in the next session. The final drafts of the students' classification essay in particular were considered as the posttest essays to be compared with the results of their exemplification essays which were considered as pretest essays. In order to compare the essays of the two types of development, interrater scoring was applied.

The students' essays were scored by using scoring rubric in the "ESL Composition Profile" proposed by Jacobs et al. (1981). This scoring rubric consists of five components: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Each of the components has different weightings: 30 (content), 20 (organization), 20 (vocabulary), 25 (language use), and 5 (mechanics). We scored the students' essays. In order to come to the same agreement in scoring, we had practiced in scoring six essays, two from each class. The results of scoring of six essays were compared to find out differences, both total scores and score of each component. Agreement was reached when the scores that each of us gave were not so much different, that is one for each component and five for the whole components. After some practice, we successfully reached agreement for most of the students' essays. In case of the differences, we referred back to the students' essays together. Briefly stated, agreement in scoring has been achieved. The sets of scores resulted from pretest and posttest from each of us as the raters were counted for the average scores for pretest and posttest. The students' scores from pretest and posttest can be seen in Appendix C.

Results

In order to know whether or not the treatment given to the two experimental groups were effective in improving the EFL students' ability in writing essays, differences between the results of the pretest and posttest scores need to be compared. However, to determine the statistical computation that we would use to compare the results of the two tests, homogeneity test was conducted to know whether the results of the pretest of the students in the experimental classes (Classes A and B) and those in the control class (Class C) are homogeneous.

The homogeneity test for the results of pretest from the three classes indicated that the students' pretest scores were homogeneous. This is shown by the mean scores from the three classes which were 72.72 with SD 7.54 (Class A), 72.20 with SD 6.03 (Class B), and 73.48 with SD 7.31 (Class C). The test of homogeneity of variances showed that there are no significant differences between the three mean scores as shown in the probability value ($p = .393$). Because of this level of homogeneity, further analysis can be conducted by comparing the mean scores by using one-way ANOVA. The result shows that the means of the three classes were not significantly different as shown in the probability value ($p = .826$). This value is higher than the accepted probability level 0.05. Based on the results of analysis of the pretest scores which show that the classes were homogeneous and the scores were no significantly different, analysis of posttest scores can be conducted by comparing the mean scores of the three classes. Analysis of

posttest scores shows that the mean scores from the three classes were 80.56 with SD 3.83 (Class A), 80.52 with SD 4.39 (Class B), and 73.19 with SD 6.06 (Class C). The results of the test of homogeneity of variances show that the variances of the three classes were not homogeneous ($p = .047$). Therefore, the three mean scores can be compared by using ANOVA. The descriptive data of posttest scores are shown in Table 2 and the comparison of posttest scores by using ANOVA is shown in Table 3.

Table 2. The descriptive data of posttest scores

	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error	95% Confidence interval for mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower bound	Upper bound		
A	25	80.5600	3.83058	.76612	78.9788	82.1412	73.00	88.00
B	25	80.5200	4.38862	.87772	78.7085	82.3315	72.00	89.00
C	21	73.1905	6.06316	1.32309	70.4306	75.9504	62.00	84.00
Total	71	78.3662	5.79221	.68741	76.9952	79.7372	62.00	89.00

Table 3. The comparison of posttest scores by using ANOVA

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	798.841	2	399.420	17.527	.000
Within Groups	1549.638	68	22.789		
Total	2348.479	70			

The results of the comparison of the means scores as shown in Table 3 show that the three mean scores are significantly different ($p = .000$). Because the comparison involves three mean scores, post hoc analysis can be conducted by comparing the mean score of each class as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. The post hoc analysis of the mean scores of posttest

(I) Class	(J) Class	Mean difference (I-J)	Std. error	Sig.	95% Confidence interval	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
A	B	.04000	1.35022	1.000	-3.1953	3,2753
	C	7.36952*	1.41306	.000	3.9837	10,7553
B	A	-.04000	1.35022	1.000	-3.2753	3.1953
	C	7.32952*	1.41306	.000	3.9437	10.7153
C	A	-7.36952*	1.41306	.000	-10.7553	-3.9837
	B	-7.32952*	1.41306	.000	-10.7153	-3.9437

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The results of post hoc analysis show that the mean score of Class A is significantly different from that of Class C and the mean score of Class B is also significantly different from that of Class C. However, the mean score of Class A and that of Class B are not significantly different. This means that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of classes involved in the experimental groups (Classes A and B) and the mean score of class used as the control group (Class C). The results of this post hoc analysis are used to answer the research questions as stated in the following.

- (1) The students given peer feedback based on a guideline sheet (Class A) have better ability in writing essays than those who were not given peer feedback (Class C).
- (2) The students conducting self-correction based on a guideline sheet (Class B) have better ability in writing essays than those who did not conduct self-correction (Class C)
- (3) The two strategies namely peer feedback based on a guideline sheet (given to Class A) and self-correction based on a guideline sheet (given to Class B) improve the ability in writing essays of the students in the two classes given peer feedback and self-correction, respectively.

Discussion

This study examines the effect of peer feedback and self-correction on the EFL students' ability in writing. From the outset we were informed by the fact that peers may not be able to give feedback due to their arguable proficiency. In addition, students might not be able to self-correct given that they consider that their submitted writing products the final ones. Therefore, in this study, the students were equipped with a guideline sheet in order to be able to provide feedback for their peers or to correct their drafts. The result of this research revealed that the students given peer feedback based on a guideline sheet (Class A) improved their ability in writing essays. This is evident from the improvement of their score from 72.72 in the pretest to 80.56 in the posttest, whereas the students who did not undergo feedback provision activities of any kind (Class C) remained constant in their achievement. This is apparent from the scores of their essays taken from the pretest and posttest which are 73.48 and 73.19, respectively. The improvement of the ability in writing of the students given peer feedback based on a guideline is consistent with the findings of previous studies (e.g., Villamil & Guerrero, 1998; Liu, 2008) indicating that peer feedback was effective in helping the students improve their writing products.

The students conducting self-correction based on a guideline sheet (Class B) have better ability in writing essays than those who did not conduct self-correction (Class C). This is proved by the mean score of students in the posttest from Class B (80.52) which is higher than that of students from Class C (73.19) and the mean difference was statistically significant. The result on self-correction in the present study is in line with the result of research conducted by Wakabayashi (2013) as well as Hajimohammadi and Mukundan (2011) which reveal that students can improve the quality of their writing products by conducting self-correction. This study also confirms that self-correction based on a guideline sheet helps students improve their writing quality since they could monitor their own work using the provided guideline, locate problematic features and revise the features for the betterment of their essays. By using the guideline sheet, students get clear points to self-correct in the area of content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. This is also confirmed in Wakabayashi's (2013) study that detailed feedback task sheet, the term for guideline sheet used in her study, is pointed up as a

potential factor affecting the positive result of self-feedback. Furthermore, this study reveals that self-correction based on a guideline sheet is more beneficial for students in writing essays than the conventional way of revising.

Situated within the debate on the dominant role of particular types of feedback, the results of this study conform to the results of research reported by Ganji (2009). In his research, Ganji found that peer feedback and self-correction improve the quality of the EFL learners' IELTS essays. While in the present study, it was found that both peer feedback and self-correction equally improve the students' scores in essay writing. In Ganji's research it was revealed that students who were provided with peer feedback outperformed those given self-correction strategy. However, Ganji's research did not involve a control group; therefore, the results of Ganji's research might be arguable because the effect resulted from the application of peer feedback and self-correction might not be caused by the peer feedback and self-correction activities. The result was likely to be the consequence of a period of exposure in the teaching by using peer feedback and self-correction strategies to boost the students' IELTS writing scores. In contrast, the present study used a control group of students who were involved in the conventional way of revising as part of the process of writing (Murray, 1980; White & Arndt, 1991). The experiences in the classroom activities of the experimental and control groups were similar except the treatment given to them. Thus, we can be sure that the effect of peer feedback and self-correction based on a guideline sheet is empirically well-supported.

Other results of research studies suggest that feedback or correction, be it given directly (Zaman & Azad, 2012) or indirectly (e.g. Hyland, 2001; Liu, 2008), effectively improves the quality of the students' essays. However, the use of guideline sheet has not been much reported in the literature. In the present study, the guideline sheet was developed by considering components of writing suggested in the literature on writing assessment. It includes content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics as suggested by Jacobs et al. (1981) and Weigle (2002). By including the components of overall writing proficiency, it might be argued that the guideline sheet in the present study has sound theoretical basis. If that is true, then the guideline sheet used in this study both for peer feedback (see Appendix A) and self-correction (see Appendix B) can be recommended as guideline sheet for further research studies.

Conclusion

This study suggests that peer feedback and self-correction based on guideline sheets affect the process of writing in a positive way. The guideline sheets with a number of items based on the five components of writing (content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics) were able to guide the students in providing feedback for their peers or to help themselves check aspects of their essays that need revising. The comparison of the achievements of the three groups of students indicated that the two experimental groups (the groups conducting peer feedback and self-correction based on guideline sheets) outperformed the group which was involved in the conventional way of revising. Thus, we are confident that regardless of the types, feedback conducted in EFL essay writing course is likely to improve the students' ability in writing essays. Moreover, peer feedback and self-correction are confirmed as strategies which are more beneficial than the conventional way of revising. It is then important that the application of peer feedback as well as self-correction be considered in EFL writing classrooms, especially when the students are still at the lower stage of proficiency in writing. In addition,

when using guideline sheet for both peer feedback and self-correction, it should be ensured that the guideline sheet is designed in such a way that it contains concise, understandable and applicable items.

About the Author:

Bambang Yudi Cahyono is a Professor in Applied Linguistics at Universitas Negeri Malang, East Java, Indonesia. He earned his MA degree from Concordia University, Montreal, Canada and PhD from the University of Melbourne, Australia. E-mail: yudic2000@yahoo.com

Rosyi Amrina is a student in Graduate Program in English Language Teaching at Universitas Negeri Malang, East Java, Indonesia. She obtained her Bachelor degree in English Language Teaching from Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, South Kalimantan, Indonesia. E-mail: rosyi_amrina@yahoo.com

References

- Boughey, C. (1997). Learning to Write by Writing to Learn: A Group Work Approach. *ELT Journal*, 51(2), 126-134.
- Cresswell, A. (2000). Self-Monitoring in Student Writing: Developing Learner Responsibility. *ELT Journal*, 54(3), 235-244.
- Dheram, P.K. (1995). Feedback as a Two-bullock Cart: A Case Study of Teaching Writing. *ELT Journal*, 49(2), 160-168.
- DiGiovanni, E., & Nagaswami, G. (2001). Online Peer Review: An Alternative to Face to Face? *ELT Journal*, 55(3), 263-272.
- Fellag, L.R. (2010). *From Reading to Writing*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.
- Ganji, M. (2009). Teacher-correction, Peer-correction and Self-correction: Their Impacts on Iranian Students' ILTS Essay Writing Performance. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 6(1), 117-139. Retrieved September 21, 2015 from <http://www.academia.edu/8910226/>.
- Hajimohammadi, R. & Mukundan, J. (2011). Impact of Self-correction on Extrovert and Introvert Student in EFL Writing Progress. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 161-168.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The Impact of Teacher Written Feedback on Individual Writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 255-286.
- Hyland, F. (2001). Dealing with Plagiarism when Giving Feedback. *ELT Journal*, 55(4), 375-381.
- Jacobs, G.M., Curtis, A., Braine, G. & Huang, S. (1998). Feedback on Student Writing: Taking the Middle Path. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 307-317.
- Jacobs, H.L., Zinkraf, S.A., Wormuth, D.R., Hartfiel, V.F., & Hughey, J.B. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Liu, Y. (2008). The Effects of Error Feedback in Second Language Writing. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching*, 15(1), 65-79. Retrieved December 8, 2015 from <http://www.w3.coh.arizona.edu/awp/>.
- Murray, D.M. (1980). Writing as Process: How Writing Finds Its Own Meaning. In T. R. Donovan & B. W. McClelland (eds.), *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition* (pp. 1-13). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

- Porto, M. (2001). Cooperative Writing Response Groups and Self-evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 55(1), 38-46.
- Sebranek, P., Kemper, D., & Meyer, V. (1999). *Write Source 2000: A Guide to Writing, Thinking, and Learning*. Wilmington, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Smalley, R.L., Ruetten, M.K., & Kozyrev, J.R. (2001). *Refining Composition Skills: Rhetoric and Grammar*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Srichanyachon, N. (2014). Self-revision Method of EFL Writers. *International Proceeding of Economics Development Research*, 77(13), 58-62. Retrieved December 5, 2015 from http://ipedr.com/vol77/013-ICLMC2014_N10018.pdf.
- Villamil, O.S., & Guerrero, M.C.M.de. (1998). Assessing the Impact of Peer Revision on L2 Writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 491-514.
- Wakabayashi, R. (2013). The Effects of the Peer Feedback Process on Reviewers' Own Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 6(9), 117-192. Retrieved December 5, 2015 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n9p177>.
- Weigle, S.C. (2002). *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, R., & Arndt, V. (1991). *Process Writing*. London: Longman.
- Yukio, H. (1998, December). Writing to Improve Analytical and Organizational Skills. *The Language Teacher Online*, 22, 12. Retrieved January 5, 2016 from http://www.jalt-publications.org/old_tlt/files/98/dec/hirayanagi.html
- Zaman, M.M., & Azad, M.A.K. (2012). Feedback in EFL Writing at Tertiary Level: Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions. *ASA University Review*, 6(1), 139-156. Retrieved December 12, 2015 from <http://www.asaub.edu.bd/data/asaubreview/v6n1sl11.pdf>.

Appendix A. Guideline Sheet for Peer-feedback

Name of the writer: _____

Name of the feedback provider: _____

Instruction: Please tick the relevant response. If you answer “No,” please provide correction in the student’s work.

No	Questions	Responses		
		Yes	No	Not Sure
	Content and Organization			
	Introductory Paragraph			
	<i>Does the writer’s introductory paragraph ...</i>			
1	introduce a topic?	_____	_____	_____
2	have a thesis statement?	_____	_____	_____

3 indicate a certain method of essay development?
(e.g. by examples, by comparison and contrast, or
by classification)

Developmental Paragraphs

Does the writer's first developmental paragraph

...

4 develop an aspect of the thesis statement?
5 have supporting sentences relevant to the topic?
6 indicate a particular method of paragraph
development you have chosen?

*Does the writer's second developmental
paragraph ...*

7 develop another aspect of the thesis statement?
8 have supporting sentences relevant to the topic?
9 indicate a particular method of paragraph
development you have chosen?

*Does the writer's third developmental paragraph
...*

10 develop another aspect of the thesis statement?
11 have supporting sentences relevant to the topic?
12 indicate a particular method of paragraph
development you have chosen?

Concluding Paragraph

Does the writer's concluding paragraph ...

13 have a thesis restated by using different words?
OR
summarize the topics of the essays?
14 have a personal comment?

Responses

No	Questions	Yes	No	Not Sure
----	-----------	-----	----	----------

Grammar

Is the writer's essay free from error in:

1 tenses?
2 subject and verb agreement?
3 plural agreement?

	Vocabulary	_____	_____	_____
	<i>Does the writer's essay have a variety of:</i>			
4	vocabulary related to the topic?	_____	_____	_____
5	transitional markers?	_____	_____	_____
	Mechanics			
	<i>Is the writer's essay free from error in:</i>			
7	capitalization?	_____	_____	_____
8	punctuation?	_____	_____	_____
9	spelling?	_____	_____	_____

Appendix B. Guideline Sheet for Self-correction

Name: _____

Instruction: Please tick the relevant response. If you answer “No,” you have to revise your work.

No	Questions	Responses		
		Yes	No	Not Sure
	Content and Organization			
	Introductory Paragraph			
	<i>Does your introductory paragraph ...</i>			
1	introduce a topic?	_____	_____	_____
2	have a thesis statement?	_____	_____	_____
3	Indicate a certain method of essay development? (e.g. by examples, by comparison and contrast, or by classification)	_____	_____	_____
	Developmental Paragraphs			
	<i>Does your first developmental paragraph ...</i>			
4	develop an aspect of the thesis statement?	_____	_____	_____
5	have supporting sentences relevant to the topic?	_____	_____	_____
6	indicate a particular method of paragraph development you have chosen?	_____	_____	_____
	<i>Does your second developmental paragraph ...</i>			
7	develop another aspect of the thesis statement?	_____	_____	_____

- 8 have supporting sentences relevant to the topic? _____
- 9 indicate a particular method of paragraph development you have chosen? _____

*Does your **third** developmental paragraph ...*

- 10 develop another aspect of the thesis statement? _____
- 11 have supporting sentences relevant to the topic? _____
- 12 indicate a particular method of paragraph development you have chosen? _____

Concluding Paragraph

Does your concluding paragraph ...

- 13 have a thesis restated by using different words?
OR
summarize the topics of the essays? _____
- 14 have a personal comment? _____

Responses

No	Questions	Responses		
		Yes	No	Not Sure
	Grammar			
	<i>Is your essay free from error in:</i>			
1	tenses?	_____	_____	_____
2	subject and verb agreement?	_____	_____	_____
3	plural agreement?	_____	_____	_____
	Vocabulary			
	<i>Does your essay have a variety of:</i>			
4	vocabulary related to the topic?	_____	_____	_____
5	transitional markers?	_____	_____	_____
	Mechanics			
	<i>Is your essay free from error in:</i>			
7	capitalization?	_____	_____	_____
8	punctuation?	_____	_____	_____
9	spelling?	_____	_____	_____

Appendix C. The Results of the Pretest and Posttest of the Students from Three Classes

No.	Class A			Class B			Class C		
	Name code	Pretest	Posttest	Name code	Pretest	Posttest	Name code	Pretest	Posttest
1	APP	75	83	ARF	65	82	AH	78	71
2	AF	67	82	ATP	60	78	A	68	68
3	AB	70	78	APP	66	76	FH	71	66
4	AL	81	88	AN	73	89	FF	75	68
5	AS	76	85	DAF	65	80	FiF	74	70
6	ANR	62	78	DZ	67	79	GW	80	79
7	BD	82	74	DK	73	81	IGN	71	72
8	EFR	71	73	DDW	77	87	JM	66	70
9	HCS	66	78	EJDP	72	80	JT	52	62
10	HAI	67	80	FKI	79	74	MF	79	83
11	HS	88	84	FRR	63	72	NU	69	74
12	IIR	69	80	HAAV	78	78	NY	72	65
13	JH	65	74	IS	78	83	NR	77	84
14	LRH	78	83	IR	81	88	PNA	71	79
15	MAA	89	83	LSBS	71	74	PN	69	70
16	NN	76	80	MRA	67	79	PU	79	80
17	NS	82	81	MGFE	81	84	RK	70	80
18	NG	69	81	RT	72	79	SSN	86	78
19	NS	67	83	RAD	73	78	SB	78	74
20	PK	71	79	RFH	81	88	VPM	85	72
21	RRA	69	75	RGSN	75	79	WK	73	72
22	RAR	68	82	SA	67	80	-	-	-
23	RSA	66	80	TIY	71	82	-	-	-
24	TA	80	85	UVW	72	80	-	-	-
25	TrA	64	85	ZK	78	83	-	-	-
	Total	1818	2014	Total	1805	2013	Total	1543	1537
	Mean	72.72	80.56	Mean	72.20	80.52	Mean	73.48	73,19