

UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC EN ABITIBI-TÉMISCAMINGUE

RÉTROACTION PAR LES PAIRS PAR L'ENTREMISE DE BLOGUES :
PERCEPTIONS ET PRATIQUES D'ÉTUDIANTS UNIVERSITAIRES AVANCÉS
D'ANGLAIS LANGUE SECONDE

MÉMOIRE
PRÉSENTÉ

À L'UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC EN ABITIBI-TÉMISCAMINGUE
COMME EXIGENCE PARTIELLE
DE LA MAÎTRISE SUR MESURE EN DIDACTIQUE DES LANGUES SECONDES

PAR
MATHIEU LOISELLE

DÉCEMBRE 2023

UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC EN ABITIBI-TÉMISCAMINGUE

BLOG-MEDIATED PEER FEEDBACK: ADVANCED ESL UNIVERSITY STUDENTS'
PERCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES

THESIS
PRESENTED

TO THE UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC EN ABITIBI-TÉMISCAMINGUE,
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
CUSTOMIZED MASTER IN DIDACTIC OF SECOND LANGUAGES

BY
MATHIEU LOISELLE

DECEMBER 2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the individuals who have played a significant role in the completion of this research. First, I am deeply thankful to my family for their unwavering support and encouragement throughout my pursuit of a master's degree.

I extend heartfelt appreciation to the esteemed professors who have been instrumental in shaping my development as a student researcher: Francis Lévesque and Hugo Asselin of the École d'études autochtones at UQAT and Roxane Drainville who have provided invaluable guidance and mentorship, for which I am truly grateful.

I am indebted to Susan Jackson for her meticulous proofreading, ensuring the coherence and clarity of this work. Her attention to detail has been invaluable in refining the quality of this research.

To my research supervisor, Maria-Lourdes Lira-Gonzales, I extend gratitude for her guidance and support throughout this journey. Her input has been indispensable in shaping this study.

Special thanks are due to the students of the BEALS whose participation has been essential to the collection and analysis of data, enriching the depth of this study.

I am also grateful to the Centre de recherche interuniversitaire sur la formation et la profession enseignante (CRIFPE) for their generous financial support, which has been instrumental in enabling the completion of this project.

Finally, I extend my appreciation to the esteemed professors who provided valuable feedback as reviewers: Pooneh Golestani, Eleonora Acerra, Eva Kartchava, and Kuok-Wa "Jimmy" Chao Chao. Your insights have been crucial in refining this research.

To everyone mentioned and to those who supported me behind the scenes, I offer my sincerest thanks. Your contributions have been indispensable, and I am grateful for your support and guidance throughout this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	VI
ABSTRACT	VII
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER I PROBLEM STATEMENT	2
1.1 The Quebec education system.....	4
1.2 Blog-mediated peer feedback in ESL education	6
1.3 General objective.....	7
1.4 Contributions of the project.....	7
1.5 Conclusion and aim of the study	7
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1 Written corrective feedback	9
2.2 Types of WCF	11
2.3 Peer feedback	13
2.4 Blog mediated feedback in ESL.....	14
2.5 Perceptions of ESL students.....	15
2.6 Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019)'s study	16
2.7 Research questions	17
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY	18
3.1 Type of research study	18
3.2 Research setting.....	18
3.3 Participant recruitment procedure	19
3.4 Data collection methods	20
3.4.1 Research instruments and procedures	20
3.4.2 Data analysis	23

3.5 Ethical considerations	26
CHAPTER IV RESULTS	27
4.1 Case of John	27
4.2 Case of Alice	32
4.3 Case of Lucy.....	37
4.4 Case of Sophie.....	41
4.5 Summary of the Results	45
CHAPTER V DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	50
5.1 Connections with Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019).....	50
5.1.1 Medium-specific error patterns	50
5.1.2 Variations in feedback modalities	50
5.1.3 Autonomy and trust in revision processes.....	50
5.2 Interpretation and comparative analysis.....	51
5.3 Limitations and further research	54
5.4 Contributions.....	55
LIST OF REFERENCES	56
APPENDIX A – PEER FEEDBACK CHECKLIST	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Description of error categories used for feedback and analysis	24
Table 2 Types of WCF	25
Table 3 Learners' revision categories	25
Table 4 Coherence chart.....	26
Table 5 John: Frequency and percentage of errors in different essays	28
Table 6 John: Frequency and percentage of feedback in different essays	29
Table 7 John: Frequency and percentage of revision types in different essays	31
Table 8 Alice: Frequency and percentage of errors in different essays	33
Table 9 Alice: Frequency and percentage of feedback in different essays	34
Table 10 Alice: Frequency and percentage of revision types in different essays	35
Table 11 Lucy: Frequency and percentage of errors in different essays.....	38
Table 12 Lucy: Frequency and percentage of feedback in different essays.....	39
Table 13 Lucy: Frequency and percentage of revision types in different essays.....	40
Table 14 Sophie: Frequency and percentage of errors in different essays.....	42
Table 15 Sophie: Frequency and percentage of feedback in different essays.....	43
Table 16 Sophie: Frequency and percentage of revision types in different essays.....	44
Table 17 Frequency and percentage of errors in different essays for all participants.....	46
Table 18 Frequency and percentage of feedback in different essays for all participants.....	47
Table 19 Frequency and percentage of revision types in different essays for all participants.....	48

ABSTRACT

This multi-case study investigates the perceptions and practices of blog-mediated peer feedback in the context of an academic writing class of advanced ESL adult learners. The study aims to examine the linguistic errors commonly made by these learners, explore how they provide feedback to their peers through blogs, analyze their responses to the feedback received, and investigate their perceptions of this feedback approach.

The study was conducted at a francophone Canadian university, in the context of a mandatory academic writing course within the Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) program. The study follows a multiple-case study design combining qualitative and quantitative data collection methods, including analysis of written productions, blog-mediated peer feedback, semi-structured interviews, and a demographic questionnaire. The findings highlight that sentence structure and spelling are the most frequent error types among advanced adult ESL learners. Furthermore, they reveal that the predominant feedback type preferred by these learners is direct error correction with comments, followed by direct error correction without comments. In terms of their revisions learners not only aligned these with their peer comments but also made correct substitutions. As for learners' perceptions, although all the participants showed a positive attitude towards blog-mediated peer feedback, emphasizing its user-friendliness and convenience, some learners expressed concerns about their peer's competence to provide feedback. The results of this study contribute to the understanding of the benefits and challenges of using blog-mediated peer feedback as a pedagogical tool in ESL writing classrooms. Furthermore, it provides valuable insights for instructors of advanced ESL learners in higher education regarding the types of errors their students tend to make when writing in academic contexts as well as how they integrate the feedback provided by their peers.

INTRODUCTION

Previous research in second language (L2) teaching has consistently emphasized the widespread use of corrective feedback as a prominent pedagogical practice with multiple purposes, including training writers to better identify their written errors and enhancing the quality of their writing (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Ellis, 2009a; Ferris, 2012; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Pearson, 2022; Russel & Spada, 2006; Sheen, 2010).

Recently, the integration of technology has introduced new trends in feedback provision, including the use of blog-mediated peer feedback (Dawson et al., 2018). By leveraging the collaborative nature of peer feedback and providing an accessible and non-threatening online platform where students can interact, blog-mediated feedback offers a promising approach to enhance the effectiveness of peer feedback.

The present study is based on one conducted by Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019) which compared the provision and efficacy of blog- versus paper-mediated peer feedback among adult ESL learners in an in a teaching English as a second language (TESL) university program. The present study however expands on Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji by exploring the learners' perceptions and practices of blog-mediated peer feedback.

CHAPTER I

PROBLEM STATEMENT

In recent years, blogs have served as a supplement to second and foreign language instruction. Blogs not only provide learner writers with an authentic language environment in that they can extend to a potentially wider audience, but they also allow for feedback provision and negotiation for both meaning and form (Tudini, 2007). This interaction allows learners to receive and provide corrective feedback on each other's writing without the pressure of participating in face-to-face revision sessions (Lira-Gonzales & Nassaji, 2019).

Corrective feedback (CF) refers to "utterances that indicate to the learner that his or her output is erroneous in some way" (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2017, p. ix). CF can be provided through oral or written comments that encourage learner reflection. Written corrective feedback (WCF) is defined as any form of indication given to students that something is wrong in their writing (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). The pertinence of WCF and whether it contributes to second language acquisition has been the subject of some controversy (Ellis, 2009a). In recent decades, while many scholars believe WCF is useful for SLA there is still lack of consensus on what type of feedback is the most effective (Karim & Nassaji, 2019).

Teacher feedback refers to a teacher providing comments on a student's production (Carless, 2015) while peer feedback refers to the students' revision and comments on each others' work (Yu & Hu, 2017). The literature has detailed that teacher feedback is generally preferred by ESL students over peer feedback as it yields better results than peer feedback in terms of accuracy (Gielen, Tops, et al., 2010). When it comes to peer feedback, Yang et al. (2006, p. 192) reported that "students do not completely depend on the feedback they get from their teacher or peers." They also stated that "the more they doubt the feedback, the more likely it is that they will develop their own independent ideas for revision" (Yang et al., 2006, p. 192). There has also been evidence showing that peer feedback may not reach the same level of accuracy as feedback provided by a teacher, encompassing the precision and correctness of the information and the alignment of feedback with established criteria (Gielen, Tops, et al., 2010). Moreover, while Gielen, Tops, et al. (2010) noted no significant difference in students' progress between both forms of feedback, Bijami et al. (2013) contributed an additional perspective. They emphasized that peer feedback goes beyond mere correction; it plays a pivotal role in shaping learners' confidence, critical thinking skills, autonomy,

and social interactions, contributing to a collaborative approach to language learning. Peer feedback can positively impact learners' confidence by providing them with additional perspectives on their work. Receiving constructive comments from peers fosters a supportive learning environment where students recognize their strengths and areas for improvement. The acknowledgment of their peers can boost self-esteem and motivate learners to actively engage in the learning process. Peer feedback can also encourage learners to critically analyze and evaluate their own work as well as the work of their peers. When students assess and provide feedback to their peers, it requires them to engage in higher-order thinking skills. This process helps in the development of analytical and evaluative abilities, enhancing their capacity for critical thinking. Through constructive criticism and reflection, students can refine their understanding of the subject matter and improve their overall academic skills. The process of giving and receiving peer feedback also empowers learners to take ownership of their learning journey. It cultivates a sense of autonomy as students actively participate in assessing and improving their work independently. By relying on peer input, learners can develop a greater sense of responsibility for their academic progress, contributing to the development of self-directed learners who can identify and address their own learning needs. Finally, peer feedback creates opportunities for meaningful social interactions among learners. Through collaborative assessment and discussion, students engage in a shared learning experience. This social aspect of peer feedback not only enriches the learning environment but also promotes communication skills and teamwork. Building a sense of community in the classroom fosters a supportive atmosphere where students feel comfortable expressing their thoughts and learning from one another. While peer feedback may have certain differences compared to teacher feedback, its unique contribution in these aspects highlights its significance in the language learning process.

When looking at corrective feedback, it is important to focus on a particular ESL instructional context. The context in which the current study is situated is the educational system of Quebec, Canada. The next section outlines this system's organizational framework and the language instruction policies relevant to its various ESL programs.

1.1 The Quebec education system

The Quebec education system includes public and private institutions in both the Francophone and Anglophone sectors. It covers four levels of instruction: (a) Elementary, (b) Secondary, (c) College (CÉGEP), and (d) University. Pre-school education is optional, but the vast majority of children enroll in pre-school programs.

French is mandated as the main language of instruction across preschool, elementary, and secondary levels in most Quebec schools under the Charter of the French Language. However, if specific requirements are met, students are allowed to receive their education in English. This linguistic flexibility extends to college and university levels, where students can choose either English- or French-language institutions.

Elementary education involves six years of schooling divided into three cycles of two years, whereas secondary offers five years of general education divided into two cycles. College constitutes an intermediary level between compulsory elementary and secondary education and university. The general and vocational colleges are known as CÉGEPs, a French acronym for *Collège d'enseignement général et professionnel*. CÉGEPs offer two-year pre-university programs and three-year technical programs leading to a Diploma of College Studies (Gouvernement du Québec. Ministère de l'Éducation, 2005).

The *Programme de formation de l'école Québécoise* (PEQ) includes ESL programs at each level which prioritize communication, integrating listening, speaking, reading, and writing to develop three competencies: C1 (to interact orally in English), C2 (to reinvest understanding of oral and written texts), and C3 (to write texts).

In the elementary ESL program, cycle one targets the oral aspects of the language; students' reading and writing skills are not evaluated. In elementary cycles two and three, students are expected to produce text according to specific criteria, applying language conventions targeted by the task. In cycle three, students make greater and more confident use of compensatory and learning strategies, showing imagination and creativity in their final products. In addition, some public and private schools in Québec offer intensive English programs (IEPs). IEPs are typically offered in elementary

cycle three and consist of approximately 400 hours of language instruction (not content), which can be distributed over one academic year (8 hours/week), one semester (18–20 hours/week), or a series of “mini-intensives” across the 10-month school year (Gouvernement du Québec. Ministère de l'Éducation, 2005).

At the secondary level, two distinct ESL programs coexist: core and enriched. The core program is for students who have completed the regular program, whereas enriched is for students who have completed an intensive English program at the elementary level or have had other enriching experiences in English. Students in both programs continue to develop the three ESL competencies initiated during the elementary program.

The difference between the core and enriched programs is that, in the former, students progress from using models to produce texts to creating their own original texts, while in the latter, students' more extensive language repertoire allows them to focus on their creativity and personal style.

Both levels focus on writing, which is described in the ESL-PFEQ program as a process for expressing oneself in a coherent, organized fashion in order “to communicate with people from all over the world, for example, through e-mail messages and letters to pen pals” (*Programme de formation de l'école québécoise : enseignement secondaire, premier cycle [Éducation Québec]*, 2004, p. 594). This process establishes a connection between writing, thinking, and reading. Writing is seen as a recursive process, in that students may go back and forth between phases (preparing to write, writing, revising, and editing), depending on the topic, purpose, and type of text. In the editing phase, for example, students are requested to focus on technical errors including spelling, capitalization, punctuation, sentence structure, and usage. In terms of CF, core students are encouraged to consult with their peers and teachers and take the feedback they receive into account, whereas enriched students' communicative competence allows them to identify their own errors and offer CF to their peers.

At the CÉGEP level, students must complete two English courses in order to graduate. The goal of the first course, *Formation générale commune*, is to enable students to understand spoken and written English and to express themselves in everyday English-language situations. The second

course, *Formation générale propre*, prepares students for the future (university or the workforce). It also serves to consolidate the content of the first course.

Turning to post-secondary education, French is the first language for most students attending Quebec's public universities with the exception of certain foreign students, Canadians from other provinces, and local residents who are native speakers of English (Office québécois de la langue française, 2017). Most students registered in Quebec public post-secondary institutions are French speakers with 95 % of students being native to the province of Quebec (Office québécois de la langue française, 2017). The level of English learners attending university classes of ESL varies depending on the program and university in which they have been admitted. In the case of the university where the present study was conducted, students are admitted to the TESL program with an intermediate to advance level (TOEFL ITP level 1). A lower level of English proficiency than is typical for TESL programs is permitted because the candidates are mostly from a remote region that is predominantly francophone. Once admitted, TESL students are expected to improve their English language proficiency.

1.2 Blog-mediated peer feedback in ESL education

As we transition to the concluding section of this chapter, it's essential to acknowledge the growing significance of blog-mediated peer feedback in ESL education. Several studies have shown that blog-mediated peer feedback has the potential to enhance learners' writing performance (e.g., Asoodar et al., 2016; Lin, 2015; Novakovich, 2016). However, even though the number of studies on the use of blog-mediated peer feedback in educational contexts is increasing (e.g., Chen et al., 2015; Dippold, 2009; Vurdien, 2013), these investigations are limited to reporting on the provision of peer feedback through blogs or blogs as motivating tools for developing L2 literacy. Further research is needed in relation to not only the provision of peer feedback but also the types of student errors and the relationship between peer feedback and students' revisions (Lira-Gonzales & Nassaji, 2019).

Building upon the groundwork laid by Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019), the current study extends their examination of the provision and effectiveness of peer feedback in blog- versus paper-mediated formats among adult ESL learners within a Teaching English as a Second Language

(TESL) university context by investigating learners' perceptions towards blog-mediated peer feedback.

Learner perceptions are important because they provide a valuable insight into the benefits and drawbacks of blog-mediated peer feedback practices and help shed light on what advanced learners of English require in terms of WCF. Furthermore, learners' perceptions have often been considered as an important catalyst that determines the success of second language learning to a great extent (Sinha & Nassaji, 2022).

1.3 General objective

The present study aims to examine ESL learners' blog mediated peer feedback perceptions and practices in an academic writing classroom at a francophone university in Quebec, Canada.

1.4 Contributions of the project

This study provides valuable insights into the linguistic challenges faced by advanced adult ESL learners in a remote, predominantly francophone context, exposing their common WCF practices and preferences in this unique setting. Additionally, it explores their perceptions of blog-mediated peer feedback, underlining the importance of considering the specific challenges and opportunities that blogs offer to ESL learners. These findings offer practical implications for educators, helping them tailor effective WCF strategies to the unique needs of their students. This, in turn, supports the language development and academic writing proficiency of intermediate-advanced ESL learners. Furthermore, this research project contributes to the field of second language education more specifically in the area of WCF. By proposing a variety of findings and a comprehensive analysis of intermediate-advanced ESL learners' WCF practices and perceptions, it contributes to the growing body of knowledge in second language education.

1.5 Conclusion and aim of the study

In conclusion, this chapter provided an overview of the Quebec ESL program and reported on the current state of corrective feedback in ESL education, focusing on the Quebec context. The exploration highlighted the pivotal role of blogs as a platform for language instruction and emphasized the need for a nuanced understanding of advanced adult ESL learners' engagement with blog-mediated peer feedback in the predominantly francophone setting of Quebec. To address

this problem, the current study aims to delve into learners' perceptions and practices of blog-mediated peer feedback in an academic writing context at a francophone university in Quebec. By addressing this gap, the study aims to offer practical insights that can inform tailored WCF strategies, contributing to the enhancement of language development and academic writing proficiency for advanced adult ESL learners in this unique linguistic context.

CHAPTER I

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I present the theoretical background of the study. I begin with a definition of WCF and then provide a brief history of research on the subject. Additionally, I highlight various forms of feedback, including direct, indirect, focused, and comprehensive, and discuss their effectiveness. I also provide an overview of peer feedback and blog-mediated feedback, exploring their applications in ESL education and summarizing the existing findings. Finally, I introduce the research questions that guide this research study.

2.1 Written corrective feedback

Bitchener and Ferris (2012) refer to WCF as any remarks conveyed to the learner indicating a mistake in their writing. The debate on WCF started in 1996 when John Truscott argued in his highly controversial publication, *Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes*, that research showed WCF to be not only ineffective but also harmful to learners, with no real evidence of its utility (Truscott, 1996). The publication sparked controversy, and the scientific community published papers defending the merits of WCF. One such paper was Ferris' (1999) *The Case for Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes: A response to Truscott (1996)*. This publication reignited the claim that grammar correction can be beneficial to learners, but further research was needed to pinpoint its exact benefits (Ferris, 1999). Researchers have attempted to uncover the benefits of WCF, but their results have been inconclusive due to limitations in study design (Van Beuningen et al., 2012). Recent meta-analysis such as Brown et al. (2023) and Kang and Han (2015) explored factors influencing the effectiveness of WCF. They stressed the importance of diverse sampling, underscoring the need to consider age and proficiency as moderating factors. Additionally, the studies called for methodological consistency, advanced analytical methods, and detailed error analysis with specific categorization and examples. The need for tailoring WCF types to individual learners' developmental readiness was also highlighted.

The Truscott-Ferris debate, akin to the ongoing discourse in the meta-analysis by Brown et al. (2023) and Kang and Han (2015), reflects the ongoing scholarly discussion and research efforts to determine the efficacy of WCF in language learning contexts, with scholars presenting contrasting views on the impact of grammar correction on L2 writing proficiency. The debate has contributed

to a nuanced understanding of the complexities surrounding WCF, prompting continued research and exploration of its role and effectiveness in language instruction.

WCF research traditionally aims to assess WCF's effectiveness in improving writing accuracy for learners and whether it is suitable for integration into language instruction. However, as highlighted by Truscott (2023), challenges, including flaws in research design and analysis, as well as a lack in validity made recent research in WCF questionable. In short, something is wrong with the way WCF is conducted and recent studies are not presenting us with a valid picture of the effects of WCF. Truscott calls for a more focused approach to address these validity concerns, emphasizing precision and rigor in future WCF studies (Truscott, 2023).

As observed by Ferris (1999, p. 9), three major inconsistencies stand out among the problems encountered: (1) a lack of accuracy, selectivity, and systematicity in the provision of feedback; (2) the disregard for individual differences among learners; and (3) issues with study design and execution. More recent studies on WCF also have major flaws. Guénette (2007) revealed inconsistencies in the design of WCF studies (Ashwell, 2000; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Fazio, 2001; Goring-Kepner, 1991; Semke, 1984; Sheppard, 1992; Chandler, 2003; Ferris and Roberts, 2001; Lalande, 1982; Robb et al., 1986), including varying proficiency levels of learners, absence of measurement of progress, lack of differentiation in treatment types, quantity and type of corrected errors, length of the study, and presence or absence of a control group.

This examination of conflicting results and inconsistencies in WCF studies, coupled with issues identified by Ferris (1999) highlighted dissimilarities in population, group comparisons, and study design, revealing challenges in result comparisons. The analysis of treatment types and procedures resonates with Guénette (2007), shedding light on the inherent difficulties in standardizing methodologies. Consequently, this underscores the importance of addressing methodological challenges in WCF research when designing and interpreting results related to written corrective feedback.

As discussed by Manchón (2011) in *Learning-to-Write and Writing-to-Learn in an Additional Language*, writing is considered a crucial skill in language acquisition as it involves the integration of grammar, vocabulary, and discourse organization. Additionally, writing provides learners with

an opportunity to practice and reinforce language structures, fostering a deeper understanding of the language. Similarly, WCF plays an important role in developing L2 writing abilities. Nagode et al. (2014) point out the treatment of specific error categories, the effects of direct and indirect feedback, combined feedback types, and the role of educational and L2 learning backgrounds in the sociocultural effectiveness of written corrective feedback.

2.2 Types of WCF

In this section, I present and analyze the various types of WCF, examining the advantages and disadvantages associated with each feedback type.

Comprehensive and selective feedback are two distinct approaches to WCF. Comprehensive feedback refers to a teacher's practice of correcting all or a wide range of errors in a learner's written work (Ellis et al., 2008). For instance, a teacher might provide comprehensive feedback by addressing issues related to grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure. Van Beuningen et al. (2012) uncovered that a significant advantage of comprehensive feedback is that it does not result in a simplification of writing in regard to the structural complexity and lexical diversity of students' writing. However, the sheer volume of feedback can potentially overwhelm students. Selective feedback, on the other hand, refers to "choosing specific errors or a single error for correction while disregarding others" (Ellis et al., 2008, p. 356). An example of selective feedback could be the case of a teacher correcting only the verb tense errors in a student's essay while overlooking other grammatical aspects. Andersson (2015), who conducted a literature review on this type of feedback, reported that while there is ongoing debate regarding the efficacy of comprehensive versus selective written feedback in English classrooms, evidence suggests that selective feedback, particularly regarding specific grammatical features like definitive articles, may be more effective for learners, with a positive trend observed in focused metalinguistic feedback provision.

Another distinction is between direct and indirect feedback. Lee (2004) defined direct feedback as a form of feedback in which the teacher writes the correct form on the student's paper. An example of direct feedback would be correcting a sentence like "He go to the store" by writing the correct form 'goes' next to the error. Indirect feedback, on the other hand, is provided when the teacher indicates the location of the error on the paper by underlining, highlighting, or circling it without

providing the correct form. For instance, the teacher might underline the phrase "He go" without providing the corrected version. Research suggests that direct feedback primarily benefits grammatical accuracy, whereas indirect feedback is generally more effective for nongrammatical accuracy, which refers to the correctness or precision of language use that extends beyond mere grammar (Dabboub, 2019). Both direct and indirect CF have been found to be effective in improving students' accuracy, but direct feedback has been shown to have a significant long-term effect (Van Beuningen et al., 2008). Recent consensus indicates that direct feedback is more suitable for beginner learners, while indirect feedback is generally preferred for advanced learners (Lira-Gonzales & Nassaji, 2020).

Metalinguistic feedback, which involves providing additional explanations alongside WCF, has been shown to have significant effects on learner performance (Bitchener et al., 2010). Feedback accompanied by metalinguistic comments tends to be more impactful than simple direct correction, as it provides additional explanations to learners. An example of metalinguistic feedback is providing a grammatical explanation alongside the correction, such as explaining why a particular verb tense is used. Metalinguistic feedback can be either direct, involving the provision of the correct answer, or indirect, requiring learners to find the correct answer themselves (Ellis, 2009b). Adding metalinguistic explanations to any form of WCF has been found to be beneficial for reducing learner errors (Bitchener, 2008).

However, factors such as learners' aptitude, proficiency, motivation, and engagement also play a significant role in the reception and effectiveness of WCF (Han, 2019; Li & Li, 2012). For instance, highly motivated learners may be more receptive to feedback and exhibit greater improvement. Conversely, learners with lower proficiency levels might find certain types of feedback overwhelming. Additionally, the engagement of learners in the feedback process, such as their active participation and application of feedback in subsequent tasks, influences the long-term effectiveness of WCF. The interplay of these factors underscores the importance of considering individual learner characteristics in designing and delivering effective written corrective feedback.

2.3 Peer feedback

The use of peer feedback has become increasingly common in ESL education, with its popularity evidenced by its widespread adoption and integration into teaching practices (Chen, 2021; Cui et al., 2021; Hentasmaka & Cahyono, 2021; Wu et al., 2022; Zhan et al., 2022). Peer feedback in second language writing refers to “information provided by peers to inform, influence, or modify their partners’ cognition and/or writing practices, which is intended to aid in enhancing their peers’ performance in writing” (Zhang et al., 2014, p. 671). It is used interchangeably with the terms peer review, peer evaluation, and peer assessments (Gielen, Peeters, et al., 2010). It is also referred to as feedback given by one student to another, such as comments made on each other's work, based on a prior set of criteria (Liu & Carless, 2006).

Researchers have claimed that peer feedback in second writing classes is useful because of its cognitive and social benefits such as: lowering writing apprehension, increasing confidence as well as establishing a social context for writing (Bijami et al., 2013; Lin & Yang, 2011; Van Popta et al., 2017). Peer feedback actively involves learners in the critical analysis of their written productions, integrating feedback into the writing process rather than rendering it as a final verdict on submitted work (Zhang, 1999). While students may prefer teacher feedback over peer feedback in an ESL writing classroom context (Zhang, 1995), peer feedback offers learners the opportunity to participate more actively and be less dependent on the teacher (Hyland, 2000). However, ESL students often have a low level of trust in peer comments as they may not see their peers as reliable sources with the expertise to review their work, and the teacher's guidance is often needed to clarify comments and structure the interactions (Guardado & Shi, 2007). Research findings have shown that peer feedback in the ESL classroom promotes student autonomy, active engagement in their cognitive processes, and critical evaluation of the usefulness of received feedback (Park, 2018; Yang et al., 2006).

Peer feedback is theoretically supported by Vygotsky’s Social Constructivist Approach, which asserts that the construction of knowledge is socially oriented (Nassaji & Tian, 2018). According to this approach, learning is influenced by cultural tools and occurs through interactions with and within the environment in which these interactions take place. Peer CF occurs in the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), a concept used by Vygotsky to refer to “the distance between the

actual developmental level of a learner and the level of potential development under guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky & Cole, 1978).

2.4 Blog mediated feedback in ESL

Weblogs, more commonly known as blogs, are online micro-publishing platforms (Williams & Jacobs, 2004). A blog provides a personal writing space that is easy to use, shareable, and automatically archived. Since blogs allow for discussions between the author and reader, they constitute a platform that enables interactive and intercreative engagement amongst students and between students and teachers (Duffy & Bruns, 2006). As such, blogs have the potential to serve as a platform for providing feedback. Williams and Jacobs (2004) argued that the discursive nature of knowledge construction is conducive to the immediacy and commentary-based system of blogging. They reported that blogs naturally foster reflection and analysis due to the integrated feedback systems; furthermore, blogs facilitate learners’ individual expression, reader commentary, and critique.

Numerous studies have found that the use of blogs in second language classes promotes interaction (Ducate & Lomicka, 2005; Trajtemberg & Yiakoumetti, 2011) and supports L2 learning by enabling students to (a) learn autonomously and collaboratively (Baggetun & Wasson, 2006; Bakar, 2009), to (b) be motivated (Amir et al., 2011), and (c) to develop learner confidence (Bakar, 2009). In addition, the use of blogs allows students to focus more on meaning than on form and “increases student interest, motivation and confidence in writing” (Noytim, 2010, p. 1131) and therefore holds great potential for L2 learning (Warschauer, 2010).

Research has investigated the effectiveness of blogs as a means of administering feedback in the ESL writing classroom. For example, Mabuan (2018) found that students viewed blogging as a beneficial platform for practicing English writing skills, freely expressing thoughts and ideas, and facilitating online peer engagement. Studies on the impact of blog-mediated feedback on language accuracy, such as Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019)’s research, have revealed blog-mediated peer feedback affordances, such as reduced stress, collaborative work with peers, and access to students’ written productions beyond the teacher. However, further research is needed to explore how technology choices influence the nature of the feedback provided (Cunningham, 2019).

Recent studies in TESL (Alsubaie & Madini, 2018; Han, 2023; Lee, 2020; Muhtia & Drajadi, 2017) have emphasized the effectiveness of blog-mediated peer feedback for language learners. For example, Alsubaie and Madini (2018) suggested that providing peer feedback using blogs as a medium enhances students' writing abilities by broadening their vocabulary, enhancing grammatical correctness, and advancing their interlanguage skills. Han (2023) findings demonstrated that blogs used in an EFL context were effective in improving the writing skills and motivation of second language students. Further evidence of the importance of blogs in an educational context is provided by Lee (2020), who highlighted that effectively integrating blogs into the ESL classroom requires well-designed tasks that suit students' linguistic and cognitive levels, as the sole use of blogs does not ensure successful learning outcomes. Additionally, Muhtia and Drajadi (2017) affirmed that EFL learners improve their writing skills through the use of blog-mediated peer feedback practices and that their perceptions towards blogs is generally positive.

2.5 Perceptions of ESL students

There is certainly terminological debate around the terms perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes (Lira-Gonzales, 2012). For certain authors these three interrelated concepts can be grouped as “a set of mental constructs that name, define, and describe the structure and content of mental states thought to drive a person's actions” (Richardson, 1996, p. 102). Others have distinguished perception as the process by which individuals become aware of objects or events (Gage, 1960) or as an intellectual ability of interpreting information (Legendre, 2005). Fishbein and Ajzen (1977) differentiated between attitude, as a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favourable or unfavourable manner with respect to a given object, and beliefs as the information an individual has about that object, which can be favourably or unfavourably evaluated.

In the current study, perceptions of ESL students have towards WCF refer to how learners subjectively view or interpret the feedback they receive (Chen et al., 2016). Previous studies have also shown that students hold different views on the value and quantity of WCF. Amrhein and Nassaji (2010) for example, found that students preferred receiving more error correction, regardless of the error type, while teachers tended to be more selective, prioritizing communication and accuracy. Both teachers and students acknowledged WCF as a valuable learning tool and

agreed on the importance of identifying repeated errors in written work. Additionally, Storch and Wigglesworth (2010) emphasized the significance of aligning WCF with learners' beliefs and preferred styles, indicating that students are more likely to engage with feedback that resonates with their individual learning preferences. It is crucial to recognize the positive impact of such alignment, as students who receive feedback in their preferred manner often exhibit greater success in error correction due to their positive perception of the task, as shown by Storch and Wigglesworth (2010)'s research.

However, while acknowledging the importance of considering learners' perceptions, it is essential to recognize the limitations of relying solely on self-reported perceptions when assessing the quality and impact of feedback (Chen et al., 2016; Karim & Nassaji, 2015; Seker & Dincer, 2014). To ensure a comprehensive understanding of feedback efficacy, it is imperative to incorporate objective measures of writing accuracy and other performance indicators alongside learners' perceptions. This dual approach, encompassing factors such as clarity, specificity, and timeliness, will contribute to a more nuanced evaluation of the effectiveness of WCF in writing instruction. It aims to address potential biases and provide a well-rounded perspective for future investigations into effective feedback practices.

2.6 Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019)'s study

To explore blog-mediated peer feedback and traditional paper-based writing, Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019) conducted a comparative study focusing on the provision and effectiveness of peer feedback, as well as students' revision processes. Their study aimed to address a significant gap in the literature by examining the role of blog-mediated peer feedback in academic writing, an area relatively unexplored in educational contexts. To this end, they examined the types of errors made by English L2 students in each medium, the diverse techniques employed in peer feedback on paper versus blogs, and how students integrate received peer feedback into their revisions in these distinct writing environments.

In their study, Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019) invited twelve participants to produce texts in both paper and blog formats. Each participant contributed two essays in each modality, submitting one draft to receive peer feedback and a finalized version after incorporating the feedback. Participants were granted the freedom to select topics aligned with their interests, with the goal of fostering intrinsic motivation and meaningful engagement with the writing tasks.

The study's results compared the types of errors, the peer feedback provided, and the revision dynamics in paper- and blog-based writing activities among the participants. Statistical analysis revealed significant differences in the types of errors between the two mediums, with word choice errors being more frequent in blogs, and sentence structure errors more common on paper. The researchers reported that errors in grammar, style, and mechanics were also found to be more prevalent in blogs. Moreover, the types of peer feedback varied significantly between mediums, with blogs featuring more content feedback, clarification requests, and direct correction, while paper tended towards indirect correction and lacked peer marking. Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019) also observed that while blog revisions left more errors unaddressed compared to their paper counterpart, peer-induced errors were more frequent on paper. Despite the presence of incomplete or erroneous peer marking, students demonstrated a greater inclination to correct errors on paper than in blogs. Additionally, they found that incorrect changes and no changes were more prevalent on paper than in blogs, highlighting distinct revision behaviors across the two mediums.

2.7 Research questions

This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What linguistic errors do advanced adult ESL students' make in academic writing at a francophone Canadian university?
2. How do advanced adult ESL students provide blog mediated written peer feedback in academic writing at a francophone Canadian university?
3. How do advanced adult ESL students respond to blog mediated written peer feedback in academic writing at a francophone Canadian university?
4. What are the students' perceptions regarding blog mediated written peer feedback?

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I describe the research design of the present study. First, I present the research context, including an overview of the study participants, their involvement, and the recruitment process. Then, I detail the data collection procedures that will be employed throughout the research project. Finally, I address ethical considerations pertaining to the participants and data collection.

3.1 Type of research study

I conducted a mixed method, multi-case study for which I gathered both quantitative and qualitative data. To address the first three research questions, I gathered quantitative data on the types of errors, the type of feedback provided, and the way students responded to the feedback provided. The aim was to analyze prevalent trends in the data to draw statistical conclusions. Whereas, to address the fourth research question, I gathered qualitative data to investigate the perceptions of students and understand their view on blog-mediated peer feedback through the analysis of semi-structured interviews.

A traditional case study examines a single case in-depth, offering detailed insights into a specific phenomenon, while a multiple case study investigates multiple cases to identify commonalities, differences, or patterns across them (Yin, 2018). The latter is used to draw broader generalizations and allows for comparisons and contrasts between cases (Baxter & Jack, 2008). “A multiple case study enables the researcher to explore differences within and between cases to replicate findings across cases” (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 548). I opted for a multiple case study as the research method for this project due to the complexity of the properties under investigation and my emphasis on exploring participants' perceptions, favoring a small sample size. However, to analyze common errors among learners effectively, multiple participants were necessary, thus aligning with the choice of a multiple case study design.

3.2 Research setting

The study was conducted in an English writing course in a public university context in a remote predominantly francophone region in Quebec. The writing course was part of the TESL program of this university. Students registered in the TESL program come from local schoolboards. As I mentioned in Chapter 1, the participants in this study were admitted to the TESL program with an

intermediate to advanced level (TOEFL ITP level 1), and, as per program requirements, are expected to improve their English language proficiency.

The ordinary academic year consists of a fall term and a winter term, each lasting 16 weeks. There is a third, optional summer term available to students which usually lasts for a period of eight weeks. Within the TESL program, students must follow a mandatory 3-credit academic writing course: Written Communication and Revision of Texts.

The course aims to teach students how to write in a clear and cohesive manner, to help them understand and master the challenges of English writing and to use appropriate structures when writing essays. It also aims to teach students how to write different types of texts and improve their ability to correct common errors in written productions while expanding and enriching their vocabulary. The course consists of 45 hours of class time distributed over a period of 15 weeks. The class meetings are held once a week, for a total duration of three hours per week. The content covered by this course includes the structure of simple and complex sentence types, analysis and writing of a variety of text genres using the appropriate structure, tone, and style, and editing and revising articles with the provision of feedback on errors. A total of four students participated in the Written Communication and Revision of Texts course as part of this research study. The course was held in person, in a classroom setting and the peer feedback was provided online, on the blog platform.

The chosen blog platform for soliciting feedback was Moodle forum, given that the university already utilizes the Moodle environment, and students are well-acquainted with its functionalities. Consequently, no additional training was considered necessary for students to navigate and utilize the platform effectively. In the event of any potential challenges with the platform, students could readily seek assistance from the university's IT technical support.

3.3 Participant recruitment procedure

The inclusion criteria for participant recruitment focused on advanced learners of English who were enrolled in the TESL program of the university. Specifically, participants were required to be registered in the Written Communication and Revision of Texts course. This targeted approach ensured that participants possessed a high level of English proficiency and were actively engaged

in a course relevant to the study's objectives. The proficiency of the participants was established according to their enrolment in the Written Communication and Revision of Texts course which, by design, requires an advanced proficiency of English. Participants were also required to pass the TOEFL ITP test as part of their TESL program to assess their English proficiency, ensuring that their profile met the inclusion criteria for the current study.

Upon receiving the ethics certificate from the CER-UQAT, I contacted the professor in charge of teaching this course, who also acted as supervisor for this research study, to coordinate the data collection schedule.

At the end of the semester, when the course was over and the final grades were provided to the students, I contacted the students to invite them to participate in my research project. Their participation included answering the questions of a semi structured interview and allowing me to use their written work as data for my research project.

3.4 Data collection methods

3.4.1 Research instruments and procedures

Essay writing and blog mediated peer feedback

Part of the data for this project corresponds to the work students did in their Written Communication and Revision of Texts class, in which they wrote a set of different types of essays. During the semester, the teacher explained the structure of various essays by using templates and examples from *The Little, Brown Handbook* by Fowler et al. (2007) and provided students with a checklist (see Appendix A) of the different ways they could administer peer feedback. No practice on how to apply these feedback techniques was provided prior to having their feedback analyzed. Students were free to choose a topic of their own for each essay, as long as the essay format was respected.

After learning the structure of an essay, students composed a five-paragraph essay of around 300-350 words and uploaded it to the teacher-created Moodle forum for the class. The students produced a total of eight different essays over the course of the trimester at the frequency of one essay per meeting, of which seven were retrieved for analysis. For consistency, only the first 300

words of each essay were taken into consideration in the analysis of the data. After each writing session, students had to read one of their peer's essays and provide WCF in the form of blog entries on the forum. The peer feedback remained available to the students from the moment it was administered and uploaded to the blog platform, and they had until the next meeting to revise and submit a final version of their essay. Students were free to make any correction they deemed necessary with the comments they received. This provided part of the data for the third research question regarding how students responded to the peer feedback provided. Uncorrected items were categorized as "no revision" during the assessment.

Students provided both feedback on content using a rubric provided by the teacher and on forms (i.e., linguistic errors). They were told to correct all the linguistic errors they could find (i.e., comprehensive feedback), but they were given the liberty to decide what kind of feedback they wanted to provide (i.e., direct, indirect, or metalinguistic). The reasoning behind this practice was to assess how students responded to the peer feedback without external interference from the teacher, thus answering the third research question. If students had received specific instructions on correcting errors and responding to feedback, there would have been no way to assess how they would naturally respond to the feedback as their corrections would have been tainted by the teacher's guidelines. For the purpose of this study, only feedback on linguistic errors was analysed. Students were then able to see and respond to the feedback provided by their peers on their written production and they had to revise their text accordingly before submitting it for assessment by the teacher. The activity, including the provision of blog-mediated feedback was graded as part of the course.

As part of the course structure, the provision of teacher feedback was delayed until after students had submitted the final version of their essays. Students first engaged in peer feedback, applied corrections to their texts based on peer suggestions, and then submitted their finalized essays for assessment. The rationale behind this approach was to encourage active participation in the peer feedback process, fostering collaboration and independent problem-solving skills. Delaying teacher feedback until after the completion of the peer feedback cycle ensured that students had the opportunity to integrate peer suggestions without being influenced by insights from the instructor.

Semi structured interview

Research question four was addressed by means of a semi-structured interview at the end of the semester. Students were invited to participate in one-on-one interviews to examine their overall perceptions, of the writing and peer feedback experience. All four students enrolled in the Written Communication and Revision of Texts course accepted to participate in the interviews. The interviews were conducted in English, online through the Zoom platform. Recordings of the interviews were subsequently transcribed into individual verbatims that were later subjected to a content analysis. The average duration of the interviews was 20 minutes. Additionally, no stimuli were used during the interviews. The following questions were adapted from Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019) for the semi-structured interview:

1. Tell me about your learning experiences of writing two drafts of this English essay.
2. Your peers provided feedback on your errors in this draft. In general, what do you think of your peers' feedback on these errors?
3. Your peers could have provided feedback on linguistic errors in many ways, such as underlining, providing the right answer, giving clues or codes, and commenting in the margin. What type of feedback do you prefer and why?
4. To what extent did you understand your peers' feedback on these errors?
5. Would you have liked your peers to change the way they gave feedback on errors to you? If so, how?

Demographic questionnaire

A demographic questionnaire in English was distributed by email at the beginning of the data collection process to gather general information on the participants, such their age, gender, native language, other languages spoken and their level of proficiency in those languages. The questionnaire aimed to construct a linguistic profile for participants, facilitating subsequent comparisons to explore potential influences of factors such as their primary language (L1) or other

spoken languages on the study results. Participants filled out the questionnaire and returned it to the researcher by email.

3.4.2 Data analysis

In accordance with the research design employed by Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019) in their mixed method study, a quantitative analysis was conducted by the researcher to examine the written productions of the participants. First, quantitative data were used to analyze the linguistic errors that participants made in order to answer the first research question. In assessing the students' writing, only the initial 300 words of each essay were considered. This selective approach ensured a standardized basis for assessment while focusing on the essential elements within the predetermined word limit.

The students' first drafts of their argumentative essays were analyzed using content-based analysis modelled on categories developed by Gu nette and Lyster (2013) for the analysis of errors (see Table 1).

Next, a content analysis was carried out on the students' first drafts of their written productions to answer the second research question regarding how they provided blog-mediated written peer feedback.

The categories of Gu nette (2009) were used for the analysis of the feedback provided (see Table 2).

Then, a content-based analysis was conducted on the students' revised versions of their first drafts to answer the third question regarding how students responded to the blog-mediated written peer feedback.

The revision type categories of Ferris (2006) were used for the analysis of errors (see Table 3).

Finally, to answer the fourth and final research question on students' perceptions regarding blog-mediated peer feedback, transcripts from the semi-structured interviews with the students were coded and subjected to a content-based analysis. Emerging categories were chosen based on the insight they could provide into these perceptions.

Table 1.

Description of error categories used for feedback and analysis; adapted from Gu enette & Lyster (2013)

Error category	Description
Determiner	Missing determiner Wrong determiner
Word choice	Wrong word choice (e.g., raining cats and rats [dogs])
Word form	Wrong word form (e.g., exciting vs. excited)
Word missing	Absence of a word from the place where it was expected to be found
Prepositions	Wrong preposition Missing preposition Extra preposition
Sentence structure	Grammatical arrangement of words. Includes agreement (subject-verb, noun-pronoun, noun- adjective, determiner-noun and article-noun) and question formation.
Verbs	Problems with verb forms Problems with verb tenses
Punctuation	Incorrect use of punctuation marks
Capitalization	Incorrect use of capital letters
L1 Use	Use of a French (L1) word. Literal translation of a French structure or expression, resulting in a calque.
Spelling	Incorrect spelling

Table 2*Types of WCF; adapted from Guénette (2009)*

Type of CF	Description
Direct error with no comments	The correct form is provided with no comments by the peer
Direct error correction with comments	The correct form is provided with comments by the peer
Clarification requests	The peer asks a question to understand what the student means
Indirect error identification	The error is underlined, highlighted, or coloured differently without providing the correct form
Indirect error identification with codes	The peer uses codes without providing the correct form
Indirect error identification with comments	The comment is provided next to the error, in a commentary bubble or outside of the text without providing the correct form

Table 3*Learners' revision categories; adapted from Ferris (2006)*

Revision operation	Description
Error corrected	Error corrected as intended by the peer
Incorrect revision	Error revised incorrectly
Deleted text	Marked text deleted to address the error
Substitution, correct	Marked text substituted by a correction not suggested by peer feedback
Substitution, incorrect	Student incorrectly made a change not suggested by the peer's feedback
Peer-induced error	Incomplete or misleading peer feedback caused the student error
Averted erroneous peer marking	Student corrected the error despite incomplete or erroneous peer feedback
No revision	No revision was made by the student

Table 4*Coherence chart*

Research question	Instrument	Analysis
What linguistic errors do advanced adult ESL students' make in academic writing at a francophone Canadian university?	Students' draft	Type of errors categories adapted from Gu�nette and Lyster (2013)
How do advanced adult ESL students provide blog mediated written peer feedback in academic writing at a francophone Canadian university?	Students' draft	Categories of WCF adapted from Gu�nette and Lyster (2013)
How do advanced adult ESL students respond to blog mediated written peer feedback in academic writing at a francophone Canadian university?	Students' revised draft	Categories of revision adapted from Ferris (2006)
What are the students' perceptions regarding blog mediated written peer feedback?	Semi structured interviews	Content analysis based on Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019)

3.5 Ethical considerations

All information obtained through this research remained confidential. No personal data from the participants were stored on an individual computer, and all electronic records were kept and accessible only on the secure server of the institution where the research took place. Student names and personal information were not used in any publication or communication. Only the researcher had access to the data from the texts and interviews produced as part of this research project.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, I present the results of the current study, providing insights into various aspects of the research. First, I present the data on the types of linguistic errors made by the participants in their academic writing. Then, I reveal the data on the type of peer feedback provided by advanced adult ESL learners in a blog-mediated academic writing context, as well as the revisions they make to their writing. Finally, I provide insights into the perceptions of advanced adult ESL learners regarding blog-mediated peer feedback practice. To provide a comprehensive representation of the findings, I start by offering a summary of the data for each individual case, which serves to contrast and enrich the general results of the present study. Then, I provide a summary of the data concerning the four research questions, offering a clear overview of the results. It is important to highlight that the four cases presented in this section collectively embody the entirety of participants involved in this research study. All names have been changed for the purpose of anonymity.

4.1 Case of John

John is a 27-year-old male registered in the TESL program and an advanced learner of English from Quebec, Canada. His L1 is French.

When examining John's written work, three predominant error types emerge, with sentence structure comprising the most frequent occurrence (36.4%), followed by errors in word choice (15.2%) and punctuation (15.2%). The following table illustrates the frequency and percentage of errors found across various essay patterns written by John.

Regrettably, no data is available for the compare-contrast essay category because John failed to upload the assigned writing task. Consequently, no essays for this specific essay type are displayed.

Table 5*John: Frequency and percentage of errors in different essays*

Categories of errors	Types of essays							Total
	Argumentative	Cause-Effect	Compare-Contrast	Definition	Description	Narration	Research Paper	
Sentence structure	7	0	-	3	0	2	0	12
	46.7	0.0	-	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	36.4
Verbs	1	0	-	0	0	0	0	1
	6.7	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
L1 Use	2	0	-	0	0	0	0	2
	13.3	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1
Determiners	0	0	-	0	0	1	1	2
	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	6.1
Prepositions	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Word choice	1	0	-	0	2	2	0	5
	6.7	0.0	-	0.0	100.0	25.0	0.0	15.2
Word form	0	1	-	0	0	0	0	1
	0.0	100.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
Word missing	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	1
	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	3.0
Capitalization	1	0	-	0	0	1	0	2
	6.7	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	6.1
Punctuation	2	0	-	0	0	1	2	5
	13.3	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	15.2
Spelling	1	0	-	0	0	1	0	2
	6.7	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	6.1
Total	15	1	-	3	2	8	4	33
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Regarding the peer feedback received, John's essays were exclusively corrected through direct error correction with comments (100.0%). A detailed overview of the frequency and percentage of feedback received in John's essays can be found in Table 6.

Table 6*John: Frequency and percentage of feedback in different essays*

Feedback type category	Types of essays							
	Argumen- tative	Cause- Effect	Compare- Contrast	Definition	Description	Narration	Research Paper	Total
Direct error correction w/ comments	3	0	-	0	0	0	0	3
	100.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Direct error correction w/o comments	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clarification requests	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indirect error identification	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indirect error identification w/ comments	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indirect error identification w/ error codes	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	3	0	-	0	0	0	0	3
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The following peer feedback was provided to John in his essays:

- In one instance, a peer noted, "In your first body paragraph (last sentence), you wrote 'the lives of the person.' I feel like it should have been 'the life of the person' or the other way around (person being plural)".
- Another instance of feedback pointed out, "[...] in your conclusion, you wrote 'I hope the government would finally act...' I would change the 'would' to 'will' as you are wishing something for the future".
- Additionally, a peer advised, "It should be 'They also are not doing it' instead of 'They are also not doing it'".

In terms of how John integrated the received peer feedback while revising his texts in different types of essays, as seen in Table 7, the two most frequent types of revision he employed were correct substitution of the error (54.5%) and correction of the error as intended by the peer (15.2%). Again, the absence of data for the compare-contrast essay category for this table was due to the work not having been submitted by the student.

Table 7*John: Frequency and percentage of revision types in different essays*

Revision types	Types of essays							
	Argumentative	Cause- Effect	Compare- Contrast	Definition	Description	Narration	Research Paper	Total
Averted erroneous peer marking	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Error corrected	4	0	-	1	0	0	0	5
	26.7	0.0	-	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.2
Substitution, correct	9	1	-	2	0	4	2	18
	60.0	100.0	-	66.7	0.0	50.0	50.0	54.5
Deleted text	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Incorrect change	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No revision	1	0	-	0	2	4	2	9
	6.7	0.0	-	0.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	27.3
Peer-induced error	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Substitution, incorrect	1	0	-	0	0	0	0	1
	6.7	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
Total	15	1	-	3	2	8	4	33
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

In the interview, John reported that a lot of the time, when dealing with peer feedback, the feedback received is not always valuable depending on the person providing the feedback. John stated, "Sometimes when you receive feedback from weaker students, there is not much you can do with it. So, in most of the texts I wrote, the feedback was like, 'Yeah, everything's fine. I would maybe change one or two things.' And often times, I would disagree with that." Nevertheless, he also reported that in general, "most students received pertinent feedback that could help them understand better how to write texts." He also expressed a concern about receiving corrections from the teacher only after obtaining the graded copy of his assignment. In terms of giving feedback, he found it challenging to comment on sentence structure as it is sometimes difficult to describe the error or back it up with a grammar rule. For the social aspect of peer feedback, John stated that although written productions can be quite personal in content, being already acquainted and on

good terms with the peers providing the feedback helped. Sometimes, he felt this social aspect could also be a limitation. John said, "Sometimes it's easier to tell them [that they made an error] because you know them and you know how they will respond, but also sometimes you don't want to hurt them."

Regarding the type of corrective feedback he preferred, John seemed satisfied with a direct error correction with comments. He stated, "If it's between peers, I just like to know exactly what the other person thinks, so what was the error and what they would say instead." However, it is essential to note that, despite instructions for students to focus on linguistic issues, there were instances where students provided feedback that primarily addressed structural aspects of their peers' texts rather than specific grammatical errors. Many students, even with clear instructions to concentrate on linguistic issues, often offered comments on the overall structure and presentation of ideas rather than pinpointing specific grammatical errors.

As for the blog platform, John pointed out that it encouraged more feedback on form rather than on errors. "I'm not going to lie. I didn't receive like that many feedback for errors [...] I'm not even sure I got like any for word spelling or like grammar stuff like that, so everything was more about like ideas." He reported that a big advantage of blog-mediated peer feedback is to have another outlook on your text from another person's perspective. "Sometimes you get so focused on your text, you just tunnel vision on it. You don't even see some mistakes you can make. [...] You just don't see them, and the other person will see them like immediately." He also mentioned the accessibility of the blog platform as an important advantage. As for the disadvantages, he mentioned the fact that providing feedback on a digital platform can often be passive, and when behind a screen, it prevents the opportunity to trigger a discussion.

4.2 Case of Alice

Alice is a 20-year-old female who turned 21 during the data collection process. She is an advanced learner of English from Quebec, Canada who is also registered in the TESL program. While French serves as her L1, Alice claims to have acquired English concurrently from a young age.

Upon analyzing Alice's written work, three primary error types emerge, with sentence structure constituting the most prevalent (22.7%), followed by punctuation (20.5%) and spelling (18.2%).

The analysis of peer feedback received by Alice revealed that the majority of her essays (60.0%) were subjected to direct error correction accompanied by comments. In addition, she also received requests for clarification (20.0%) and encountered an indirect form of error identification with accompanying comments from her peers (20.0%). A detailed overview of the frequency and percentage of feedback received in Alice's various essays can be found in Table 9.

Table 9

Alice: Frequency and percentage of feedback in different essays

Feedback type category	Types of essays							
	Argumen- tative	Cause- Effect	Compare- Contrast	Defini- tion	Descrip- tion	Narration	Research Paper	Total
Direct error correction w/ comments	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	3
	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	60.0
Direct error correction w/o comments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clarification requests	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
Indirect error identification	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indirect error identification w/ comments	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
Indirect error identification w/ error codes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	5
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Some examples of the peer feedback received in different essays by Alice are as follows:

- One peer stated, "I think that nowadays need an 's' = nowadays". The peer provided a correction accompanied by comments.

Finally, in the interview, Alice revealed that employing blogs as a platform for administering peer feedback proved remarkably convenient. She emphasized the ease of accessibility and the potential for organizing essays, which surpassed other conventional means and technologies like emails. According to her, blogs facilitated better connections with peers. Alice expressed her preference for receiving feedback directly, stating, "I like to know exactly what's wrong, so I have a preference for direct correction accompanied by metalinguistic comments from my peers rather than an indirect method like codes." She further explained her dissatisfaction with codes, saying, "I find it quite challenging to understand them sometimes because every teacher has a different code system, resulting in significant variations. Thus, I truly appreciate it when people immediately tell me what's wrong so that I can fix it." Alice also shared that initially, the feedback she received from peers could be vague and unclear. However, with repeated iterations, the clarity of the feedback improved. Learning to "teach" one another through feedback provision was a fun and positive experience for her. Alice highlighted issues with the grid format for essay correction and feedback, suggesting that having feedback directly in the text or providing indicators for locating the corrections would be more valuable. Concerning students who fill the comments section of the grid with corrective feedback, she advised, "I would tell them to go part by part, so the person knows which section of their text needs correction and changes, rather than providing general comments in the comments section." Alice noted the advantages of blog-mediated peer feedback, particularly gaining a fresh perspective on her writing. She stated, "I find it very constructive because we can develop ourselves based on the comments we receive. Sometimes, an outsider has a better view of a situation that we might not have." Alice appreciated the convenience of working on essays from home and the motivational aspect and teamwork fostered by the blog platform. She acknowledged that using the blog as a feedback medium required some adjustments but ultimately became a fun and user-friendly platform to utilize. She also recognized the advantages for teachers, such as convenient access to students' essays and the ability to provide tailored, confidential grading directly through the platform, further cementing her willingness to use it in the future. Finally, Alice had no negative remarks regarding this method of feedback provision, stating, "I don't think I have anything negative to say. It was easy to use, and it was a great way to receive and give feedback [...]."

4.3 Case of Lucy

Lucy, a 20-year-old female, is currently enrolled in the TESL program with the aim of becoming an English teacher. From Quebec, Canada, her first language is French, and she has an advanced proficiency in English as a second language. In Lucy's written work, the two error types that occurred most frequently were spelling representing the predominant category (41.2%), followed by sentence structure (19.6%). For a comprehensive breakdown of the frequency and percentage of errors across various essay patterns written by Lucy, please refer to Table 11. Unfortunately, no data is available for the definition essay type. This absence can be attributed to the unavailability of Lucy's work on the blog platform, because she either failed to complete the assigned writing task or did not upload it. Consequently, there is no data to display for this specific essay type.

Table 11*Lucy: Frequency and percentage of errors in different essays*

Categories of errors	Types of essays							Total
	Argumentative	Cause-Effect	Compare-Contrast	Definition	Description	Narration	Research Paper	
Sentence structure	2	1	2	-	2	2	1	10
	16.7	100.0	22.2	-	33.3	10.5	25.0	19.6
Verbs	1	0	0	-	0	1	0	2
	8.3	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	5.3	0.0	3.9
L1 Use	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Determiners	0	0	1	-	2	0	0	3
	0.0	0.0	11.1	-	33.3	0.0	0.0	5.9
Prepositions	0	0	0	-	1	0	0	1
	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	16.7	0.0	0.0	2.0
Word choice	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Word form	0	0	0	-	1	0	0	1
	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	16.7	0.0	0.0	2.0
Word missing	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Capitalization	4	0	0	-	0	2	0	6
	33.3	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	10.5	0.0	11.8
Punctuation	3	0	1	-	0	2	1	7
	25.0	0.0	11.1	-	0.0	10.5	25.0	13.7
Spelling	2	0	5	-	0	12	2	21
	16.7	0.0	55.6	-	0.0	63.2	50.0	41.2
Total	12	1	9	-	6	19	4	51
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Lucy's essays primarily received direct error correction with comments (66.7%), although she also received instances of direct error correction without comments (16.7%) and an indirect form of error identification (16.7%). Refer to Table 12 for a comprehensive breakdown of the frequency and percentage of feedback received across Lucy's different essays.

Excerpts of the peer feedback received in different essays by Lucy are provided below:

- One peer noted, "United States does not need a hyphen". The peer offered a correction along with their comments.

- Regarding a specific phrase, a peer advised, "The United States should be followed by 'is' not 'are' as it is viewed as a single entity". They provided a correction accompanied by their comments.
- In another instance, a peer indirectly identified an error by simply stating, "New ways", without further comments.
- A direct correction was made by a peer, who stated, "8 = eight", without providing additional comments.

In terms of how Lucy integrated the received peer feedback while revising her texts in different types of essays, as seen in Table 13, the two most frequent types of revision Lucy employed were correct substitution of the error (41.2%) and complete removal of the erroneous structure (11.8%). Similarly, the absence of data for the definition essay category for this table is justified by the student's work being irretrievable from the blog platform.

Table 12

Lucy: Frequency and percentage of feedback in different essays

Feedback type category	Types of essays							Total
	Argumen- tative	Cause- Effect	Compare- Contrast	Definition	Description	Narration	Research Paper	
Direct error correction w/ comments	0	1	3	-	0	0	0	4
	0.0	100.0	100.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7
Direct error correction w/o comments	0	0	0	-	1	0	0	1
	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	50.0	0.0	0.0	16.7
Clarification requests	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indirect error identification	0	0	0	-	1	0	0	1
	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	50.0	0.0	0.0	16.7
Indirect error identification w/ comments	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indirect error identification w/ error codes	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	0	1	3	-	2	0	0	6
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 13*Lucy: Frequency and percentage of revision types in different essays*

Revision types	Types of essays							Total
	Argumentative	Cause- Effect	Compare- Contrast	Definition	Description	Narration	Research Paper	
Averted erroneous peer marking	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Error corrected	0	1	2	-	2	0	0	5
	0.0	100.0	22.2	-	33.3	0.0	0.0	9.8
Substitution, correct	8	0	0	-	0	9	4	21
	66.7	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	47.4	100.0	41.2
Deleted text	0	0	1	-	0	5	0	6
	0.0	0.0	11.1	-	0.0	26.3	0.0	11.8
Incorrect change	0	0	2	-	0	0	0	2
	0.0	0.0	22.2	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9
No revision	4	0	3	-	4	5	0	16
	33.3	0.0	33.3	-	66.7	26.3	0.0	31.4
Peer-induced error	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Substitution, incorrect	0	0	1	-	0	0	0	1
	0.0	0.0	11.1	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Total	12	1	9	-	6	19	4	51
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Finally, during the interview, Lucy disclosed her initial difficulty with providing feedback to her peers using the blog platform due to a lack of confidence in her writing ability. She expressed, "It's hard for me to correct my peers because I don't consider myself better than anyone. Giving feedback to someone whom I perceive as better than me is challenging." Nonetheless, she acknowledged the benefits of receiving feedback from peers at a similar level rather than solely relying on the teacher. Lucy highlighted the dynamic aspect of providing feedback on a blog platform, emphasizing the efficiency and speed it offers. She indicated a preference for receiving more indirect feedback, such as underlining and clues, rather than direct error correction accompanied by metalinguistic comments. Reflecting on the disadvantages, she recognized potential challenges for students who struggle with technology, making this feedback method problematic. Lucy also acknowledged the social aspect of blog-mediated peer feedback, sharing,

"Maybe in a larger class, providing blog-mediated peer feedback would be more complicated because I wouldn't appreciate feedback from someone I don't know." She even expressed reservations about having peers who are not friends or close acquaintances read her text, saying, "I'd be like, 'I don't want him or her to read that,' but they had to read it anyway." Regarding her preferred way of receiving feedback, Lucy stated, "To me, I think it would be to underline [the error] and maybe give a clue [...] because the code, to me, was complicated." She also noted the benefits of not immediately providing the answer to students, allowing them to contemplate their errors and develop metacognition. Whenever Lucy received comments, she found them to be clear and easily understandable. She expressed no desire to change anything about the feedback method but emphasized that using a blog platform requires a transitional period for students to become familiar with its usage before it becomes accessible to everyone.

4.4 Case of Sophie

Sophie, a 21-year-old woman, is an advanced English learner from Quebec, Canada, with French as her native language (L1). She, like the other participants, is currently enrolled in the TESL program to become an English as a second language teacher.

The most common type of error in Sophie's writing appeared to be sentence structure, accounting for a significant majority (60.3%). Additionally, she made errors in other categories to a lesser extent, including punctuation (9.5%), spelling (7.9%), and capitalization (6.3%). The following table presents the frequency and percentage of errors observed in Sophie's essays across different patterns.

Unfortunately, no data is available for the research paper essay category. This absence is due to the unavailability of Sophie's work on the blog platform, resulting from her failure either to post the written production or to complete the assigned task. As a result, there is no data to display for this specific essay type.

Table 14*Sophie: Frequency and percentage of errors in different essays*

Categories of errors	Types of essays							Total
	Argumentative	Cause-Effect	Compare-Contrast	Definition	Description	Narration	Research Paper	
Sentence structure	12	3	12	3	3	5	-	38
	63.2	75.0	80.0	37.5	42.9	50.0	-	60.3
Verbs	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
L1 Use	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Determiners	2	1	0	0	0	0	-	3
	10.5	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	4.8
Prepositions	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	1
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	-	1.6
Word choice	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Word form	1	0	0	2	0	0	-	3
	5.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	-	4.8
Word missing	1	0	0	0	0	2	-	3
	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	-	4.8
Capitalization	0	0	2	1	0	1	-	4
	0.0	0.0	13.3	12.5	0.0	10.0	-	6.3
Punctuation	0	0	1	1	3	1	-	6
	0.0	0.0	6.7	12.5	42.9	10.0	-	9.5
Spelling	3	0	0	1	0	1	-	5
	15.8	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	10.0	-	7.9
Total	19	4	15	8	7	10	-	63
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0

Sophie's essays predominantly received direct error correction without comments (50.0%). However, she also received a significant amount of direct error correction accompanied by comments (37.5%). For a comprehensive analysis of the frequency and percentage of feedback received in Sophie's diverse essays, consult Table 15.

Table 15*Sophie: Frequency and percentage of feedback in different essays*

Feedback type category	Types of essays							Total
	Argumen- tative	Cause- Effect	Compare- Contrast	Defini- tion	Descrip- tion	Narra- tion	Research Paper	
Direct error correction w/ comments	3	2	1	0	0	0	-	6
	27.3	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	37.5
Direct error correction w/o comments	8	0	0	0	0	0	-	8
	72.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	50.0
Clarification requests	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Indirect error identification	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	1
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	-	6.3
Indirect error identification w/ comments	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	1
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	-	6.3
Indirect error identification w/ error codes	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Total	11	2	1	0	1	1	-	16
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0

Excerpts of the peer feedback received in different essays by Sophie are presented below:

- One peer pointed out, "'Eventhough' should be written as two separate words". The peer provided a correction accompanied by their comments.
- Similarly, a peer highlighted, "'Some think' no 'S'", offering a correction without additional comments.
- Another peer's comment emphasized, "'Students' education' don't forget the apostrophe", proposing a correction along with their comments.
- In a different instance, a peer provided the correct form without additional comments, stating, "This mandate reduces".

Regarding how Sophie integrated the peer feedback she received in her revisions of the different types of essays, as seen in Table 16, the two most frequent types of revision she employed were

correction of the error as intended by the peer (27.0%) and substitution of the erroneous structure with a correct form (20.6%).

As for the previous case, the absence of data for the research paper essay category for this table due to the student's work being irretrievable from the blog platform.

Table 16

Sophie: Frequency and percentage of revision types in different essays

Revision types	Types of essays							Total
	Argumentative	Cause- Effect	Compare- Contrast	Definition	Description	Narration	Research Paper	
Averted erroneous peer marking	2	0	0	0	0	0	-	2
	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	3.2
Error corrected	8	2	1	0	3	3	-	17
	42.1	50.0	6.7	0.0	42.9	30.0	-	27.0
Substitution, correct	5	0	0	6	0	2	-	13
	26.3	0.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	20.0	-	20.6
Deleted text	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	1
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	-	1.6
Incorrect change	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
No revision	2	2	14	2	4	3	-	27
	10.5	50.0	93.3	25.0	57.1	30.0	-	42.9
Peer-induced error	1	0	0	0	0	0	-	1
	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	1.6
Substitution, incorrect	1	0	0	0	0	1	-	2
	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	-	3.2
Total	19	4	15	8	7	10	-	63
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0

Finally, in the interview, Sophie conveyed that obtaining a peer's opinion on her essays can be beneficial for written productions. Reflecting on her experience with peer feedback, she expressed, "What helped me the most with corrective feedback was seeing it from another perspective." Sophie commended her peers for their efforts in providing comprehensive comments on her essays, noting that the comments became more thorough as the semester progressed. Regarding her feedback preferences, she expressed a dislike for codes, finding them often unclear. Describing code structures, she elaborated, "I feel like they're too broad, and you don't really know what they mean. So, I usually prefer straightforward comments or advice." One advantage of peer feedback that Sophie emphasized was that it offers an alternative perspective from individuals at a similar level. Regarding disadvantages, she pointed out the potential bias in the quality of correction based on whether the peer providing feedback is a friend or a stranger. Sophie shared, "Whether the person correcting is your friend or not, there might be some bias in the quality of the feedback provided." When discussing blog platforms, Sophie appreciated the accessibility and security they provided. She stated, "What I really liked about using blogs as a feedback platform is that your work is always accessible, unlike paper feedback that can easily get lost." However, she acknowledged that blog publications could become cluttered and challenging to follow. Elaborating on this, she explained, "It was difficult to keep track because it often turned into a discussion. It sometimes felt like a mess to follow." Sophie noted that the blog used in the course was organized into sections for each essay type, which provided some semblance of order. However, due to multiple versions written and published by each student, it was still easy to lose track within the post feed.

4.5 Summary of the Results

In summary, the first research question aimed to investigate what linguistic errors advanced adult ESL students' make in their academic writing at a francophone Canadian university.

Table 17 shows the frequency and percentage of errors in each essay for all the participants. The two most frequent error types are sentence structure (36.6%) and spelling (18.8%).

Table 17*Frequency and percentage of errors in different essays for all participants*

Categories of errors	Types of essays							Total
	Argumentative	Cause-Effect	Compare-Contrast	Definition	Description	Narration	Research Paper	
Sentence structure	23	6	16	7	5	10	3	70
	45.1	54.5	55.2	43.8	25.0	21.7	16.7	36.6
Verbs	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	4
	3.9	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	2.1
L1 Use	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Determiners	2	1	1	0	3	1	1	9
	3.9	9.1	3.4	0.0	15.0	2.2	5.6	4.7
Prepositions	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	1.6
Word choice	1	1	0	0	3	2	0	7
	2.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	15.0	4.3	0.0	3.7
Word form	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	8
	3.9	18.2	0.0	12.5	10.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
Word missing	1	0	1	0	0	4	1	7
	2.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	8.7	5.6	3.7
Capitalization	6	0	3	2	1	4	2	18
	11.8	0.0	10.3	12.5	5.0	8.7	11.1	9.4
Punctuation	5	0	2	2	3	7	8	27
	9.8	0.0	6.9	12.5	15.0	15.2	44.4	14.1
Spelling	7	1	5	3	0	17	3	36
	13.7	9.1	17.2	18.8	0.0	37.0	16.7	18.8
Total	51	11	29	16	20	46	18	191
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The second research question aimed to determine how advanced adult ESL students provide blog mediated written peer feedback in their academic writing at a francophone Canadian university.

Table 18 shows the frequency and percentage of feedback in each essay for all the participants. When combining data for each of the participants, it appears that the two most frequent mean of providing feedback in each essay types are a direct error correction with comments (53.3%), followed by a direct error correction with no comments (30.0%).

Table 18*Frequency and percentage of feedback in different essays for all participants*

Feedback type category	Types of essays							Total
	Argumen- tative	Cause- Effect	Compare- Contrast	Defini- tion	Descrip- tion	Narra- tion	Research Paper	
Direct error correction w/ comments	7	3	5	0	1	0	0	16
	46.7	100.0	83.3	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	53.3
Direct error correction w/o comments	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	9
	53.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	30.0
Clarification requests	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
Indirect error identification	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	100.0	0.0	6.7
Indirect error identification w/ comments	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	6.7
Indirect error identification w/ error codes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	15	3	6	0	5	1	0	30
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The third research question sought to determine how advanced adult ESL students respond to blog mediated written peer feedback in their academic writing at a francophone Canadian university.

Table 19 presents the frequency and percentage of revision types in different essays for all the participants. The data shows that there is a tendency for advanced adult ESL learners to prefer correct substitution of the error (35.6%) when correcting their essays, but that they also tend to correct errors based on their peers' comments, which accounts for (16.8%).

Table 19*Frequency and percentage of revision types in different essays for all participants*

Revision types	Types of essays							Total
	Argumentative	Cause- Effect	Compare- Contrast	Definition	Description	Narration	Research Paper	
Averted erroneous peer marking	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Error corrected	13	3	5	1	7	3	0	32
	25.5	27.3	17.2	6.3	35.0	6.5	0.0	16.8
Substitution, correct	23	1	0	10	0	22	12	68
	45.1	9.1	0.0	62.5	0.0	47.8	66.7	35.6
Deleted text	1	0	1	1	0	6	0	9
	2.0	0.0	3.4	6.3	0.0	13.0	0.0	4.7
Incorrect change	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
No revision	7	7	20	4	13	14	5	70
	13.7	63.6	69.0	25.0	65.0	30.4	27.8	36.6
Peer-induced error	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Substitution, incorrect	4	0	1	0	0	1	1	7
	7.8	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	2.2	5.6	3.7
Total	51	11	29	16	20	46	18	191
(% of total)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Finally, in response to the fourth research question, participants' perceptions of blog-mediated peer feedback were examined. Analysis of the semi-structured interview transcripts revealed several emerging categories. Overall, the participants expressed a generally positive attitude towards blog-mediated peer feedback. They acknowledged the value of having their written productions corrected by their peers and noted that the comments received became clear and concise as they became more familiar with the platform and the revision process. While some participants questioned the relevance of this feedback method and highlighted significant flaws that made teacher feedback more desirable, they also recognized the positive aspects of peer feedback. One prominent concern among the participants was that peers may not possess the same level of expertise as an expert teacher, particularly for stronger students. This raised concerns that engaging

in peer feedback might be a poor use of time and resources. On the other hand, weaker students enjoyed sharing their essays on the blog and receiving feedback from their peers. However, they expressed doubt in their ability to evaluate their peers' work, particularly when they considered it superior to their own, which impacted their self-esteem. Despite these concerns, all participants reported numerous benefits, such as the user-friendly nature of the platform, the convenience of working from home, and the accessibility of texts for both students and teachers, fostering improved communication and correction processes.

In observing the data, it needs to be acknowledged that not every participant submitted all the required essays for evaluation. The absence of this data could affect the study's outcomes and represent a potential source of error when comparing the individual data sets.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study aimed to investigate the linguistic errors made by advanced adult ESL learners in their academic writing at a francophone Canadian university. Additionally, it aimed to determine how these learners provide blog-mediated written peer feedback, their responses to such feedback, and their perceptions towards blog-mediated peer feedback.

5.1 Connections with Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019)

In exploring the linguistic errors of advanced adult ESL learners in academic writing and their perceptions of blog-mediated peer feedback, the current study aligns with the work of Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019). While their research compared both paper and blog-based writing, the current study specifically delves into the intricacies of blog-mediated peer feedback.

5.1.1 Medium-specific error patterns

Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019)'s investigation, although encompassing both paper and blog-based writing, resonates with the current study's findings. Their results emphasize that the most frequent errors in writing, namely errors pertaining to sentence structure, are the most significant for advanced ESL learners. This correlation in the findings suggests that addressing these specific errors could be crucial for enhancing the writing skills of advanced ESL learners.

5.1.2 Variations in feedback modalities

Building upon Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji's insights, the current study exclusively explored how advanced ESL learners provide and respond to blog-mediated written peer feedback. While Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji's work looked at potential differences in feedback modalities between blogs and paper, the current study contributes by delineating the specific forms—direct and metalinguistic feedback—employed in the context of blog-mediated interactions. This nuanced exploration enriches the understanding of the ways in which advanced ESL learners interact with and interpret peer feedback within the context of a blog-mediated environment.

5.1.3 Autonomy and trust in revision processes

Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019) underscore the distinct advantages of blogs as platforms for expression and connection with peers. The current study's findings echo this sentiment, highlighting that while learners considered their peers' feedback, they also exhibited a

commendable level of autonomy in the revision process within the blog-mediated environment. Together, both studies support the idea that blog-mediated environments empower learners to exercise autonomy in addressing errors, showcasing a balance between peer input and individual agency.

In integrating these parallels with Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji's work, the current study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how different writing mediums, specifically focusing on blog-mediated interactions, influence error patterns, peer feedback practices, and learner autonomy. These connections strengthen the broader discourse on the intricacies of L2 writing and blog-mediated peer feedback and reinforce the practical implications of this research within the realm of second language education.

5.2 Interpretation and comparative analysis

Regarding the first research question that aimed to investigate what linguistic errors advanced adult ESL learners' make in their academic writing at a francophone Canadian university, the results of this study showed that the most common errors made by advanced adult ESL learners are related to sentence structure. These findings align with those of Lira-Gonzales and Nassaji (2019) who found that the two most frequent error types in paper-and blog-based writing pertain to sentence structure and word choice. Another study that corroborates the findings is Singh et al. (2017) who found that the most common error of post-secondary ESL students was the construction of complex sentences which included errors with subject-verb agreement.

These findings differ from recent research conducted by George and Halimb (2023) which explored common errors of first-year TESL students in their essay writing. Their results revealed that the participants' most common grammatical errors involved nouns, determiners, and verbs which conflicts with the results of the current study. Although participants were of a similar age group of the current study, the study focused on a cohort of Malay students with intermediate or 'moderate' English proficiency, which might account for the observed discrepancy. Additionally, participants were not engaged in any form of WCF practice during the course of their study, and this lack of exposure to WCF may have influenced the types of errors they committed.

The second research question investigated how advanced adult ESL learners provide blog-mediated written peer feedback. The findings indicate that advanced ESL learners use mostly direct and metalinguistic feedback when correcting their peers' errors. These findings correlate with existing literature, including Guénette (2009) who examined the CF practices of a group of pre-service ESL teachers. The results of her study revealed that there was a tendency among pre-service ESL teachers to use a direct, metalinguistic form of feedback when providing WCF to students' essays, similar to what was observed in the current study. Moreover, some of her participants stated that simply correcting the errors without providing explanations was not sufficient for learning to occur. In another study, Guénette and Lyster (2013) found that pre-service teachers had a tendency to provide direct corrections at the expense of more indirect CF strategies which further corroborates the results of the present study.

In Guénette (2009)'s study, a distinctive aspect was observed in the feedback approach adopted by pre-service ESL teachers, who provided corrective feedback that was more selective rather than comprehensive. This marked difference prompts a call for further exploration into the potential factors influencing the diverse feedback practices among pre-service teachers in various contexts. Rooted in the sociocultural background of the participants, these factors may include beliefs, values, motives, goals, and past experiences with WCF. Notably, participants in the current research study were actively engaged in peer feedback practices, further shaping their perspectives towards WCF provision. Proficiency levels and the extent of feedback training among participants further contribute to the intricate network of influences shaping the types of comments they provide.

Collectively, these factors contribute to the diversity and complexity observed in participant reactions and engagement with peer feedback. Understanding how these complex elements interact is key to understanding the dynamics of feedback provision in educational setting, as they shape both the form and effectiveness of feedback practices among pre-service ESL teachers.

The third research question explored how advanced adult ESL students respond to blog-mediated written peer feedback. Our study reveals that the most common type of revision for advanced adult

ESL learners is a correct substitution of the error. In this type of revision, the marked text is substituted by a correction not suggested by the peer's feedback.

Results showed that students found an extensive number of errors that were not marked by their peers but corrected a majority of those errors by their own volition. These findings suggest that while advanced ESL learners take into consideration their peers feedback, they also exhibit a certain level of learner autonomy in their revision processes and place a considerable amount of trust in their own revision skills when it comes to academic writing.

These findings are in alignment with previous literature in the field that support the social and cognitive benefits of peer feedback (Bijami et al., 2013; Lin & Yang, 2011; Van Popta et al., 2017) as well as the beneficial aspect of blogs as a platform to express thoughts and connect with peers (Lira-Gonzales & Nassaji, 2019; Mabuan, 2018).

Lastly, concerning the fourth research question that investigated participants' perceptions of blog-mediated peer feedback, a generally positive attitude towards this form of WCF was reported by all participants in the study. However, participants also expressed a degree of concern regarding inconsistencies in the quality and nature of the feedback received and the possible effect on self-confidence that this type of feedback might have.

This positive attitude towards blog-mediated peer feedback corroborates with other studies such as Muhtia and Drajati (2017) who also reported that learners have a generally positive perception of this type of feedback.

Additionally, similar attitudes towards WCF were also expressed by participants in Chen et al. (2016) who overall held a very positive view towards the WCF received but expressed concerns primarily about an overemphasis on explicit grammar correction while emphasizing the importance of addressing both grammatical and content-related errors in WCF. In contrast, participants in the current study mostly voiced apprehensions regarding the consistency and type of feedback provided.

As for students' perceptions of the effectiveness of the feedback, the results are consistent with Sinha and Nassaji (2022) whose study indicates that there is no substantial correlation between learners' perceptions and the effectiveness of the WCF provided.

The advantages highlighted by participants in the current study include the accessibility and ease of use of the blog platform, the ability to work from anywhere and at one's own pace, and the opportunity to receive a fresh perspective on one's writing from another individual. These advantages corroborate with other studies such as Lira-Gonzales et al. (2021) who also reported significant advantages for blog-mediated feedback.

On the other hand, the participants also acknowledged certain disadvantages, such as the varying proficiency levels within a group leading to a discrepancy in the feedback received, and the potential impact on self-esteem when comparing work between peers with stronger or weaker writing skills. Similar concerns towards peer feedback were also expressed by participants in a study by Lira-Gonzales et al. (2021). However, they observed that the motivational advantages of blog-mediated peer feedback outweighed these apparent disadvantages by a considerable margin.

5.3 Limitations and further research

The limitations of this research study include factors such as the small sample size and the homogeneity of the participants in terms of age, background and L1. All participants in this multiple case study fell within the 20-year age range, shared a similar rural background, and spoke French as an L1. These factors naturally affect the generalizability of the results to other populations. Future research could overcome these limitations by replicating the study in different settings, with a more diverse participant population. Recruiting participants from different first language backgrounds would also be valuable for comparing and corroborating the results of this research study, thereby strengthening its validity and generalizability. Furthermore, while the small sample helped to provide deeper insight on certain aspects such as the perceptions of the participants regarding blog-mediated peer feedback, it could be triangulated by results from a quantitative study with a larger sample size, particularly results pertaining to the common types of errors committed by adult ESL learners.

5.4 Contributions

In summary, this research provides valuable insights into the linguistic challenges faced by advanced adult ESL learners, their common WCF practices and preferences, and their perceptions of blog-mediated peer feedback. These findings contribute significantly to the field of second language education, offering practical implications for educators and researchers.

From a pedagogical standpoint, the findings of this research study should help educators select effective feedback strategies tailored to the needs of their students and help them understand the specific needs and preferences of advanced ESL learners when it comes to WCF. This will in turn support the language development and academic writing proficiency of their students.

Moreover, in terms of scientific contributions, this research study advances the knowledge within the field of second language education and WCF. By proposing a variety of findings and a comprehensive analysis of advanced ESL learners' practices and perceptions, it contributes to the growing body of knowledge in the area of second language education. This study opens doors for further exploration and research into the intricate dynamics of WCF in an ESL context, ultimately enriching our understanding of how feedback strategies impact students' language learning and writing skills.

REFERENCES

- Alsubaie, A., & Madini, A. A. (2018). The effect of using blogs to enhance the writing skill of English language learners at a Saudi university. *Global Journal of Educational Studies*, 4(1), 13-30.
- Amir, Z., Ismail, K., & Hussin, S. (2011). Blogs in language learning: Maximizing students' collaborative writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 18, 537-543.
- Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers think is right and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 95–127-195–127.
- Andersson, S. (2015). Comprehensive or Selective Feedback, that is the Question. A Literature Review Focusing on Writing Strategies in an EFL/ESL Classroom.
- Asoodar, M., Atai, M. R., & Vaezi, S. (2016). Blog-integrated writing with blog-buddies: EAP learners' writing performance. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 54(2), 225-252.
- Baggetun, R., & Wasson, B. (2006). Self - regulated learning and open writing. *European Journal of Education*, 41(3 - 4), 453-472.
- Bakar, N. A. (2009). E-learning environment: Blogging as a platform for language learning. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(4), 594-604.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The qualitative report*, 13(4), 544-559.
- Bijami, M., Kashef, S. H., & Nejad, M. S. (2013). Peer feedback in learning English writing: Advantages and disadvantages. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 3(4), 91-97.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102-118.
- Bitchener, J., East, M., & H., C. (2010). The Effectiveness of Providing Second Language (L2) Writers With On-Line Written Corrective Feedback. *Ako Aotearoa*.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207-217.
- Brown, D., Liu, Q., & Norouzian, R. (2023). Effectiveness of written corrective feedback in developing L2 accuracy: A Bayesian meta-analysis. *Language teaching research*, 13621688221147374.
- Carless, D. (2015). *Excellence in university assessment: Learning from award-winning practice*. Routledge.
- Chen, J. (2021). Research on the Effect of Peer Feedback Training in English Writing Teaching-- A Case Study of Students in Business English Major. *English Language Teaching*, 14(6), 12-24.

- Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: a case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific journal of second and foreign language education*, 1(1), 1-17.
- Chen, W.-C., Shih, Y.-C. D., & Liu, G.-Z. (2015). Task design and its induced learning effects in a cross-institutional blog-mediated telecollaboration. *Computer assisted Language learning*, 28(4), 285-305.
- Cui, Y., Schunn, C. D., & Gai, X. (2021). Peer feedback and teacher feedback: a comparative study of revision effectiveness in writing instruction for EFL learners. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 1-17.
- Cunningham, K. J. (2019). Student Perceptions and Use of Technology-Mediated Text and Screencast Feedback in ESL Writing. *Computers and Composition*, 52, 222-241.
- Dabboub, A. E. (2019). *The effectiveness of comprehensive corrective feedback-direct and indirect-on EFL learners' language accuracy, structural complexity and lexical diversity*. Nottingham Trent University (United Kingdom).
- Dawson, P., Henderson, M., Ryan, T., Mahoney, P., Boud, D., Phillips, M., & Molloy, E. (2018). Technology and feedback design. *Learning, design, and technology*.
- Dippold, D. (2009). Peer feedback through blogs: Student and teacher perceptions in an advanced German class. *ReCALL*, 21(1), 18-36.
- Ducate, L. C., & Lomicka, L. L. (2005). Exploring the blogosphere: Use of web logs in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign language annals*, 38(3), 410-421.
- Duffy, P., & Bruns, A. (2006). The use of blogs, wikis and RSS in education: A conversation of possibilities. Learning on the Move: Proceedings of the Online Learning and Teaching Conference 2006,
- Ellis, R. (2009a). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1).
- Ellis, R. (2009b). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97-107.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36(3), 353-371.
- Ferris, D. (1999). The Case for Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes: A Response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 1-11.
- Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short-and long-term effects of written error correction. *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*, 81104.
- Ferris, D. R. (2012). Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing studies. *Language Teaching*, 45(4), 446-459.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1977). Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research.

- Fowler, H. R., Aaron, J. E., & McArthur, M. (2007). *The little, brown handbook*. Pearson Longman.
- Gage, N. L. (1960). Equilibrium Theory and Behavior Change: An Experiment in Feedback from Pupils to Teachers.
- George, J. A., & Halimb, M. I. H. B. M. (2023). Common Grammatical Errors Made by First-Year TESL Students in Writing: A Case Study. *World Journal of English and Linguistic Studies*, 1(1).
- Gielen, S., Peeters, E., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Struyven, K. (2010). Improving the effectiveness of peer feedback for learning. *Learning and instruction*, 20(4), 304-315.
- Gielen, S., Tops, L., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Smeets, S. (2010). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback and of various peer feedback forms in a secondary school writing curriculum. *British educational research journal*, 36(1), 143-162.
- Gouvernement du Québec. Ministère de l'Éducation, d. L. e. d. S. (2005). *Indicateurs de l'éducation; édition 2005*.
- Guardado, M., & Shi, L. (2007). ESL students' experiences of online peer feedback. *Computers and Composition*, 24(4), 443-461.
- Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct?: Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(1), 40-53.
- Guénette, D. (2009). *The Cyberscript Project: A mixed-method study of pre-service ESL teachers' corrective feedback beliefs and practices* [McGill University].
- Guénette, D., & Lyster, R. (2013). Written corrective feedback and its challenges for pre-service ESL teachers. *Canadian modern language review*, 69(2), 129-153.
- Han, S. (2023). The contribution of blog-based writing instruction to enhancing writing performance and writing motivation of Chinese EFL learners. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1069585.
- Han, Y. (2019). Written corrective feedback from an ecological perspective: The interaction between the context and individual learners. *System*, 80, 288-303.
- Hentasmaka, D., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2021). Peer Feedback Uptakes and Outcomes across EFL Students' Proficiency Levels: A Study at Tertiary Education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(3), 271-286.
- Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language teaching research*, 4(1), 33-54.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83-101.
- Kang, E., & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta - analysis. *The Modern language journal*, 99(1), 1-18.

- Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2015). ESL students' perceptions of written corrective feedback: What type of feedback do they prefer and why? *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL*, 4(1), 5-26.
- Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2019). The effects of written corrective feedback: A critical synthesis of past and present research. *Instructed Second Language Acquisition*, 3(1), 28-52.
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 285-312.
- Lee, L. (2020). An exploratory study of using personal blogs for L2 writing in fully online language courses. In *Recent Developments in Technology-Enhanced and Computer-Assisted Language Learning* (pp. 145-163). IGI Global.
- Legendre, R. (2005). *Dictionnaire actuel de l'éducation* (3rd ed.). Guérin.
- Li, S., & Li, P. (2012). Individual Differences in Written Corrective Feedback: A Multi-Case Study. *English Language Teaching*, 5(11), 38-44.
- Lin, M. H. (2015). Learner-centered blogging: A preliminary investigation of EFL student writers' experience. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 18(4), 446-458.
- Lin, W.-C., & Yang, S. C. (2011). Exploring students' perceptions of integrating Wiki technology and peer feedback into English writing courses. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 10(2), 88-103.
- Lira-Gonzales, M.-L. (2012). *A Teacher's Formative Assessment Perceptions and Practices in Oral Intermediate English Courses at the Université de Montréal*. Université de Montréal (Canada).
- Lira-Gonzales, M.-L., & Nassaji, H. (2019). The provision and efficacy of peer feedback in blogs versus paper-based writing. *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 170(2), 228-250.
- Lira-Gonzales, M.-L., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The Amount and Usefulness of Written Corrective Feedback Across Different Educational Contexts and Levels. *TESL Canada Journal*, 37(2), 1-22.
- Lira-Gonzales, M.-L., Nassaji, H., & Chao, K. (2021). The impact of blog-mediated peer feedback and peer feedback training on the accuracy of french as a second language (FSL) writing. *Formation et profession: revue scientifique internationale en éducation*, 29(1), 1-18.
- Liu, N.-F., & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: the learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher education*, 11(3), 279-290.
- Mabuan, R. A. (2018). Using blogs in teaching tertiary ESL writing. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 6(2), 1-10.
- Manchón, R. M. (2011). Writing to learn the language. *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language*, 61-82.

- Muhtia, A., & Dražati, N. A. (2017). Incorporating blogging into an EFL writing course: an action research. *Issues in Language Studies*, 6(2).
- Nagode, G. P., Pižorn, K., & Juriševič, M. (2014). The role of written corrective feedback in developing writing in L2. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 11(2), 89-98.
- Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2017). *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning: Research, theory, applications, implications* (Vol. 66). Taylor & Francis.
- Nassaji, H., & Tian, J. (2018). Constructivism. In *Issues in Applying SLA Theories toward Reflective and Effective Teaching* (pp. 23-36). Brill.
- Novakovich, J. (2016). Fostering critical thinking and reflection through blog - mediated peer feedback. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 32(1), 16-30.
- Noytim, U. (2010). Weblogs enhancing EFL students' English language learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 1127-1132.
- Office québécois de la langue française. (2017). *Langue et éducation au Québec. 3, Enseignement universitaire*. Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec
- Park, J. (2018). Effectiveness of teacher and peer feedback: through the lens of Korean tertiary writing classroom. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(2), 429.
- Pearson, W. S. (2022). A typology of the characteristics of teachers' written feedback comments on second language writing. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 2024937.
- Programme de formation de l'école québécoise : enseignement secondaire, premier cycle [Éducation Québec]*. (2004). (M. d. l'éducation, Ed.). Québec. <https://numerique.banq.qc.ca/patrimoine/details/52327/44374>
- Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. *Handbook of research on teacher education*, 2(102-119), 273-290.
- Russel, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Norris and Ortega (006)(Ed.) Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching*.
- Seker, M., & Dincer, A. (2014). An Insight to Students' Perceptions on Teacher Feedback in Second Language Writing Classes. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 73-83.
- Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 32(2), 203-234.
- Singh, C. K. S., Singh, A. K. J., Razak, N. Q. A., & Ravinthar, T. (2017). Grammar Errors Made by ESL Tertiary Students in Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 10(5), 16-27.
- Sinha, T. S., & Nassaji, H. (2022). ESL learners' perception and its relationship with the efficacy of written corrective feedback. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 41-56.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing: Case Studies. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 32(2), 303-334.

- Trajtemberg, C., & Yiakoumetti, A. (2011). Weblogs: a tool for EFL interaction, expression, and self-evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 65(4), 437-445.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 46(2), 327-369.
- Truscott, J. (2023). What about validity? Thoughts on the state of research on written corrective feedback. *Feedback Research in Second Language*, 1, 33-53.
- Tudini, V. (2007). Negotiation and intercultural learning in Italian native speaker chat rooms. *The Modern language journal*, 91(4), 577-601.
- Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 156(1), 279-296.
- Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language learning*, 62(1), 1-41.
- Van Popta, E., Kral, M., Camp, G., Martens, R. L., & Simons, P. R.-J. (2017). Exploring the value of peer feedback in online learning for the provider. *Educational Research Review*, 20, 24-34.
- Vurdien, R. (2013). Enhancing writing skills through blogging in an advanced English as a Foreign Language class in Spain. *Computer assisted Language learning*, 26(2), 126-143.
- Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.
- Warschauer, M. (2010). New tools for teaching writing.
- Williams, J. B., & Jacobs, J. (2004). Exploring the use of blogs as learning spaces in the higher education sector. *Australasian journal of educational technology*, 20(2).
- Wu, W., Huang, J., Han, C., & Zhang, J. (2022). Evaluating peer feedback as a reliable and valid complementary aid to teacher feedback in EFL writing classrooms: A feedback giver perspective. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 73, 101140.
- Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(3), 179-200.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications* (Vol. 6). Sage Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Yu, S., & Hu, G. (2017). Understanding university students' peer feedback practices in EFL writing: Insights from a case study. *Assessing Writing*, 33, 25-35.
- Zhan, Y., Wan, Z. H., & Sun, D. (2022). Online formative peer feedback in Chinese contexts at the tertiary Level: A critical review on its design, impacts and influencing factors. *Computers & Education*, 176, 104341.

- Zhang, H., Song, W., Shen, S., & Huang, R. (2014). The effects of blog-mediated peer feedback on learners' motivation, collaboration, and course satisfaction in a second language writing course. *Australasian journal of educational technology*, 30(6).
- Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 209-222.
- Zhang, S. (1999). Thoughts on some recent evidence concerning the affective advantage of peer feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 321-326.

APPENDIX A – PEER FEEDBACK CHECKLIST

PEER FEEDBACK CHECKLIST

This essay has been written by:

This essay has been corrected by:

Title

Is the title appropriate for the essay? Why?

Introduction

	4 😊	3	2	1	0 😞
The introduction clearly leads into the thesis.					
The thesis is clear, and it shows what the body paragraphs will be about without summarizing the topic already.					

Thesis Statements

	4 😊	3	2	1	0 😞
The thesis makes a claim.					
The thesis can be proven within the constraints of the assignment.					
The thesis is focused: not too broad.					
The thesis is like a preview of the essay.					
The thesis explains what the author is discussing and why it is important to discuss					
The controlling idea provide direction for the thesis, how the author views the topic (without saying “I feel” or “My essay will discuss”)					
All of the sentences in the essay pertain to the Thesis					

Body Paragraphs

	4 😊	3	2	1	0 😞
Every paragraph has a topic sentence.					
Every paragraph offers some kind of evidence.					
Every paragraph offers full explanation of how and why the evidence proves the author's point, and how and why that point relates back to the thesis.					
For every assertion the author makes, he/she gives proof and explanation.					
The paragraphs are all unified: each paragraph is about only one thing.					
There are smooth transitions between paragraphs.					
<i>The author has stated what the term means by following a certain pattern (extended or new meaning).</i>					
<i>The author has stated what the term does not mean</i>					
<i>The author has avoided the "is when" sentence construction</i>					

Do all of the sentences in the essay pertain to the Thesis? Explain

Conclusion

	4😊	3	2	1	0😞
<i>At least one of the following points are present in the conclusion:</i>					
It presents a quotation that reflects the author's ideas, or sums up what he/she want to say in an interesting way					
It presents figurative language.					
It presents an example or anecdote.					
It presents predictions or speculations.					
The conclusion successfully ends the essay					

Use of English: