UNEMI
UNIVERSIDAD ESTATAL DE MILAGRO

REPÚBLICA DEL ECUADOR

UNIVERSIDAD ESTATAL DE MILAGRO

VICERRECTORADO DE INVESTIGACIÓN Y POSGRADO

FACULTAD DE POSGRADOS

ARTÍCULOS PROFESIONALES DE ALTO NIVEL
PREVIO A LA OBTENCIÓN DEL TÍTULO DE:

MAGÍSTER EN ENSEÑANZA DEL INGLÉS COMO LENGUA EXTRANJERA

TEMA:

INFLUENCE OF COLLABORATIVE AND TEACHER FEEDBACK ON THE ENGLISH WRITING SKILLS OF TENTH-GRADE STUDENTS

Autor:

MARÍA DANIELA ZAVALA DÁVILA

Tutor:

MSC. STEVEN ARTURO TORRES BURGOS

Milagro, 2026

RESUMEN

La escritura constituye una de las habilidades más complejas del inglés como lengua extranjera, pues requiere conocimientos gramaticales, vocabulario, coherencia, organización y pensamiento crítico. Estudiantes de educación secundaria aún presentan dificultades para producir textos precisos y significativos.

Analizar la influencia de la retroalimentación colaborativa y docente en las habilidades de escritura en inglés de estudiantes de décimo grado.

Se utilizó un enfoque mixto, diseño cuasiexperimental con 20 estudiantes de una institución pública ecuatoriana. Se utilizaron pretest y post-test, tareas de escritura, formatos de retroalimentación entre pares, retroalimentación correctiva por parte del profesor y un cuestionario de percepción. La intervención consistió en ocho sesiones de revisión colaborativa, seguida de retroalimentación escrita correctiva por parte del docente. Los datos cuantitativos se analizaron con estadística descriptiva, y los cualitativos con análisis temático.

Se mejoró el rendimiento escrito, se obtuvieron mayores puntajes en el post-test y se presentaron menores dificultades para interpretar palabras y textos. Los estudiantes manifestaron percepciones positivas respecto a las dos modalidades, pero consideraron que la retroalimentación del docente fue más precisa y confiable.

Los resultados evidencian que ambas modalidades desempeñan roles complementarios, ya que la retroalimentación entre pares estimula la interacción y la reflexión, mientras que la retroalimentación docente ofrece mayor precisión en la corrección textual.

La integración de retroalimentación colaborativa y docente es una estrategia pertinente para fortalecer la escritura en inglés, promover la autorreflexión y favorecer el aprendizaje lingüístico en estudiantes de educación secundaria.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Retroalimentación colaborativa; retroalimentación del profesor; habilidades de escritura en inglés; retroalimentación entre pares; retroalimentación correctiva escrita; estudiantes de EFL; Educación secundaria.

ABSTRACT

Writing is considered one of the most complex skills in English as a Foreign Language (EFL). This requires the students to acquire grammatical knowledge, vocabulary, coherence, organization, and critical thinking. Despite its importance, it is still not possible for secondary school students to write accurately and meaningful texts. Feedback has been one of the most effective methods of improving students' writing skills as students work on their writing skills. We studied the impact of collaborative and teacher feedback on tenth-grade English writing skills in this study. We employed a mixed-methods approach and quasi-experimental design with 20 students from a public high school in Ecuador. Data was collected through a pre-test, post-test, paragraph-writing tasks, peer feedback forms, teacher corrective feedback, and perception questionnaire. The intervention was conducted in eight sessions where students participated in collaborative peer-review and then received teacher-written corrective feedback. The qualitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and the quantitative data with thematic analysis. In general, the writing performance of students improved as evidenced by higher post-test scores and less misinterpretation of words and text. In addition, the students had positive perceptions of collaborative and teacher feedback, but teacher feedback was considered to be more accurate and reliable for improving writing quality. The authors find that the integration of collaborative and teacher feedback improves the English writing skills by encouraging the learner to be self-reflective and to learn language. This paper is proof of concept in the case of EFL teaching at the secondary level to integrate collaborative feedback strategies and writing feedback.

KEYWORDS: collaborative feedback; teacher feedback; English writing skills; peer feedback; written corrective feedback; EFL learners; secondary education.

1. INTRODUCTION

English is now the most common language for international communication, higher education, scientific research and professional development. As a result, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) has not only grown in importance as it has become a more widely used language in universities and higher education but also in the education system globally. Among the four macro language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing, writing is considered one of the most challenging because you're trying to integrate linguistic knowledge, cognitive processes of language and communicative capability. Writing effectively, as well as grammatical and syntactical skill selection of words and sentences, coherence of ideas, and understanding of the audience and purpose are all essential aspects of a written text. Writing is not a language that can be easily understood by students, and it is hard for students to express ideas in the written language.

Writing is one of the biggest challenges for secondary school students in EFL systems. To deal with the problem of organizing ideas, creating grammatically correct sentences, the right vocabulary and composing coherent paragraphs is very difficult. These challenges result in written content that is inaccurate, poorly organized, poorly structured and not cohesive. These problems are particularly evident in public schools where English is not available outside the classroom and where there is not enough time for students to practice writing. So, it is very clear that improving students' writing skills has become one of the highest priorities of English language teaching.

Writing development is not a single activity but rather a recursive process: planning, drafting, revising, editing and rewriting. Students are then supported at each stage where they learn through feedback that is useful to recognize strengths and weaknesses, and to further polish their draft. It is because of this that written corrective feedback is one of the most widely studied teaching strategies for second language learning. Corrective feedback helps students to spot linguistic errors, reflect on their own performance and gradually develop language knowledge. More importantly, good feedback turns writing from a product-based activity into a continuous learning process in which revision is a key component.

As far as written corrective feedback is concerned, the theoretical foundations of this have evolved greatly over the past decades. First, it was argued that the principal way to improve grammatical accuracy was by the teacher. As recently as a few years ago, we came to see students as active participants in the revision process. Hyland and Hyland (2023) have argued that feedback should not be viewed merely as correction of errors but as an interactive process

where learners build knowledge, develop self-regulation, and improve their communicative skills. Lee (2024) similarly contends that good teacher feedback integrates explicit correction with explanation, in order to encourage students to ask questions and not just to answer one thing.

At the same time, collaborative learning has become a key pedagogical approach that has the potential to change traditional classroom dynamics and is now in vogue. Collaborative learning is based on constructivist theories which posit that knowledge is social in structure and is formed through interaction with others. Collaborative feedback (peer feedback) encourages students to review their classmates' writing and identify strengths and weaknesses, suggest a solution and negotiate meaning through discussion among them. Students are no longer passive recipients of teacher correction but rather they become professional judges and assessors of written language, developing analytical and reflective skills that can help writing in the long run.

Various international studies have shown the educational value of cooperative feedback. As Topping (2022) contends, peer assessment enhances learners' metacognitive awareness because students learn to evaluate writing according to explicit criteria and reflect on their own writing while simultaneously having experienced peer review. Similarly, Zhang et al. (2021) noted that students who were structured peer-reviewed improved grammatical accuracy, vocabulary use, and writing quality as well. Wang and Han (2025) also found that collaborative writing and teacher guidance were instrumental for students to revise the text, organize ideas, and write coherent written works. These findings suggest that collaborative feedback is not only related to language development but also contributes to learner autonomy, critical thinking, communication skills, and confidence.

Despite these advantages, teacher feedback is still integral to EFL writing instruction. Teachers have linguistic knowledge of many topics that students are often unaware of while reviewing peer review so they can identify grammatical, lexical, and organizational problems. Lee (2024) explains that teacher written corrective feedback is still the best source of guidance because it provides detailed explanations and tailored suggestions that inform a revision process. Pham (2021) said that it has been shown that systematic teacher feedback is key to reducing grammatical errors and enhancing writing accuracy over time. Hence, more and more research show that collaborative feedback should complement rather than replace teacher feedback.

As part of the Ecuadorian educational curriculum, English instruction has undergone substantial changes to enhance communication skills. Still, writing is not as much of a priority as listening skills, and classroom teaching is more about grammar than actual writing. And so

many students finish secondary education unable to write good or clear texts in English. Also, writing instruction is often based on teacher correction, so students are not able to contribute to a more cooperative revision process. This teaching situation highlights the need to develop innovative methods which enhance the teaching of writing in public schools.

Previous studies in Ecuador had mostly focused on grammatical instruction, vocabulary acquisition, or digital resources for language learning. Less research is available to study the impact of collaborative and teacher feedback on English writing skills among tenth-grade students from public schools in Ecuador. This gap in the literature hinders faculty and students' understanding of the impact of different feedback strategies in the Ecuadorian EFL context for writing development.

Further research is needed to determine if collaborative and teacher feedback are able to enhance students' writing skills while also allowing for learner autonomy and engagement. In this study, we address this educational need by examining the impact of collaborative and teacher feedback on the English writing skills of tenth-grade students. The research used a mixed-methods approach, which integrates quantitative and qualitative evidence to get to the root cause of the phenomenon under study. The quantitative part of the study looks at students' writing performance across pre-test and post-test comparisons, and the qualitative part of the study looks at how learners perceive the effectiveness of collaborative and teacher feedback during the intervention.

The research was conducted in a quasi-experimental setting with twenty tenth-grade students from a public school. Participants were involved in paragraph writing and took part in structured peer-review activities and teacher-written feedback over eight weeks. Students' writing was analyzed for grammar accuracy, vocabulary usage, organization, coherence, and the number of morphological, syntactic, and semantic errors. We also collected perception questionnaires in order to assess students' response to feedback.

Our study was conducted in English language classrooms to address the problem for EFL students to develop writing skills and the limited collaboration in the English language classroom as well. While teacher feedback has been regarded as a good teaching method in the past, too much reliance on teacher feedback may lead to students being less likely to actively review, revise, and improve their own written work. Collaborative feedback plus teacher feedback might be a better model to give students more autonomy and better writing performance.

The purpose of this research is to study the impact of collaborative and teacher feedback on the English writing skills of tenth-grade students. In particular, how does mixing the two

instructional techniques contribute to grammar, vocabulary, organization, coherence and to reducing morphological, syntactic and semantic errors? Also, the research aims to assess how students perceive collaborative and teacher feedback as helpful in the writing process.

In this article, we will divide the content into 5 major parts. In the beginning, we review the literature on theories and empirical studies about English writing, collaborative learning, peer feedback, teacher feedback and written corrective feedback. The methodology section describes the research approach, design, participants, instruments, data collection procedures and analysis methods. The results section is about the quantitative and qualitative results of the intervention and the discussion on how the findings are interpreted with respect to other international studies. Finally, the article concludes with the main conclusions, pedagogical implications for English language teaching, study limitations and recommendations for future research.

There is a potential that the results of this study will help improve the existing knowledge on how to give feedback in EFL writing, as well as to provide teachers with suggestions on how to make more collaborative, student-centered and reflective education. If teachers' expertise and students' collaboration are combined, the English writing skills of the students may increase and the learning process can be more interactive to encourage learners to be creative, critical and to engage with the writing process.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

English Writing Skills in EFL Contexts

Writing is one of the most challenging productive skills in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) that involves integrating linguistic knowledge, cognitive processes and communicative skills into a cohesive written product. Writing, in contrast with speaking, requires more accuracy in grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, organization and coherence as the writer cannot rely on immediate clarification from the audience. Thus, developing writing skills is a major challenge for EFL learners, especially in secondary education where students are still learning the linguistic foundations necessary to express ideas effectively.

Writing is, according to Hyland and Hyland (2023), a process of planning, drafting, revising, and publishing through revision and reflection, and this involves a process where the learner must continuously review and improve in their writing. As Graham (2023) states, writing is not only a communication process but also a cognitive process for critical thinking, language

development, and academic success. Students who receive structured guidance during the writing process will produce coherent and grammatically correct texts.

Writing in EFL settings is often more about grammar and vocabulary acquisition, while the revision aspect is neglected. Recent research indicates that writing development is not just about linguistic knowledge, but also about the quality of instruction at the time of writing. Lee (2024) explains that students improve writing when they get feedback that motivates them to reflect rather than just fix mistakes. As a result, writing pedagogy has become more process-oriented where revision is a core aspect.

Hence, English language is one of the most challenging skills for an EFL learner. All kinds of errors in written production are reported in error analysis studies, in what is called morphological, syntactic, and semantic errors. Morphological errors are the incorrect verb endings, plural formation, and word construction. Syntactic errors are related to sentence structure, word order, articles, and prepositions. Semantic errors are the use of inappropriate vocabulary or expressions that alter the intended meaning of the message. These difficulties indicate that instructional approaches that allow students to recognize their writing problems and correct them with real feedback will be needed.

Collaborative Feedback in English Writing

Collaborative feedback (peer feedback) is an important element of communicative language teaching and collaborative learning methods. Students review and comment on the written work of their peers as per the established criteria. Rather than just correcting teacher and student feedback, students contribute to writing quality evaluation and can suggest the need for further improvement.

The theoretical foundations of collaborative feedback are closely related to Vygotsky's sociocultural theory that learning occurs through social interaction and collaboration with others. From this perspective, peer interaction facilitates knowledge construction since learners negotiate meaning, exchange ideas, and solve problems collectively. Topping (2022) argues that peer assessment enhances higher-order thinking skills when students need to assess writing in a critical manner and also look at their own linguistic skills.

There are some recent empirical studies that support the effectiveness of collaborative feedback in EFL writing instruction. Zhang et al. (2021) showed that students who were given structured peer-review activities developed better grammatical accuracy and organization while students who were not directly taught to write showed more grammatical inaccuracies and their writing was better. Noroozi et al. (2023) also showed that guided peer feedback improves students' argumentative writing by allowing them to reflect, self-regulate, and develop critical evaluation

skills. Such findings suggest that collaborative revision not only drives language development but also enhances students' metacognitive awareness and autonomy.

The other benefit of collaborative feedback is that people learn to be a learner. In the process of reviewing the composition of fellow students, they are made aware of writing conventions and they can then carry this knowledge into their own texts. Panadero and Lipnevich (2022) argued that peer assessment fosters self-regulated learning because students learn to measure quality using strict criteria, to track their own progress, and become more responsible for their learning. Collaborative feedback then takes students from being passive recipients of criticism to active participants in writing improvement.

Collaborative feedback is also not without its drawbacks. Students may ignore grammatical errors because they lack linguistic comprehension and may avoid making critical comments to keep the good relationship going. Thus, researchers generally recommend combining collaborative feedback with teacher feedback in order to be both accurate and to retain the benefit of collaborative learning.

Teacher Feedback and Written Corrective Feedback

Teacher feedback has long been regarded as one of the most important instructional methods for second-language writing. The written corrective feedback is comments, corrections, explanations, and suggestions from teachers to identify errors and make improvements to the following drafts. Unlike the direct correction process, good feedback encourages students to investigate their mistakes, understand the grammatical basis of their errors, and revise their own writing.

Hyland and Hyland (2023) argue that feedback must be viewed as an interactive dialogue rather than a one-way transmission of corrections. Good teacher feedback should incorporate accurate linguistic correction with comments that encourage learners to reflect and make decisions while revision is ongoing. Likewise, Lee (2024) finds that detailed written feedback impacts grammatical accuracy, student motivation, and engagement in the writing process.

Teacher feedback has been found in the literature to be different. Direct feedback provides the correct linguistic form; indirect feedback indicates an error is present without providing the answer, motivating students to correct themselves. Pham (2021) found that both approaches contribute to writing improvement, but indirect feedback appears to promote greater long-term language retention because learners actively engage in solving linguistic problems.

Studies have also pointed out the need for constructive feedback along with positive comments. According to Ferris and Bitchener (2023), constructive feedback should recognize students' strengths and also point to areas for improvement. This helps the learner to be more motivated

and reduces the anxiety associated with writing correction. Thus, the present EFL curriculum is increasingly focused on feedback as a formative assessment method that supports learning and not only assesses performance.

Influence of Collaborative and Teacher Feedback on English Writing Skills

Research has shown that collaborative feedback and teacher feedback cannot be seen as competing instructional approaches but rather as complementary approaches that enhance writing development. Teacher feedback provides expert linguistic advice and collaborative feedback encourages reflection, interaction, and learner autonomy. Using both strategies is valuable to students to see students' perspectives in the revision process.

Wang and Han (2025) found that secondary school students receiving peer and teacher feedback improved writing quality more than those who were only given one form of feedback. Zhao and Zhang (2024) found the same effect of combining feedback on grammatical and vocabulary accuracy, text organization, and self-confidence in EFL students. These results indicate that collaborative learning environments with teacher knowledge are best for writing improvement.

In the Ecuadorian educational system, the research on the combined impact of collaborative and teacher feedback is limited. Most teaching approaches are still based on teacher correction, despite increasing international evidence that collaborative learning is effective. Therefore, the study of how these feedback strategies influence the English writing skills of tenth graders is important not only in the national literature but also in the practical course of English teachers who wish to work towards more participatory and student-centered writing instruction.

All in all, the literature reviewed shows that writing development depends on continuous opportunities for revision supported by meaningful feedback. Collaborative and teacher feedback help to increase grammatical accuracy, vocabulary use, organization, coherence, and learner autonomy. With these complementary instructional strategies in place, we believe that it is a good pedagogical model to enhance English writing skills in secondary EFL education.

3. METODOLOGY

This study used a mixed-methods research approach to examine the effects of collaborative and teacher feedback on English writing skills of tenth-grade students. A mixed-methods approach was chosen because, in this study, it allows researchers to incorporate quantitative

and qualitative information, and a broader perspective on the research problem is better as opposed to just a single methodologies-based approach. Creswell and Creswell (2023) claim that mixed-methods research combines both numerical data and experiences of participants and thus is a means to show not only whether an educational intervention is successful but also how and why it is successful in the learning process. For English writing instruction, this approach was appropriate as the study is to measure improvement in students' writing skills but also to investigate the students' perceptions of collaborative and teacher feedback as a whole during the intervention period.

The study was structured as quasi-experimental and a pre-test and post-test was conducted in a single group of students. This was the approach adopted as the research was done in a natural educational setting where random assignment of students was not feasible. According to Cohen et al. (2018), quasi-experimental designs are widely used in education research because they allow researchers to assess the impact of instructional interventions while maintaining the normal organization of classroom activities. The quantitative component was to compare students' writing performance before and after the implementation of collaborative and teacher feedback, and the qualitative part was to survey students' feelings and opinions regarding both feedback methods.

The research was conducted with the participation of 20 tenth graders were involved through the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) program during the academic year. The students included male and female students aged 15 to 16 and their English language was equivalent to the A1-A2 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Students were recruited through convenience sampling as they were enrolled in the class of research participants for the teaching practicum. All students were involved voluntarily and ethical principles (confidentiality, anonymity and academic integrity) were adhered to throughout the research.

The independent variable of the study was Collaborative and Teacher Feedback, which is the process by which students were encouraged to write better written papers by their peers and English teacher. Collaborative feedback was structured peer-review, where students looked at their classmates' paragraphs and evaluated them based on established standards. Teacher feedback was written feedback (corrections, comments, explanations) after each writing task to guide the students in the process of revision.

The dependent variable was English Writing Skills, which is the ability of students to produce coherent, grammatically correct and meaningful written text in English. It consisted of several dimensions most commonly reported in the literature on second language writing: grammatical

accuracy, vocabulary use, text organization, coherence, cohesion, mechanics, and reduction of morphological, syntactic, and semantic errors. Improvement in these dimensions was the most important indicator of the effectiveness of the intervention.

A few research instruments were used to collect quantitative as well as qualitative information. First, a diagnostic pre-test was administered before the intervention to assess students' initial level of writing ability. At the end of the period when the intervention was completed, the post-test similar to the pre-test was conducted to assess the students' writing skills. Both tests asked them to write short paragraphs in English and were conducted using an analytic writing rubric that evaluated grammar, vocabulary, organization, coherence, mechanics, and overall communicative efficiency.

Throughout the intervention, students wrote six paragraph-writing tasks related to familiar topics in English language appropriate to their language level. With the help of structured feedback checklists developed by the researcher, students drafted each paragraph and conducted peer-review sessions. These checklists instructed students to look for grammatical errors, vocabulary mistakes, organizational weaknesses, and coherence issues; instead of simply identifying mistakes, they were to suggest other ways forward.

After the group discussions on each paragraph, the English teacher then reviewed each paragraph and gave written feedback. Teacher comments included direct and indirect correction, clarification of grammar rules, vocabulary advice, suggestions on how to structure the text better, and observations about coherence and mechanics of the writing. This process allowed students to compare peer comments with teacher feedback before revising and producing a final version of each writing task.

A student perception questionnaire was administered at the end of the intervention to reinforce the quantitative information. The questionnaire consisted of closed-ended items measured through a Likert scale and open-ended questions to address students' opinions regarding the usefulness, clarity, reliability and effectiveness of collaborative and teacher feedback. This instrument was useful in qualitative terms for learning about teacher and student attitudes towards both.

The intervention lasted for eight weeks, and in each week one writing activity was performed. The lesson was the same all around: first, students received clear instructions on the writing topic and assessment criteria; then, each student wrote a first draft of a paragraph and the students exchanged their written work and finished the peer-feedback checklist. Fourth, the teacher reviewed each composition and gave individualized written corrective feedback. And finally, students revised and rewrote their paragraphs in response to peer feedback and teacher

suggestions. This process encouraged self-reflection and incremental improvement in writing ability.

The quantitative data obtained from the pre-test, post-test and writing assessments were analyzed using descriptive statistics, such as means, percentages and score comparisons to identify what students' writing improved post-intervention. A particular focus was on morphological, syntactic and semantic errors, so that the researcher could identify the areas that students developed the most. The qualitative information collected from questionnaires and classroom observations was analyzed with thematic analysis: the students' responses were divided into the categories of collaborative feedback, teacher feedback, writing confidence, learner autonomy and the effectiveness of the intervention.

To ensure the quality of the study, several approaches were taken to strengthen its validity and reliability. Instrument content was reviewed based on the study objectives and the variables. The analytic writing rubric and peer-feedback checklist were developed based on criteria commonly reported in the literature on EFL writing assessment. Qualitative and quantitative evidence was combined to confirm the findings in the study and to provide the students with a better understanding of the feedback process.

For the entire study, ethical principles guided each step of the investigation. Students were aware of the purpose of the study and participated voluntarily. Data collection, analysis, and reporting were conducted in private and the information was kept confidential to ensure that the results were based on the data collected and reported anonymously, to protect participants' privacy, and to ensure the findings were reflective of the educational impact of collaborative and teacher feedback on the English writing skills of tenth-grade students.

4. RESULTS

In this section, quantitative and qualitative findings have been presented in our research for collaborative and teacher feedback in the 8-week intervention. The results are organized by the research objective that was to investigate the impact of collaborative and teacher feedback on English writing skills in tenth-grade students. Quantitative data were obtained from the pre-test, post-test, writing tasks, and error analysis, and qualitative data were obtained from students' perception questionnaires at the end of the intervention.

4.1 Pre-test and Post-test Performance

The first goal of the study was to determine whether students' writing performance improved after participating in collaborative peer-review activities and receiving teacher written corrective feedback. To accomplish this, students passed a diagnostic writing task before the intervention and a final writing task after completing the instructional program.

Table 1

Comparison of Students' Writing Scores Before and After the Intervention

Assessment	Mean Score	Standard Score (%)
Pre-test	5.10	51.0
Post-test	5.65	56.5
Mean Difference	**+0.55**	**+5.5**

As shown in Table 1, students' average writing score increased from 5.10 in the pre-test to 5.65 in the post-test, representing an improvement of 0.55 points. While this is a slight increase, the impact of collaboration and teacher feedback in our intervention is clear because students benefited from the continuous feedback from all students. The results highlight the fact that continuous opportunities for revision enabled learners to improve grammatical accuracy, vocabulary use, and paragraph organization.

The improvement from both assessments indicates that feedback was beneficial to the writing process in that students had to revise their work before producing the final version. And the classroom observation showed that students became better at identifying and correcting their mistakes on subsequent writing tasks.

4.2 Analysis of Writing Errors

To identify the areas where students experienced the greatest difficulties, all written compositions were analyzed according to three major categories of linguistic errors: morphological, syntactic and semantic errors. These categories were identified in peer feedback and teacher feedback records.

Table 2

Frequency of Errors Identified Through Teacher Feedback

Error Type	Frequency	Percentage
Syntactic Errors	510	41.95%
Morphological Errors	449	36.92%
Semantic Errors	257	21.13%
Total	**1216**	**100%**

Teacher feedback showed that syntactic errors were the most common category with 41.95% of all errors. Syntactic errors consisted mainly of incorrect sentence structure, verb tense selection, word order, article usage, and prepositions. Morphological errors were 36.92% and semantic errors were 21.13% of all errors.

The large number of syntactic errors indicates that students had greater difficulties constructing grammatically correct sentences than in vocabulary or in building out words. These findings are consistent with previous studies showing that sentence construction is one of the most difficult tasks to begin with in the beginning EFL learners.

Table 3

Frequency of Errors Identified Through Collaborative (Peer) Feedback

Error Type	Frequency	Percentage
Syntactic Errors	390	34.95%
Morphological Errors	409	36.65%
Semantic Errors	317	28.40%
Total	**1116**	**100%**

Table 3 shows that collaborative feedback also helped students to recognize a considerable number of linguistic errors. Syntactic errors were one of the most common categories amongst students, like teacher feedback. However, students found fewer syntactic errors than the teacher and identified proportionally more semantic errors than the teacher.

These findings suggest that peer reviewers were able to understand vocabulary and even obvious grammatical mistakes but sometimes overlooked more complex syntactic structures that required greater linguistic expertise. Nevertheless, collaborative feedback was successful in encouraging students to critically assess written language and to participate actively in the revision process.

4.3 Comparison Between Collaborative and Teacher Feedback

One of the key objectives of the study was to compare the impact of collaborative and teacher feedback in identifying writing problems.

Table 4

Comparison of Errors Identified by Peer Feedback and Teacher Feedback

Error Category	Teacher Feedback	Peer Feedback
Syntactic Errors	257	317
Morphological Errors	510	390
Semantic Errors	449	409
Total Errors	**1216**	**1116**

Teacher feedback revealed 100 more linguistic errors than collaborative feedback. The biggest difference was in syntactic structures where teachers saw much more problems with sentence organization, verb forms and grammatical relationships. This result reflects the teacher's greater linguistic expertise and experience assessing written production.

On the other hand, collaborative feedback encouraged students to contribute to the evaluation process and raised awareness of common vocabulary and grammar mistakes. Peer comments were generally less specific than teacher comments but they opened up space for discussion, reflection and collaborative learning.

4.4 Students' Perceptions of Collaborative and Teacher Feedback

The perception questionnaire also measured the students' opinions on whether both feedback strategies are useful after completing the intervention.

Table 5

Students' Perceptions of Feedback

Statement	Main Response
Teacher feedback improved my writing.	Strongly Agree
Peer feedback helped me identify mistakes.	Agree
I felt more confident after revising my classmates' work	Agree
Teacher comments were clearer and more reliable.	Strongly Agree
I would like to continue using both feedback strategies.	Agree

The questionnaire showed high levels of positive feedback toward both teaching strategies. Teacher feedback was the most reliable way for students to learn in school because they had the most detailed explanation of the teaching and correct grammatical guidance, but students also recognized that collaborative feedback made them aware of their own errors and encouraged students to be present in the classroom.

Reviewing classmates' paragraphs enhanced their ability to identify mistakes in their own writing. Some expressed more motivation as collaborative revision lessened anxiety about teacher correction and made writing more interactive for students.

4.5 Overall Findings

By the end of the research, the results show that collaboration and teacher feedback, as we call it, positively influenced students' English writing skills. Quantitative data suggests that writing scores are better and grammatical errors are less, and qualitative data further supports positive student perceptions of both feedback strategies.

Teacher feedback was particularly effective for identifying complex syntactic and morphological errors due to the teacher’s linguistic expertise. Collaborative feedback, on the

other hand, supported the autonomy and classroom interaction of learners, critical thinking and self-reflection for students in the revision process.

Together, these results indicate that collaborative and teacher feedback should be seen as complementary, not competing teaching strategies. They were combined to provide a supportive learning environment in which students could learn from the expert while also gaining the analytical skills to evaluate and improve their writing. As such, the intervention not only contributed to better writing performance but also increased the participation (and confidence in writing) of learners as well.

5. DISCUSSSION

Based on this study, working together and teacher feedback was used for the study of English writing skills in the tenth grade. It was found that both teacher and student feedback were helpful in student writing development because it made students write better, improve grammatical accuracy, vocabulary usage, organization, and overall text quality. The post-test scores improved moderately even though the intervention and teacher feedback were more structured and student focus was higher, so that the students were able to write better (and therefore engage and reflect). This research is consistent with previous research that has suggested the involvement of students in the writing process from a teacher's perspective and the importance of peer interaction and teacher feedback.

One of the most important results of this study was the improvement of writing scores between pre-test and post-test. During eight weeks of collaborative peer review and teacher written corrective feedback, students improved on average. This is a sign that feedback is a process of learning and should not be seen only as a correction to mistakes which students can make, but as part of a process of revision, analysis and reconstruction of their written work. These findings are in line with Hyland and Hyland (2023), who argue that good feedback promotes learning when students are actively engaged in revising their texts instead of just getting the correction. In the same vein, Graham (2023) argues that writing development is largely about getting opportunities to write, revise and rewrite texts every week or every few weeks to improve the learning and to keep it clean and fresh from failure.

Teachers' feedback was also more specific to writing errors than collaborative feedback, especially in syntactic structures. Teachers have more linguistic knowledge and knowledge of the language and are familiar with it so they can spot grammatical mistakes that students might

not be able to see during peer review. Lee (2024) similarly reported that teacher written corrective feedback is beneficial in terms of grammatical correctness because teachers give direct explanations and explicit guidance on language use. Teacher comments in this study were concerned not only with identifying mistakes but also grammatical rules and specific corrective strategies. Thus, students perceived teacher feedback to be the best source of correction and hence they were satisfied by what was found in Zhang et al. (2021), who found that EFL learners tend to trust teacher feedback more than peer comments because of teachers' professional expertise.

While teacher feedback is more accurate, collaborative feedback has educational benefits as well. Students participated in the review of paragraphs in the group, finding grammatical errors, and suggesting improvements. Working together encouraged reflection and discussion, and students in those groups learned more about common writing problems. Peer assessment promotes higher-order thinking skills, to the point where students become less inhibited from critically thinking about their writing on their own, Topping (2022). And Panadero and Lipnevich (2022) argue that collaborative assessment promotes self-regulated learning and encourages students to monitor their progress and take responsibility for their learning. These theoretical perspectives can explain why students in the present study reported increased confidence and increased awareness of their writing after peer-review activities.

The distribution of writing errors was also significant. Syntactic errors were the most frequent category of errors detected in the intervention and morphological and semantic ones the second. This is in line with previous studies done for EFL students, where sentence structure and grammatical relationships are often the first ones they encounter as learners. Ferris and Bitchener (2023) argue that syntactic complexity is developed gradually as the level of knowledge and control of grammar, vocabulary and discourse becomes better. Similarly, Pham (2021) said that verb tenses, word order, articles and prepositions remain the most difficult grammatical problems for students in secondary school EFL. Therefore, syntactic errors were concentrated in this work as well, and we believe that this is related to common developmental problems rather than specific instructional problems.

Though peer reviewers did not report too many syntactic errors as the teacher did, collaborative feedback was still essential to students' revision. During peer-review sessions, students were able to exchange ideas, discuss writing criteria and negotiate possible corrections before submitting revised drafts. This kind of collaboration transformed writing from a student-based activity to a social learning process. These findings are in line with Vygotsky's sociocultural theory in which knowledge is formed through interactions and learning is brought to bear when

students work together to solve problems. Collaborative feedback in writing instruction helps students learn all the skills needed for communication and critical thinking as well.

The perception questionnaire also provided qualitative evidence regarding students' opinions of both feedback strategies. The majority of the students were favorable towards collaborative and teacher feedback, and they appreciated that they were both ways of communicating and teaching. Teacher feedback was appreciated because it was based on a well-structured explanation and specific suggestions, while collaborative feedback offered the opportunity for discussion, participation and sharing of learning. Noroozi et al. (2023) found that guided peer feedback facilitates students' motivation and engagement and also enhances the quality of argumentative writing. The similarities between these findings and the present study indicate that integrating multiple sources of feedback leads to better learning experiences than doing it only with one kind of teacher correction.

Part of the pedagogical lesson from this research is that the value of collaborative feedback can be viewed as being a complement to teacher feedback, not a replacement. Teacher experience is still necessary to identify complex linguistic problems, and to give grammatical explanations. But collaborative feedback helps students to be more active in the writing process instead of just passive recipients of correction. Wang and Han (2025) showed that students who received feedback from both peers and teachers improved writing quality significantly more than students who were only receiving feedback from one source. It is with this study that we find that both methods were helpful but they were complementary for writing development.

The results also highlight the importance of formative assessment in English language teaching. Rather than treating assessment only as an assessment of grades, the intervention used feedback to support continuous improvement as a way to teach. Black & Wiliam (2018) argue that formative assessment is good when feedback gives learners the information, they need to bridge the gap between present and expected performance. During the intervention, students were given multiple opportunities to revise their texts in response to peer and teacher feedback. This recursive process encouraged reflection, self-correction, and gradual improvement in writing.

From a practical perspective, we believe English teachers should include collaborative revision activities in their writing lessons. Structured rubrics, checklists, and classroom training on how to give feedback are needed to facilitate peer review. Without adequate guidance, students may only be looking at the superficial grammatical errors and not the organization, coherence, and content development. Thus, teachers are essential in demonstrating good feedback practices and ensuring that collaborative revision really works for learning.

However, positive aspects of the intervention should be taken into account when interpreting the results. The study only had twenty participants from one school and this limitation affects the generalizability of the results to other educational settings. The intervention was for 8 weeks and this might not be enough to give the long-term improvement in writing skills. Further studies should be done with larger samples in multiple schools and longer interventions to see if the improvements are sustained over time. Different forms of written corrective feedback, such as digital feedback, automated feedback systems and collaborative online writing platforms might be used in future studies.

Taken together, our results support the evidence that good writing instruction needs to be a collaboration between teacher and student. This is because teacher feedback gives instruction with linguistic accuracy as well as individualized advice, and collaborative feedback allows students to develop independence in thinking, be creative, communicate and reflect. Together, these two approaches provide an environment in which students are involved in the development of knowledge in writing and so can always improve writing skills. Collaborative and teacher feedback is therefore a good approach to enhance English writing skills in secondary school EFL students and is in line with the growing body of international research that supports dialogue and collaboration in teaching writing.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The focus of this study was on the impact of collaborative and teacher feedback in the writing skills of tenth-grade English writing of a public high school in Ecuador. From both the quantitative and qualitative findings in the intervention of the study we conclude that the combined feedback strategies and strategies of collaborative and teacher feedback can be used to improve students' writing skills. Collaborative peer review based on teachers' written corrective feedback with teachers and students' feedback in collaboration led to better communication skills, vocabulary incorporation, structure writing skills, writing style, writing quality, and writing skills in writing and communication skills. This study accomplished the main objective by demonstrating that collaborative and teacher feedback can be effective teaching tools for the improvement of English writing in secondary EFL education.

The pre-test and post-test results indicate that students' writing performance improved significantly after the eight-week intervention. Although the mean score improvement was moderate, feedback and writing to the editor were kept as students' written production was

continuous and provided feedback to students and students were able to revise writing and improve writing. This is in line with the process-based approach to writing instruction that considers revision as a foundational part of language learning rather than writing as a final product. The intervention showed that systematic feedback helps learners identify their linguistic deficiencies and develop a higher level of writing skills.

Another important conclusion is that teachers' and classroom feedback are complementary in the teaching process. Teacher feedback was particularly helpful in identifying grammatical, syntactic, and organizational issues because the teacher has linguistic competence and experience with teaching them well. Students thought teacher feedback was good, detailed and reliable to support writing to the best of their ability to make a better writing. Collaborative feedback also encouraged students to actively engage in the writing of the text, thinking through ideas, identifying mistakes and suggestions for improvement and reviews. And these peer-review projects helped learners take responsibility for the revision process, to have more autonomy, reflection, communication and responsibility for their own writing, to be in charge of feedback and reflection. Therefore, we conclude that both forms of feedback serve different but complementary instructional roles in addition to each other in ways that make writing development more effective than either approach alone.

Writing errors also provide some insight into the linguistic challenges faced by tenth-grade EFL learners. Syntactic errors were the most common mistakes identified throughout the intervention, followed by morphological and semantic ones. This also indicates that students still face problems in sentence construction, grammatical relationships, verb tense usage and word order despite regular English instruction. Nevertheless, the reduction of the errors as the students continued to work on writing as well as the feedback that they receive, in turn, increases students' linguistic awareness and they become fluent. So, error correction should not just be performed as an evaluation or assessment, but rather as a formative teaching and learning process, learning through reflection and revision.

The qualitative findings support the impact of using both collaborative and teacher feedback in English writing. Both feedback strategies were positively perceived and recognized for their positive effect on writing performance by students. Teacher feedback was valued because it provided individualized explanations and grammatical clarification; collaborative feedback enabled students to exchange ideas, bring up language problems and learn from their peers' writing. This is why students are able to be active participants in the assessment process when appropriate guidance, structured criteria and good learning environments are provided.

Collaborative feedback can not only improve writing skills, but also critical thinking skills, communication skills and autonomy.

From a pedagogical point of view, the study shows that writing instruction should move away from teacher-centered correction to more collaborative and reflective learning. In order to do so, English teachers should integrate structured peer-review activities into regular classroom practice while maintaining teacher written corrective feedback as professional guidance throughout the revision process. Analytic rubrics, peer feedback checklists, guided revision activities, and specific training on how to give constructive feedback in collaboration can all help improve the quality and effectiveness of collaborative feedback and maximize its educational advantages. Thus, feedback can be seen as a constant learning strategy rather than as the most straightforward method of correcting errors at the end of our assessment.

The findings also contribute to the growing literature on English language teaching in the Ecuadorian educational system. Collaborative learning and written corrective feedback have been well documented outside the USA and relatively few studies have considered their combined use in Ecuadorian secondary schools. Therefore, this study provides empirical evidence for the incorporation of collaborative feedback in English writing instruction in public schools. Our findings suggest that the blending of peer interaction with teacher knowledge is a feasible and effective teaching approach that results in better writing and more student participation and motivation.

Though these positive outcomes were robust, there are several limitations to this study. The study was carried out with just twenty students in one school and cannot generalize the results to other schools. The intervention duration was only eight weeks, and the teaching time, which might cause better writing skills, is limited in the literature. Furthermore, the study focused purely on paragraph writing and did not examine how collaborative and teacher feedback may affect other types of academic writing, such as essays, reports, or argumentative writing, etc.

In future research, we would like to replicate this study with larger and more diverse samples from different educational institutions and proficiency levels. Experimental and control groups could contribute to better evidence of the effectiveness of collaborative and teacher feedback. Similarly, researchers could study how digital collaborative platforms, automated writing evaluation systems, artificial intelligence tools, and online peer-review environments affect students' writing development. Longitudinal studies on the long-term effects of collaborative feedback on learner autonomy and writing proficiency would also be of great interest in English language teaching.

As a result of these interventions, we have found that the combination of collaborative and teacher feedback is an effective approach to improve the English writing skills of tenth graders. Teacher feedback has the linguistic skills to help students identify and explain the more complex writing problems, and collaborative feedback motivates students to be involved in the revision process, develop critical thinking, and be more responsible for their own learning. Together, these two approaches provide useful learning mechanisms that improve grammatical accuracy, organization, vocabulary use, and communication skills in writing English. As such, teachers in secondary EFL classrooms should have structured teaching practice that combines collaborative peer review and systematic teacher feedback in their practice to develop more reflective, autonomous, and successful writers.

7. REFERENCES

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). *Classroom assessment and pedagogy*. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 25(6), 551–575. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2021). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development*. Multilingual Matters.

Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Ellis, R. (2009). *A typology of written corrective feedback types*. ELT Journal, 63(2), 97–107. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023

Ferris, D. R. (2023). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Ferris, D. R., & Bitchener, J. (2023). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.

Graham, S. (2023). The sciences of writing. *Reading Research Quarterly, 58*(1), 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.470

Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2019). Feedback in second language writing. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 1–22). Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2023). *Feedback in second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Lee, I. (2021). Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts. *Springer Nature*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-2693-5

Lee, I. (2024). Teacher written corrective feedback and student engagement in EFL writing. *TESOL Quarterly*. Advance online publication.

Noroozi, O., Banihashem, S. K., Taghizadeh Kerman, N., Parvaneh Akhteh Khaneh, & Biemans, H. (2023). The role of peer feedback in improving argumentative essay writing: A systematic review. *Educational Research Review, 38*, 100503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100503

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Heinle & Heinle.

Panadero, E., & Lipnevich, A. A. (2022). A review of peer assessment: Practices, effects, and future directions. *Educational Psychology Review, 34*(2), 789–822.

Pham, A. L. (2021). The effects of indirect feedback on grammatical errors in EFL learner writing. *International Journal of Instruction, 14*(2), 213–230.

Richards, J. C. (2022). *The changing face of language learning: Learning beyond the classroom*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Topping, K. J. (2022). *Peer assessment: Learning by judging and discussing the work of other learners*. Routledge.

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

Wang, Y., & Han, J. (2025). Collaborative writing and peer feedback in secondary EFL education. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 67*, 101145.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Zhao, H., & Zhang, Y. (2024). Effects of peer and teacher feedback on English writing performance among EFL learners. *Language Teaching Research*. Advance online publication.

Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., & Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL students' preferences for written corrective feedback: A mixed-methods study. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, Article 660204. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660204

Zhang, Y., & Hyland, K. (2022). Fostering learner engagement through written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 58*, 100919.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice, 41*(2), 64–70.

CONSEJO EDITORIAL

REVISTA DE INVESTIGACIÓN EN CIENCIAS DE LA EDUCACIÓN, ACTIVIDAD FÍSICA Y SALUD

ISSN: 3073-1410

Asunto: Carta de aceptación

12 de Agosto del 2026

El Consejo Científico de RICEAFS y la Comisión de Publicaciones de Editorial Scientific News

CERTIFICAN:

Que el artículo científico denominado: **"**Influence of collaborative and teacher feedback on the English writing skills of tenth-grade students". Siendo:

Autores: [1]María Daniela Zavala-Dávila y [2]Steven Arturo Torres-Burgos

Ha sido aceptado para Publicación continua en el **Volumen 4 Número 2, 2026 "Problemas contemporáneos en el ámbito de la Ciencias de la Educación, Actividad Física y Salud"**, como parte de la Revista de Investigación en Ciencias de la Educación, Actividad Física y Salud, según consta en los registros oficiales de la Comisión de Publicaciones de RICEAFS.
Es todo cuanto podemos certificar en honor a la verdad, facultando a la interesada hacer uso del presente documento.

Atentamente

PhD. Darley Burgos

UNEMI

UNIVERSIDAD ESTATAL DE MILAGRO

¡Evolución académica!

@UNEMIEcuador