A Comparative Study of the Effect of Self-revision, Peer Revision, and Teacher Revision on Second Language Learners' Writing Performance

Zahra Fakher Ajabshir *
Department of General Courses, University of Bonab, East Azarbaijan, Iran
fakherzahra@yahoo.com

Farhad Mazlum
English Department, Faculty of Humanities, University of Maragheh, Maragheh, Iran
fmazlum@maragheh.ac.ir

Fatemeh Pilevar
English Department, Faculty of Humanities, University of Maragheh, Maragheh, Iran
fatmepilevar@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the relative effectiveness of self-revision, peer revision, and teacher revision on the writing performance of English as a foreign language (EFL) learners. A total of 60 intermediate level EFL learners were randomly assigned to three groups: self-revision, peer revision, and teacher revision groups. Throughout the treatment, which consisted of 13 sessions lasting 70 minutes each, the participants received instruction on various aspects of writing and then engaged in writing texts. Depending on the assignments designated to their groups, they received feedback from the teacher, feedback from peers, or undertook self-revision of their work. Subsequently, the students revised their original work based on the feedback received, with a specific emphasis on the areas highlighted during the initial assessment. The analysis of pretest and post-test scores using t-tests and an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) indicated that the peer revision group exhibited the highest performance, while the other two groups demonstrated similar performance. These findings emphasize the educational value of different revision approaches and the superiority of peer revision in enhancing second language (L2) writing abilities.

Keywords: Peer Revision; Second Language; Self-Revision; Teacher Revision; Writing

* Corresponding Author

1. Introduction

Writing is an essential aspect of second language acquisition (SLA) as it actively engages learners in the cognitive processes underlying second language (L2) mastery. It is a complex undertaking that poses numerous challenges for learners (Li, 2020; Tao, 2020). As English as a foreign language (EFL) learners strive to enhance their writing skills, the process of revision plays a crucial role in refining and improving the quality of their compositions. Revision can take various forms, including self-revision, peer revision, and teacher revision. Each type of revision offers unique benefits and challenges that can impact the effectiveness of the writing process for ESL learners. Understanding the relative effectiveness of these different revision approaches is essential for educators and students alike in order to optimize learning outcomes and improve writing performance.

This study aims to investigate the relative effectiveness of self-revision, peer revision, and teacher revision on EFL students' writing performance and provide insights into how different revision strategies ca be effectively implemented in EFL classes. The findings could have valuable implications for curriculum design, classroom practice, and even learners' autonomy development. By grounding this study in theories of L2 learning, it is attempted to bridge the gap between theoretical underpinnings and practical application in EFL writing instruction.

2. Literature review

2.1 Theoretical Foundations

The potential benefits of incorporating different revision types are theoretically supported, enhancing our understanding of how learners can benefit from different revision types in their wring practices. Self-revision involves the writer reviewing and editing their work, a process that necessitates critical thinking and a thorough understanding of language conventions (Chung et al., 2021). EFL learners engaging in self-revision must possess a strong grasp of grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure to effectively identify and correct errors within their compositions (Ndoye, 2017). This method places the onus of improvement squarely on the individual writer, requiring them to be self-reflective and analytical in assessing their writing weaknesses (Nielsen, 2019). While self-revision offers learners the opportunity to develop independent writing skills and exercise autonomy over their work, it may also present challenges in terms of objectivity and identifying nuanced language errors that could impede overall writing proficiency (Adachi et al., 2018).

In contrast, teacher revision involves feedback from an experienced language instructor who provides guidance on areas of improvement in a student's writing. Teachers can offer valuable insights into language usage, organization, coherence, and overall writing quality, leveraging their expertise to help ESL learners refine their skills more effectively (Çinar, 2022). This method allows for direct interaction between teacher and student, fostering a mentorship dynamic that can enhance learning outcomes (Jiang & Yu, 2021). However, the effectiveness of teacher revision may be influenced by factors such as the teacher's feedback style, availability, and the alignment of feedback with the specific needs of individual ESL learners (Adachi et al., 2018).

Peer revision in EFL writing studies has been widely implemented, leading to significant improvements in students' cognitive, social, and linguistic development (e.g., Jin et al., 2024; Li et al., 2020; Sippel, 2024, Yu et al., 2019). Peer feedback plays a crucial role in enhancing students' writing skills by encouraging them to reflect on their learning through valuable comments (Li et al., 2020). It also helps students gain a deeper understanding of task requirements and acquire additional strategies and techniques to improve their writing abilities (Hsu et al., 2018). Furthermore, students can utilize evaluations as a means to deepen their comprehension and refine their self-regulated learning strategies (Sippel, 2024).

2.2 Empirical Studies

There have been numerous studies investigating the effects of self-revision (e.g., Li & Zhang, 2021; Memari Hanjani, 2024; Pourdana & Tavassoli, 2022; Sangeetha, 2020), peer revision (e.g., Gonzalez-Torres & Sarango, 2023; Jin et al., 2024; Pham et al., 2020; Tian & Zhou, 2020; Sippel, 2024) and teacher revision (e.g., Gonzalez-Torres & Sarango,2023; Jiang & Yu, 2021; Safivand et al., 2021; Tian & Zhou, 2020) on the development of L2 writing skill. A study by Kim & Emeliyanova (2019) provided evidence on students' revision practices following feedback from teachers, highlighting the significance of revision processes in enhancing accuracy in subsequent writing tasks. Safivand et al. (2021) also confirmed the significant effect of teachers' linguistic and affective feedback on EFL students' writing skills. In their research, Pourdana & Tavassoli (2022) explored the impact of e-portfolio assessment on the engagement modes and genre-based writing improvement of language learners and found that this assessment method affected both higher and lower-level writing skills. Additionally, Gonzalez-Torres and Sarango (2023) conducted a study comparing the effectiveness of peer feedback and teacher feedback in enhancing the quality of writing revisions among EFL students. Their findings highlighted the advantages of both approaches. Sangeetha (2020) investigated the effects of utilizing the self-editing technique to enhance writing skills. The results showed a significant improvement in students' writing abilities after implementing self-

editing, and it also shed light on students' positive perceptions of learning this skill.

The extant literature on revision in L2 writing provided evidence that each type of revision may be conducive to better L2 compositions (e.g., Li & Zhang, 2021; Jin et al., 2024; Memari Hanjani, 2024; Pham et al., 2020; Pourdana & Tavassoli, 2022; Safivand et al., 2021; Tian & Zhou, 2020). The studies conducted so far generally targeted one type of feedback, and there is a need for studies that address either type of revision in a single experimentation to provide an overall understanding of their differential effects of the improvement of L2 writing. This study thus seeks to provide valuable insights into effective writing pedagogies for EFL learners by investigating how different types of revision impact writing quality and skill development. By directly comparing these three revision methods, the study could provide valuable insights that have broader implications for the EFL community. The findings could help identify the specific strengths and limitations of each revision approach, allowing EFL instructors to make more informed decisions about how to integrate and balance self-revision, peer revision, and teacher feedback in their writing instruction. Additionally, the study could shed light on the extent to which EFL learners can develop their writing skills through self-regulation and peer collaboration, informing pedagogical approaches that empower learners and foster a more learner-centered classroom environment. Furthermore, the study's insights into the comparative effectiveness of different revision strategies could enhance teacher training programs, equipping EFL instructors with the knowledge and skills to provide targeted, tailored feedback that maximizes their students' writing improvement.

Based on the previous backdrop, the following questions were formulated:

RQ#1 To what extent self-revision lead to significant improvements in EFL learners' writing performance?

RQ#2 To what extent peer revision lead to significant improvements in EFL learners' writing performance?

RQ#3 To what extent teacher revision lead to significant improvements in EFL learners' writing performance?

RQ#4 Are there any significant differences in the writing performance of EFL students who engage in self-revision, peer revision, and teacher revision?

3. Method

3.1 Design

This study adopted a quasi-experimental with pretest-treatment-post-test design. The study's independent variable was revision (self, peer, and teacher), and the dependent variable was the writing performance on the post-test.

3.2 Participants

The current research involved the participation of sixty Iranian EFL learners, consisting of 32 males and 36 females. These learners were enrolled in an IELTS preparation academic writing course. The research sample was selected using convenience sampling and comprised EFL learners aged 17-25 (M = 19.44, SD=2.09) at an intermediate level. The participants' native language was Turkish, and they had approximately six years of prior English learning experience. Out of the initial pool of 68 participants, a few individuals (n=8) were excluded from the data due to their absence from certain treatment sessions or their failure to complete the post-test. To conduct the study, the participants were randomly divided into three groups: the teacher revision group, the peer revision group, and the self-revision group, each consisting of 20 learners. The written consent form was completed by the participants, and they were assured about the data anonymity.

3.3 Instruments

The instruments used to collect data in this study are as follows.

3.3.1 Oxford Placement Test (OPT) and TOEFL Test

First, to ensure that all participants possess a homogeneous level of general English proficiency, an OPT was administered. The OPT (UCLES, 2001), developed by Oxford University Press and Cambridge ESOL, includes three parts. Part one included 40 multiple-choice questions (vocabulary and reading), part two consisted of 20 multiple-choice questions (grammar), and part three was the writing section with some essay-type questions.

To establish a baseline for the participants' L2 writing skill and ensure the sample's homogeneity in terms of L2 writing, the writing section of a TOEFL test was administered, which revealed the participants' homogeneity ($P>0.05$, $F_{(2, 81)} =32$).

3.3.2 Pretest/Post-test

The pretest/post-test included five writing tasks. Drawing on some previous studies (e.g., Lawrence, 2019) and two EFL teachers' rating of the researcher's pre-selected topics, some writing prompts were adopted/adapted, and the participants were required to choose three topics and write expository, descriptive, or narrative paragraphs of at least 200 words for each topic. Sample topics included (1) a typical Iranian family, (2), My country (3), Shopping (4),

My home, and (5) Summer holiday. Learners were asked to complete the pretest/post-test in 90 minutes.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

In the initial session, the participants underwent a proficiency test of OPT and the writing section of a TOEFL test. This was followed by a second session where they completed a writing pretest. After the pretest, the participants were randomly divided into three groups: self-revision, peer revision, and teacher revision. The course they enrolled in consisted of one-semester L2 writing instruction, with classes held twice a week. Each writing session had a duration of 70 minutes. The course textbook used for teaching writing in all classes was "Longman Academic Writing Series: Paragraphs to Essays, with Essential Online Resources" (Oshima & Hogue, 2017). Starting from the third session, all groups of learners received instruction on writing.

During the 13-session treatment period, the writing instructor provided writing instruction to each group, incorporating the material from the textbook. The teaching approach focused on the process of writing, covering various stages such as prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing. The teacher also delivered the instruction on different stages of writing, grammar and punctuation rules, sentence structure, paragraph development, and typical genres (descriptive, narrative, expository). In each session, the students were actively involved in writing paragraphs, and depending on their group assignment, they received feedback from the teacher, peer, or self-revised their work. The feedback targeted micro and macro aspects of writing, including content, organization, and language mechanics. Subsequently, the students revised their original work based on the feedback received, with a specific emphasis on the areas highlighted during the initial assessment.

In the last session, the post-test was administered, and two professional writing raters assessed the learners' papers. Consistent with the pretest format, the post-test featured five writing prompts, for which participants were tasked with writing a paragraph of a minimum of 200 words each. To lessen the practice effect on the learners, the writing prompts in the pretest were deliberately different from those presented in the post-test. Table 1 shows the study procedure.

Table 1

The Study Procedure

	Self-revision group	Peer revision group	Teacher revision group
Session 1 (QPT)	✓	✓	✓
Session 2 (Pretest)	✓	✓	✓
Sessions 3-15 (Treatment)	The teacher delivered the instruction on different stages of writing, grammar and punctuation rules, sentence structure, paragraph development, and typical genres (descriptive, narrative, expository). Students wrote texts and self-revised their writings.	The teacher delivered the instruction on different stages of writing, grammar and punctuation rules, sentence structure, paragraph development, and typical genres (descriptive, narrative, expository). Students wrote texts and received peer feedback.	The teacher delivered the instruction on different stages of writing, grammar and punctuation rules, sentence structure, paragraph development, and typical genres (descriptive, narrative, expository). Students wrote texts and received teacher feedback.
Session 16 (Post-test)	✓	✓	✓

3.5 Scoring Procedures

In this study, an analytic approach was utilized to evaluate the writing of the learners in both the pretest and post-test. Two proficient English teachers were responsible for assessing the learners' writing based on the criteria for analytic scoring. The analytic rubric, which consisted of five sub-domains of writing ability (content, organization, syntactic structures, vocabulary, and mechanics), was adapted from Bachman and Palmer (1996) and rated on a five-point Likert

scale. To ensure consistency in rating the pretest and post-test, the raters underwent a training session prior to scoring. The interrater reliability of the scores assigned by the two raters was calculated using SPSS software and was found to be acceptable, with a Kappa coefficient of .90 for the pretest and .87 for the post-test.

4. Data Analysis

 To analyze the data collected and provide answers to the research questions, the researchers employed SPSS, version 22. The research utilized a pretest-treatment-post-test design, which involved three distinct groups. The data collected from the pretest and post-test were carefully examined using paired comparisons and an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). The purpose was to evaluate the progress made by each group from the pretest to the post-test, as well as to determine any disparities between the three groups after the treatment. ANCOVA allows the researcher to control for the participants' initial writing performance (pretest scores) as a covariate, which helps account for any pre-existing differences in writing ability between the three groups before the intervention. This increases the statistical power of the analysis, enabling the detection of smaller differences in the writing performance between the groups, which is particularly important given the relatively small sample size. Additionally, ANCOVA can help adjust for any measurement error or random variability in the pretest scores, and it can address potential confounding factors, such as the influence of the pretest scores on the posttest performance. To ensure that there were no existing differences in L2 writing knowledge between the groups, the students' pretest scores were used as a covariate in the analysis. Furthermore, the main assumptions of ANCOVA, such as normality, linearity, and homogeneity of variance, were thoroughly assessed and found to be in compliance. Finally, post hoc test paired comparisons were carried out to identify specific pairwise differences between the three groups.

5. Results

Initially, the normality of data distribution was assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (Table 2). The calculated p-values for the pretest and post-test of each group were higher than the 0.05 threshold, indicating no significant statistical variances and confirming the data's normal distribution.

Table 2

Test of Normality

Students			Pretest	Post-test
Self-Revision	N		20	20
	Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	10.20	14.80
		Std. Deviation	1.436	1.005
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.155	.237
		Positive	.155	.237
		Negative	-.145	-.163
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.695	1.060
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.720	.212
Peer Revision	N		20	20
	Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	10.15	16.20
		Std. Deviation	1.565	1.508
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.188	.203
		Positive	.188	.203
		Negative	-.162	-.147
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.842	.907
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.478	.383
Teacher Revision	N		20	20
	Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	10.80	15.00
		Std. Deviation	1.473	1.124
	Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.157	.263
		Positive	.157	.263
		Negative	-.142	-.187
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.700	1.177
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.711	.125

Regarding research questions 1, 2, and 3, which address the effectiveness of either treatment approach on L2 writing, the pretest scores of each group were compared to their post-test scores. The results of paired samples t-tests conducted on the pretest/post-test scores are displayed in Table 3. It is noteworthy that the p-value for each group was found to be lower than the significance level ($p<0.05$),

indicating the improvement observed in each group from the pretest to the post-test.

Table 3
Paired Samples T-Test Comparing the Pretest and Post-test of Each Group

Group		Mean	SD	SEM	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Self-revision	Pretest	10.20	.224	.050	5.945	6.155	121.000	19	.000
	Post-test	14.80							
Peer revision	Pretest	10.15	.894	.200	3.781	4.619	21.000	19	.000
	Post-test	16.20							
Teacher revision	Pretest	10.80	.883	.197	4.187	5.013	23.309	19	.000
	Post-test	14.80							

An ANCOVA test (Table 4) was conducted to analyze between-group comparisons (RQ#4), revealing a significant difference between the groups (p<0.05). Table 4 displays statistically significant differences among the groups. With a large effect size according to Cohen's criterion (=0.14), the Partial η2 value was .73. Therefore, it can be concluded that the writing performance of EFL learners was significantly impacted by exposure to different revision modes.

Table 4
ANCOVA Results of Groups' L2 Writing Performance

	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Partial η2
Corrected model	2837.87	3	2987.32	51.43	0.000	.71
intercept	453.56	1	453.56	15.76	0.000	.23
Pretest	907.8	1	907.8	12.47	0.000	.37
Group	1006.74	4	1408.56	18.79	0.000	.73
Error	4887.87	72	52.21			
Total	101.652.004	76				
Corrected total	7.412.87	75				

As shown in Table 5, the best performance belonged to the peer revision group (M=16.20), followed by the teacher revision (M=15.00), and self-revision group (M=14.80). Also, the difference between the teacher revision and self-revision groups was not significant (p=.865) while the difference between teacher revision and peer revision groups was significant (p=.009). Similarly, the difference in the performance of the self-revision and peer revision groups was

significant (p=.002). Thus, it can be concluded that peer revision was a superior type of revision compared to either self-revision or teacher revision.

Table 5
Post hoc Paired Between-Group Comparisons of Post-test Scores

(I) Students	(J) Students	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Self-Revision	Teacher Revision	-.200	.389	.865	-1.14	.74
	Peer Revision	-1.400*	.389	.002	-2.34	-.46
Peer Revision	Teacher Revision	1.200*	.389	.009	.26	2.14
	Self-Revision	1.400*	.389	.002	.46	2.34
Teacher Revision	Self-Revision	.200	.389	.865	-.74	1.14
	Peer Revision	-1.200*	.389	.009	-2.14	-.26

6. Discussion

The goal of this study was to examine the impact of self-revision, peer revision and teacher-revision on EFL students' writing performance. It was found that peer revision groups outperformed self-revision and teacher revision groups in terms of enhancing written work. Interestingly, the study also revealed that while the peer revision group demonstrated the best performance, the self-revision and teacher revision groups showed similar levels of improvement in the quality of written content. These findings suggest that collaborative peer revision may offer unique benefits in enhancing writing skills, potentially due to the diverse perspectives and feedback provided by peers in a group setting.

The better performance of the self-revision in the post-test compared to the pretest provides evidence supporting the contribution of self-revision to improving L2 writing. This is consistent with some empirical studies (e.g., Chung et al., 2021; Rahmani et al., 2022; Hanjani, 2024; Li & Zhang, 2021). Self-revision plays a pivotal role in enhancing the writing proficiency of EFL learners by fostering a deeper understanding of grammar, vocabulary, and overall coherence in their compositions. Initially, through self-revision, EFL learners are able to independently identify and rectify errors in their writing, thereby sharpening their grammatical accuracy and language proficiency over time. Additionally, self-revision encourages EFL learners to reflect on the structural organization of their writing, assisting them in developing a more logical flow of ideas and improving coherence within their compositions. Moreover, engaging in self-revision allows EFL learners to expand their vocabulary repertoire as they

actively search for alternative words and expressions to refine their writing. By carefully reviewing and editing their work, EFL learners can gain a better understanding of their strengths and weaknesses in English writing, ultimately leading to improved language skills and the ability to express themselves more effectively in written form. Overall, the practice of self-revision empowers ESL learners to take ownership of their learning process, cultivate a critical eye for detail, and continuously strive for excellence in their written communication skills.

Positive evidence supporting teacher revision was also found in this study, which supports the findings of some previous studies (e.g., Chung et al., 2021; Dressler et al., 2019; Pham et al., 2020; Rezaei, 2022; Ruegg, 2015). Teacher revision plays a vital role in nurturing the writing abilities of EFL learners through the provision of valuable feedback, guidance, and support throughout the writing process (Ruegg, 2015). When teachers engage in revising students' written work, they offer personalized assistance that aids in enhancing students' language proficiency, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary usage, and overall writing style (Jiang & Yu, 2021). Through the provision of constructive feedback on grammar, syntax, organization, and coherence, teachers can assist EFL learners in identifying and rectifying common errors, refining their ideas (Hung et al., 2016), and structuring their writing more effectively (Gonzalez-Torres & Sarango, 2023). Furthermore, teacher revision aids EFL students in developing a deeper comprehension of language conventions, sentence structures, and cultural nuances that are crucial for effective written communication in English (Kim & Emeliyanova, 2019). Additionally, teacher feedback encourages EFL learners to reflect on their writing, independently revise, and make informed decisions regarding their language choices (Dressler et al., 2019). Ultimately, teacher revision empowers EFL students to build confidence in their writing abilities, express themselves more clearly and cohesively (Ndoye, 2017), and actively engage in the process of language acquisition and academic achievement.

As mentioned earlier, the best performance belonged to peer revision group. One potential reason for the superior performance of peer revision groups could be the active engagement of multiple individuals offering varied insights and suggestions (Gonzalez-Torres & Sarango, 2023; Jin et al., 2024), leading to a more comprehensive and well-rounded revision process (Hsu et al., 2018). The interaction and exchange of feedback among peers in a group setting may stimulate deeper critical thinking and reflection on the written work, ultimately resulting in more substantial improvements (Li & Zhang, 2019). On the other hand, the comparable performance of the self-revision and teacher revision groups could be attributed to the individual focus and expertise provided by both personal reflection and teacher guidance (Ruegg, 2015), highlighting the importance of these revision methods in refining writing skills. This study

underscores the importance of considering different revision approaches and the benefits of collaborative peer revision in enhancing writing quality.

The outperformance of the students who received peer feedback during writing tasks has been reported in some earlier students as well (e.g., Jiang & Yu, 2021; Tai & Yang, 2015; Tian & Zhou, 2020; Zhao, 2010). It is argued that peer revision is essential in L2 writing as it offers learners constructive feedback and chances for enhancement. Through peer revision, students gain various viewpoints and suggestions that can improve the overall quality of their writing (Tai & Yang, 2015). This process fosters active participation in the language and aids in a better comprehension of grammar, vocabulary, and sentence construction (Li & Zhang, 2021). By receiving input from fellow language learners, students can better understand the intricacies of the language and benefit from each other's errors (Jiang & Yu, 2021). This collaborative method creates a nurturing learning atmosphere where students can hone their language abilities through meaningful exchanges with their peers (Hsu et al., 2018).

In line with the findings of this study, it is asserted that peer revision nurtures a feeling of community and cooperation among language learners (Levi Altstaedter, 2018), establishing a foundation for positive discussions and shared learning. Engaging in peer revision tasks helps students enhance their critical thinking and analytical abilities by assessing and offering feedback on their peers' writing (Cui et al., 2022). This process benefits both the writer and the reviewer, fostering a deeper comprehension of language norms and communication tactics. By participating in peer revision, students can pinpoint common mistakes, draw lessons from each other's strengths and weaknesses, and collectively strive to enhance their overall writing proficiency in the L2 (Hanjani, 2024). By actively participating in discussions with their peers about their written work, students are given the opportunity to express their ideas and receive valuable feedback. This constructive criticism enables them to develop greater self-awareness and a deeper understanding of their writing skills, including their areas of strength and areas that require improvement.

7. Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

The main aim of the present research was to investigate the effect of teacher revision, peer revision and self-revision on the writing performance of EFL students. The results revealed that the best performance belonged to the peer revision group, and self-revision and teacher revision groups performed equally well. It can be concluded that using self-revision, peer revision, and teacher revision in L2 writing classes presents a comprehensive approach to enhancing writing skills. Self-revision prompts learners to critically assess their work, fostering autonomy and self-awareness while refining editing abilities. Peer revision cultivates collaboration and communication skills as students offer and

receive constructive feedback, benefiting from diverse perspectives and collective learning. Teacher revision offers expert guidance, providing tailored feedback and addressing specific language issues, ensuring students receive professional insights and suggestions for improvement. By incorporating these revision strategies, students can cultivate a well-rounded skillset in writing, acquiring confidence, proficiency, and a deeper comprehension of the writing process within a supportive and interactive classroom environment.

Based on the findings of the present study, some pedagogical implications are suggested. This study would give insights to L2 teachers and educators to incorporate feedback in general, and peer feedback, in particular, to improve L2 writing. Engaging in peer feedback not only exposes students to different perspectives on their writing but also helps them develop critical thinking and analytical skills. This process enables students to grasp various writing styles, structures, and language usage, ultimately enhancing the quality of their writing (Hung et al., 2016). Additionally, providing feedback to peers improves students' communication and collaboration skills, fostering a sense of community in the classroom. Through revising based on peer feedback, students can reflect on their writing strengths and weaknesses, leading to continuous improvement in language proficiency and writing abilities (Hsu et al., 2018). In conclusion, integrating peer feedback and revision in language learning empowers students to become more independent and confident writers, while creating a supportive and constructive learning environment.

It is important to highlight that the integration of all types of revision, including self-revision, peer revision, and teacher revision, in L2 writing classes offers a comprehensive approach to enhancing writing skills (Hung et al., 2016; Ndoye, 2017). Self-revision encourages learners to critically assess their work, promoting autonomy and self-awareness while honing editing abilities. Peer revision fosters collaboration and communication skills as students provide and receive constructive feedback, benefiting from diverse perspectives and collective learning. Teacher revision provides expert guidance, offering personalized feedback and addressing specific language issues, ensuring that students receive professional insights and suggestions for improvement. By incorporating these revision strategies, students can develop a well-rounded skill set in writing, gaining confidence, proficiency, and a deeper understanding of the writing process in a supportive and interactive classroom environment.

The limitations of the study are acknowledged. The study's duration was constrained, restricting the researchers' ability to observe the long-term effects of the different revision approaches on EFL learners' writing development. Additionally, the sample size and representativeness of the participants could be a concern, potentially affecting the statistical power and the broader applicability of the findings. Furthermore, the study may not be able to account for all the

relevant contextual factors that could influence the effectiveness of the revision methods, and the measurement of writing performance could be subject to subjective biases and inconsistencies. While acknowledging these limitations, the study's findings can still contribute valuable insights to the EFL community, and future research can build upon the initial results to address the identified challenges and further advance our understanding of effective writing instruction and feedback practices for EFL learners. There are some pathways for future research. One potential area could involve investigating the effects of various revision tasks, such as sentence-level editing, content revision, and organization restructuring, on language learners' writing development. Additionally, research could focus on combining different feedback modes with technological tools to offer feedback and revision assistance for language learners, particularly in online learning environments. Another potential direction for research could be examining the long-term effects of different revision practices on language learners' writing skills. Through exploring these less-explored areas, researchers can assist educators in customizing their instructional approaches to better facilitate students' writing growth.

Declarations

Funding

Not applicable.

Conflict of interest

The author has no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

Adachi, C., Tai, J. H. M., & Dawson, P. (2018). Academics' perceptions of the benefits and challenges of self and peer assessment in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* 43, 294–306. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1339775

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.

Chung, C. W., Chen, W. F., & Olson, D. R. (2021). Learning to revise: How online peer feedback facilitates revision. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *54*, 100780. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3178

Çinar, S. (2022). The role of teacher and learner in education. *International Journal of Education*, *Teaching, and Learning*, *4*(2), 129-138.

Cui, Y., Schunn, C. D., & Gai, X. (2022). Peer feedback and teacher feedback: a comparative study of revision effectiveness in writing instruction for EFL

learners. *Higher Education Research & Development, 41*(6), 1838–1854. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1969541

Dressler, R., Chu, M., Crossman, K., & Hilman, B. (2019). Quantity and quality of uptake: Examining surface and meaning-level feedback provided by peers and an instructor in a graduate research course. *Assessing Writing, 39*. 14-24. 10.1016/j.asw.2018.11.001.

Gonzalez-Torres, P., & Sarango, C. (2023). Effectiveness of teacher and peer feedback in EFL writing: a case of high school students. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 22*(4), 73-86. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.4.5

Hanjani, A. M. (2024). Comparing trained EFL peer reviewers' feedback: From claim to reality. *Assessing Writing*, *60*, 100836. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100836

Hsu, T. C., Chang, S. C., and Liu, N. C. (2018). Peer assessment of webpage design: behavioral sequential analysis based on eye tracking evidence. *Educational Technology & Society, 21*, 305–321.

Hung, Y. J., Samuelson, B. L., & Chen, S. C. (2016). "Relationships between peer-and self-assessment and teacher assessment of young EFL learners' oral presentations," in *Assessing Young Learners of English: Global and Local Perspectives*, ed M. Nikolov (Cham: Springer), 317–338.

Jiang, L., & Yu, S. (2021). Understanding changes in EFL teachers' feedback practice during COVID-19: Implications for teacher feedback literacy at a time of crisis. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *30*(6), 509-518. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00583-9

Jin, X., Jiang, Q., Xiong, W., Feng, Y., & Zhao, W. (2024). Effects of student engagement in peer feedback on writing performance in higher education. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *32*(1), 128-143.

Kim, Y., & Emeliyanova, L. (2019). The effects of written corrective feedback on the accuracy of L2 writing: comparing collaborative and individual revision behavior. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(2), 234-255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819831406

Lawrence J. E. (2019). *Writing prompts for English learners*. Independently published.

Levi Altstaedter, L. (2018). Investigating the impact of peer feedback in foreign language writing. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 12*(2), 137–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2015.1115052

Li, H., Zhang, L., & Parr, M. (2020). Small-group student talk before individual writing in tertiary English writing classrooms in China: nature and insights. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 570565. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.570565

Li, W., & Zhang, F. (2019). "A study of features and effects of self-regulated revision in literature review writing," in *Proceedings of the Conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL)*, Atlanta, GA.

Li, W., & Zhang, F. (2021). Tracing the path toward self-regulated revision: An interplay of instructor feedback, peer feedback, and revision goals. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 612088. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.612088

Li, X. (2020). A practical study of the "Process Approach" in writing teaching in the EFL class. *Advances in Higher Education,4,* 2630. https://doi.org/10.18686/ahe.v4i9.2630

Ndoye, A. (2017). Peer/self assessment and student learning. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *29*(2), 255-269.

Nielsen, K. (2019). Peer and self-assessment practices for writing across the curriculum: learner-differentiated effects on writing achievement. *Educational Review.* 73(6), 753-774. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1695104

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2014). Longman Academic writing series 3 paragraphs to Essays, with essential online resources by Alice Oshima. *Ann hogue (z-lib. org). pdf*.

Pham, T. N., Lin, M., Trinh, V. Q., & Bui, L. T. P. (2020). Electronic peer feedback, EFL academic writing and reflective thinking: Evidence from a Confucian context. *Sage Open*, *10*(1).https://doi.org/10.1177/215824402091455

Pourdana, N. and Tavassoli, K. (2022). Differential impacts of e-portfolio assessment on language learners' engagement modes and genre-based writing improvement. *Language Testing in Asia, 12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00156-7

Rahmani, P., Zoghi, M., & Davatgar, H. (2022). EFL learners' attitudes toward peer and self-assessment of descriptive type of writing: An exploratory sequential mixed-methods study. *Issues in Language Teaching*, *11*(2), 357-393. https://doi.org/10.22054/ilt.2023.66461.680

Rezaei, A. (2022). Cultivating Iranian IELTS candidates' writing skills through online peer feedback: A mixed-methods inquiry. *Educational Research International*, 6577979. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/6577979

Ruegg, R. (2015). The relative effects of peer and teacher feedback on improvement in EFL students' writing ability. *Linguistics and Education, 29*, 73–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.12.001

Safivand, A. (2021). *Impact of teacher's autonomy-supportive feedback on ENL students' writing performance and motivation*. University of Rochester.

Sangeetha, V. (2020). Inculcating self-editing skills for enhancing writing skills of the EFL students. *International Journal of Instruction, 13*(1), 509-322. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13133a

Sippel, L. (2024). Maximizing the benefits of peer interaction: Form-focused instruction and peer feedback training. *Language Teaching Research*, *28*(2), 413-439.

Tai, H. C., Lin, W. C., & Yang, S. C. (2015). Exploring the effects of peer review and teachers' corrective feedback on EFL students' online writing performance. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *53*(2), 284-309. https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633115597490

Tao, Z. (2020). Strategies for cultivating students' critical thinking ability in teaching college English writing. *Frontiers in Educational Research,* 3, 131–137. https://doi.org/10.25236/FER.2020.031322

Tian, L., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Learner engagement with automated feedback, peer feedback and teacher feedback in an online EFL writing context. *System*, *91*, 102247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102247

Yu, S., Zhang, Y., Zheng, Y., Yuan, K., and Zhang, L. (2019). Understanding student engagement with peer feedback on master's theses: A Macau study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*, 50–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1467879

Zhang, F. (2018). *A Study of Students' Self-Regulated Revision on English Writing from A Socio-Cognitive perspective.* Ph.D. thesis, Northeast Normal University, Changchun.

Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. *Assessing writing*, *15*(1), 3-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.01.002