

مجلة أكاديمية شمال
أوروبا المحكمة للدراسات
والبحوث التربوية والإنسانية
- الدنمارك -

العدد : 22

13/01/2024

إستخدام التصحيح الذاتي وتصحيح الأقران لتعزيز القدرة على الكتابة لدى طلاب الجامعات
Using Self- and Peer-Correction to Enhance College Students' Writing Ability

prepared by



Dr. Wijdan Mohieldeen Mohammed Suliman
Department of English Language & Translation
College of Science and Arts at Al Asyah
Qassim University
Saudi Arabia
w.suliman@qu.edu.sa

Abstract

This study examines the effects of self-correction and peer-correction strategies on the writing proficiency of students enrolled in foreign language courses at college of Sciences and Arts at Alasyah in Saudi Arabia . Furthermore, it investigates the function of error codes and error records in enhancing students' cognizance of linguistic errors in their written work, the relationship between self-determination and the efficacy of these strategies in the context of inclusive education policies in Saudi Arabia. This study adds to the literature on the potential advantages that students, specifically those with diverse learning needs, can derive from self-correction and peer-correction strategies in a foreign language classroom. Additionally, it illuminates the potential impact of cultural factors on the execution of these approaches. It applies the Wehmeyer's (1996) Functional Model of Self-Determination to evaluate students' success and adaptability in an inclusive education environment. The novelty of this study lies in its concentration on Saudi Arabian students with hearing impairments, a group that has been relatively neglected in prior scholarly investigations. The study findings have practical implications for Saudi higher education policy and the provision of services for hearing-impaired students, both of which are also discussed here.

Keywords: *peer correction – writing -foreign language, college students*

Introduction

The significance of possessing advanced foreign language communication skills has increased consequent to the recent trend of globalization. This statement is even more apt with respect to higher education, a stage where students often face the challenge of articulating their ideas in a logical and persuasive fashion in a foreign language. Development of writing skills among college students enrolled in foreign language courses is an essential aspect of foreign language education (Al-Ahdal & Abduh, 2021; Menke & Anderson, 2019). The integration of error codes and error records, alongside the implementation of self-correction and peer-correction strategies makes this learning process more effective as these inspire foreign language students to engage in a process of self-reflection and self-improvement while navigating the complexities of foreign language writing (Kadri & Hamada, 2018). Thus, the method has far-reaching ramifications for the field of foreign language education, surpassing the individual benefits of self- and peer-correction. It also underscores the importance of allocating consistent writing instruction throughout the week during class periods.

Most language classrooms, and foreign language classrooms more than the others, place greater emphasis on imparting content rather than developing specific language proficiencies (Hall, 2017). However, this study highlights the significance of devoting time and resources to the methodical advancement of writing processes. Instructors can allocate class time for these activities and integrate self-correction and peer-correction practices into the curriculum to create an environment that encourages students to actively investigate the intricacies of language and writing. This shift in pedagogical emphasis is consistent with the notion that foreign language

instruction should not only impart knowledge but also develop students' language skills so that they can communicate with confidence and efficacy. By analyzing the progression of writing proficiency among college students over the course of a semester, this study explores the field of foreign language education. An enhanced understanding of linguistic errors among students is cultivated through the deliberate application of self-correction and peer-correction methods in addition to the utilization of error codes and error logs (Luna López, 2021). An important consequence of students developing a sense of ownership over their language learning and critical self-evaluations is a substantial enhancement in their writing abilities (Jamrus & Razali, 2019). Furthermore, recognizing the critical nature of writing proficiency in facilitating effective communication in a foreign language, highlights the importance of dedicating consistent class time to writing instruction. Given the escalating level of global interconnectivity, the findings of this study are particularly relevant; they offer insightful perspectives that can be applied to enhance and direct foreign language instruction in a variety of contexts, including Saudi Arabia's educational system.

Review of literature

Peer Learning, peer correction, and self-correction

Peer correction, also known as peer editing or peer feedback, is a process in which fellow students assess and offer constructive criticism on the written compositions of one another (Patchan & Schunn, 2015). Academic settings frequently employ this approach in an effort to enhance students' writing skills. Considerable scholarly inquiry has been devoted to examining the effectiveness of peer correction, revealing its positive impacts on students' writing proficiency (Kang & Han, 2015). When assessing and offering constructive criticism on the work of their peers, learners augment their understanding of foundational tenets of structure, syntax, and conventions of written communication (Hyland, 2019). Active participation facilitates the ability of individuals to identify and rectify their own mistakes. Students can develop a sense of perspective, self-assurance, and critical thinking skills by reading texts composed by their peers (Ferris, 2003). Peer correction in the realm of writing involves students evaluating and offering constructive criticism on each other's written projects, generally within the confines of a classroom setting (Nilson, 2016). Ferris (2003) has discerned pivotal elements concerning peer correction in the realm of second language writing, as per his investigation. The author places significant emphasis on the fact that peer correction not only benefits the students receiving the corrections but also presents a substantial learning opportunity for those providing the feedback. Engaging in the process of assessing and correcting the written work of their peers enhances students' comprehension of writing conventions, grammatical usage, and vocabulary (Lee, 2017). In order for peer correction to be effective, it is necessary to provide students with clear and specific instructions regarding which aspects of the writing should be highlighted. Instructors may delegate the task of identifying grammatical errors, identifying organizational issues, or evaluating the application of specific vocabulary to peers (Link et al., 2022). Ferris (2003) emphasizes the importance of maintaining a balanced state of mind between identifying

mistakes and offering constructive criticism. While it is critical to identify errors, fostering an environment that is constructive and supportive for peer correction can be enhanced by acknowledging the writer's strengths (Tai et al., 2015). Furthermore, it is imperative that students are motivated to revise their work subsequent to receiving feedback from their peers. Implementing the recommendations and rectifications they receive throughout the revision process; they will ultimately enhance their writing capabilities.

Peer correction, apart from its inherent benefits, is universally acknowledged as an essential element in the language acquisition process. By offering supplementary input throughout the language acquisition process, it has the potential to augment the feedback provided by the instructor (Blake, 2013).

The domain of expertise concerning language acquisition is undergoing a shift from being solely occupied by language instructors to one that places greater emphasis on the needs and interests of the students. Peer feedback is widely recognized as a critical source of input, alongside instructor and self-assessment, in academic environments like English as a Second Language (ESL). Peer correction has been highlighted by Edge (1989) as a means to promote active linguistic thought among students through the identification of the most effective forms of expression. Furthermore, this exercise provides instructors with the opportunity to assess students' understanding of grammatical rules through their involvement in correcting each other's mistakes. Moreover, peer correction fosters a transformation in the educational path of students, wherein they become more dependent on their peers as opposed to their instructors, thus developing a sense of autonomy. To mitigate potential complications and maximize benefits, Topping et al. (2017) suggest specific protocols and principles. This includes the creation of assignments that genuinely encourage cooperation and interaction among students, the establishment of relatively small groups to ensure fair and active participation, and the establishment of clear responsibilities among students participating in peer tutoring to facilitate efficient assistance for their fellow learners throughout their academic trajectory. By incorporating these methodologies collectively, the role of peer correction in enhancing students' writing abilities and fostering a supportive academic environment is evident.

Amongst contemporary pedagogical approaches, self-correction has emerged as a prominent practice in conjunction with conventional error correction and instructor-provided feedback. Self-correction, as defined by Cameron et al. (2005), is an indirect mode of instruction in which instructors provide students with alternatives that empower them to recognize and correct their own mistakes. In the end, it is the instructor's responsibility to accurately identify the problems, taking into account the linguistic and writing abilities of the students. Self-correction is a fundamental component of the writing process, which entails a comprehensive examination and revision of one's work to identify and address errors, enhance coherence, and elevate the overall standard of writing (Shpit, 2022). Metalinguistic awareness is a critical component of writing self-correction. It entails the deliberate contemplation and manipulation of language as an object of scrutiny.

Error detection is an additional critical element by which authors identify and correct the discrepancies between the written content and the intended message (Leacock et al., 2022) which may manifest in various ways, including grammatical errors, misspellings, improper word usage, or awkward sentence construction. This self-correction is an iterative process in which authors revise and amend their own work on numerous occasions in order to improve its overall quality with each revision cycle (Escorcía et al., 2017). Peer or editor feedback can significantly impact this procedure, as can the degree of self-correction is influenced by the writing medium, the language proficiency of the author, and the purpose of the writing (Aghajani & Zoghipour, 2018). The degree to which writers develop their self-correction abilities differs, with seasoned writers generally exhibiting more robust self-monitoring and self-correction capabilities in contrast to inexperienced writers.

The role of correction codes begins the moment an error is identified. Correction codes are highly beneficial instruments comprising a structured system of symbols, abbreviations, or notations that are employed by educators, editors, or scholars to discern and annotate errors or mistakes (Bhavya et al., 2022). Their utility extends to a variety of critical functions. To begin with, correction codes empower educators or editors to accurately pinpoint the precise location and characteristics of errors present in a given text, thereby assisting students or authors in developing a more comprehensive understanding of their errors. Additionally, using these improves operational effectiveness by eliminating the need for extensive explanations of individual errors (Wiegmann & Shappell, 2017). This results in time saving for instructors and furnishes students with succinct points of reference to help them review their mistakes. Furthermore, these codes enhance lucidity by providing concise annotations that specify the precise nature of the error, thereby eliminating the need for extensive explanations. In conclusion, correction codes guarantee consistency by providing a standardized method for identifying errors, thereby ensuring that feedback on diverse written or assessment materials remains consistent and interpretable (Sovacool et al., 2018).

Error logs supplement the correction codes: they refer to comprehensive records or methodical documentation of linguistic errors committed by individuals as they occur in written or spoken form (Han, 2019). These records serve a multitude of objectives, such as language analysis, investigations into language acquisition, and instruction in languages (Chun et al., 2016). In the context of written accuracy, students have the option to supplement error codes with an error record. The students involved in the current study documented the number of errors they committed under different error categories—including punctuation, subject-verb agreement, word selection, and verb tense—in the error log.

Research Gap

Literature on the effectiveness of self-correction and peer-correction strategies in collegiate foreign language courses to enhance writing abilities is deficient in the Saudi context. While

there have been scholarly inquiries into language education in Saudi Arabia, little attention has been paid to pedagogical approaches such as self-correction and peer-correction, as they pertain to college courses in the second and third semesters. Furthermore, the implementation and results of these strategies may be significantly influenced by the cultural and educational subtleties that are unique to classrooms in Saudi Arabia, when compared to other regions. Given the unique obstacles and prospects that arise within this framework, it is necessary to conduct empirical investigations that scrutinize the effectiveness of self-correction and peer-correction approaches in collegiate settings in Saudi Arabia.

Research Questions

1. To what extent do self-correction and peer-correction strategies impact the development of writing skills among college students in foreign language classrooms?
2. How does the use of error codes and error logs contribute to students' awareness of linguistic errors in their writing?

Method

A convenience sample of twenty-two students from the College of Sciences and Arts at Alasyah in Qassim University, between the age groups 19 to 22, participated in the investigation. All these students were registered for English courses throughout the second semester of the 2022-2023 academic year. The participants were duly apprised of the study's aims and their informed consent to participate was obtained. Data were collected electronically to optimize efficiency and safeguard the anonymity of the participants. Emphasis was placed on upholding participant confidentiality and ethical considerations throughout the entirety of the procedure.

Instruments

A 25-item questionnaire was administered to evaluate levels of self-determination in accordance with Wehmeyer's (1996) Functional Model of Self-Determination. Four crucial domains were addressed in this survey: self-actualization, self-control, independence, and psychological empowerment. One of these dimensions was the intended measurement for each item in the questionnaire. The items comprising the questionnaire were deliberately chosen to guarantee lucidity and congruence with the particular facets of self-determination that were being examined. One open-ended question was also included in the questionnaire. The research utilized two out of the four written assignments provided in the course manual. In a planned task, participants were tasked with composing a paragraph delineating their preferred cuisine. In the second assignment, they were tasked with composing an essay pertaining to their preferred location. Essays were then randomly redistributed amongst the participants, and they were asked to examine them using the correction codes they were trained to use and log them onto the error logs. In a second phase, participants were asked to write the other two prescribed essays after going through the correction codes and error logs from the previous cycle. The writing quality as

well as the effectiveness of self-correction and peer-correction strategies were examined across these two writing cycles.

Ethical Consideration

In this investigation, ethical considerations were given paramount significance throughout the questionnaire administration procedure. Prior to their participation, all 22 students who were matriculated in the College of Sciences and Arts at Alasyah in Qassim University were furnished with thorough and inclusive information concerning the research's aims and purposes. All participants were adequately apprised of the details and granted informed assent, thus ensuring their voluntary agreement to partake in the study. The participants were duly informed of the voluntary nature of their involvement, and they maintained full autonomy to withdraw from the study without incurring any adverse repercussions. To ensure the protection of the participants' privacy, the responses were rendered confidential by anonymizing the data. In addition, the candidates were provided with detailed instructions regarding the procedure for completing and submitting the survey. Every concern and question that arose during the process was promptly addressed, and participants were encouraged to seek additional clarification when needed. To ensure compliance with the principles of ethical research conduct and to protect the autonomy and rights of the participants throughout the investigation, this approach was utilized.

Data Analysis

To investigate the research inquiries and postulates, this study employed a combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches during the data analysis phase. The quantitative data were constituted of the following variables: gender, academic level, type of hearing loss, and specialty. These characteristics were collected through the use of a 25-item survey. By applying descriptive and inferential statistical methods, an analysis was conducted on these data. Through the application of descriptive statistics, including measures of variability and central tendency, a synopsis of the data was produced. Utilizing inferential statistics such as ANOVA and t-tests, distinctions between groups in relation to the aforementioned variables were examined. The primary aim of conducting these statistical analyses was to identify any significant correlations or differences that were relevant to the research questions. The collection of qualitative and quantitative data was facilitated by the inclusion of open-ended questions in the survey. The responses provided by the participants underwent thematic analysis, which is a systematic process employed to identify recurring themes or patterns within the responses. Thematic analysis consisted of multiple stages, including data categorization, theme identification, and interpretation. The researcher conducted a comprehensive analysis and categorization of the responses with the intention of extracting noteworthy insights from the qualitative data. Through the integration of findings derived from qualitative and quantitative analyses, a thorough comprehension of the research inquiries was attained. By employing a triangulation approach involving qualitative and quantitative data, the study aimed to offer a more comprehensive and nuanced comprehension of the impacts of peer-correction and self-correction strategies, the utilization of error codes and error logs, and the correlation between self-determination and the effectiveness of correction strategies within the context of inclusive education policies in Saudi

Arabia. The data analysis procedure was carried out precisely, in adherence to the study's research objectives. By combining qualitative thematic analysis with quantitative statistical methods, the research strategy extracted insightful information from the responses of participants and numerical data. The implementation of this all-encompassing approach enabled a more comprehensive understanding of the results of the research.

Findings and Results

The error code rubric that was given to the students included symbols for 25 different problems, including run-on sentences, connectors, incorrect word order, connections, and spelling issues. The highest rates of errors were made by 11 students, while ten students committed five different types of errors at the lowest rate. It was interesting to note that, despite the fact that some students clearly possessed a higher level of English competence, they committed some of the most worrisome blunders. Six sorts of mistakes were made by three students, these pertained to word choice, unclear phrases, verb forms, and missing words. The researcher thought that while some of the errors were real difficulties for the learner, others, such as imprecise sentences and missing words, would be resolved if the student gained a better understanding of their audiences and were pushed to express their views more clearly in writing.

Table 1. Table of the Quantitative Result

Quantitative Findings	Key Statistics or Observations
Types of Errors	- 25 different problems identified (e.g., run-on sentences, connectors, word order, spelling)
Highest Error Rates	- 11 students had the highest error rates
Lowest Error Rates	- 10 students had the lowest error rates for five different types of errors
Common Writing Mistakes	- Most common mistakes: word choice, verb form, missing words
Error Persistence	- Similar kinds of errors persisted across various assignments
Impact of Error Analysis and Correction Strategies	- Exercises and discussions led to improved error recognition and correction
Improvement Over Assignments	- Some students reduced errors between first and final drafts
Changes in Error Count Between Assignments	- Two cases had the same error count in both first and final manuscripts
Revision Process Impact	- Students engaged in the revision process to detect and fix errors
Encouragement of Writing	- Students were motivated to write more and take chances to express themselves
Peer and Self-Correction Benefits	- Peer and self-correction strategies raised students' awareness of writing as a process

The word choice, verb form, and missing words were the most often made mistakes in the four writings that the participants provided. It was also discovered that similar kinds of errors persisted throughout the various assignments.

With the aid of this information, the teacher was able to develop exercises that would allow the students to practice the three different types of errors and express any uncertainties they may have had about them. These exercises included taking passages from the texts and sharing them with the class to discuss potential corrections and justifications for changing the word or verb forms. Some grammatical tasks were suggested for students to complete. However, these were only recommendations. Therefore, the students may or may not have complied.

On the other hand, in the second cycle, students never made the kind of blunder that involved uncertain parts. It is crucial to remember that the texts were peer and self-corrected, nevertheless. Therefore, the instructor hadn't yet provided feedback. As a result, the teacher might have discovered other mistakes that the students overlooked.

One could say that student 4 had the highest level of proficiency and only made one kind of mistake at a time. In other words, she only committed each of the six categories of errors she made once, although at various times. For instance, the missing word error in the final version of Assignment 1 was effectively self-corrected in the initial draft when there were errors in word form and subject-verb agreement. The same thing happened with the second Assignment, when the student made a word order mistake in the first draft, a word choice mistake, and a run-on sentence in the final draft. As a result of the students' extensions of their compositions at each level, which could have led to more unsupervised errors, we believe that various errors appear in different versions of the Assignment.

Table 2. Table of Qualitative Result

Qualitative Findings	Key Points/Themes
Types of Errors Identified	- Run-on sentences, connectors, incorrect word order, connections, and spelling issues were common.
	- Some errors seemed outdated despite students' English competence.
	- Six types of mistakes included word choice, unclear phrases, verb forms, and missing words.
Persistence of Errors	- Word choice, verb form, and missing words were consistently made errors across assignments.
Error Correction Strategies	- Teacher developed exercises to practice error types and encourage clear expression.
	- Students shared passages for class discussion on potential corrections and justifications.
	- Some grammatical tasks were recommended but not mandatory.
Student Proficiency	- Student 4 demonstrated higher proficiency and made errors in each category at different times.

Variability in Error Count	- Errors varied in number between the first and second assignments.
	- Five participants reduced errors, two had consistent error counts, and others improved.
	- More accuracy observed in the most recent iteration of Assignment 2.
Student Motivation and Writing Process	- Projects drove students to write more, experiment with language, and express themselves.
Revision Process	- Students engaged in detecting, categorizing, and fixing errors in the second draft.
Awareness of Writing Process and Correction Tools	- Emphasis on peer and self-correction aimed to raise awareness of the writing process.
	- Collaboration among peers facilitated ease in working together and addressing challenges.

It was found that the participants' errors varied in terms of the number of errors recorded in the error log between the first and second cycles of writing. Five participants showed a reduction in their mistakes, making one to six less errors. Both the first and second cycle outputs contained the same number of errors in two cases. In contrast, they were more accurate in the most recent iterations of Assignment 2. The participant only ever added one in the first draft of Assignment 1 and kept the same number of errors in the final versions of Assignment 2 in that one occasion. The last participant's change from writing a very restricted and condensed first text to a more accessible, longer piece may have contributed to her making more errors in the second than she did in the first. Between the two writing cycles, the peer and self-correction based on correction codes and error logs seemed to drive students to write more and take more chances because they valued the ability to try out new terms because they allowed them to express themselves.

Students also went through the revision process, which entails detecting, categorizing, and fixing errors, when they wrote in the second cycle of the exercise. Even though the quantity and frequency of mistakes are crucial indicators of progress, a more significant outcome was sought after—raising students' awareness of writing as a process and exposing them to the advantages of peer and self-correction in the hope that they will continue to use these steps and tools in their upcoming academic writing assignments.

In other words, because classmates shared the same academic standing, they were more at ease working on each other's writing, asking questions when they were uncertain, and coming up with and offering answers to both their own and their peers' challenges.

The comprehensive outcomes derived from the quantitative and qualitative components of this research illuminate the intricate characteristics of error analysis, correction methodologies, and their influence on the growth of writing proficiency among college students enrolled in foreign language courses. The study's quantitative findings unveiled an exhaustive enumeration of 25 distinct categories of errors, comprising concerns such as misspellings and run-on sentences. Not

only did learners with comparatively lower English proficiency commit these errors, but students with comparatively higher language competence also exhibited behaviors reminiscent of earlier phases of language acquisition. It became evident that specific errors, including imprecise sentences and omissions of words, could be corrected by developing a more profound comprehension of audience awareness and employing clearer expression. The qualitative results provided significant insights into the recurrence of errors in diverse assignments; in particular, word selection, verb conjugation, and omissions of words consistently emerged as prominent concerns. However, the instructor's proactive engagement, which encompassed the creation of error correction activities and collaborative discourse, led to enhanced error identification and rectification. Furthermore, the significance of peer and self-correction as efficacious mechanisms for enhancing students' consciousness regarding the writing process was emphasized by the qualitative data. Additionally, the research emphasized the personal development of pupils, as certain individuals exhibited a decline in errors during the process of honing their writing abilities. Particularly extraordinary was the level of proficiency demonstrated by Student 4, who addressed various error categories at different times and exemplified self-correction mastery. Moreover, the findings revealed that tasks that granted students the opportunity to expand upon their compositions promoted a greater output of writing, cultivating an atmosphere in which pupils were at ease utilizing language in an unconventional manner and articulating their thoughts. The synthesis of qualitative and quantitative data highlights the complex nature of error detection and rectification in foreign language classrooms. The results underscore the significance of utilizing targeted exercises, fostering peer collaboration, and encouraging self-correction as means to enhance writing abilities, regardless of the starting language proficiency of the students. Furthermore, the research emphasizes the significance of fostering a writing environment that promotes innovation and self-expression, all the while preserving a profound understanding of linguistic subtleties. In conclusion, these results provide significant knowledge for instructors who are interested in improving the efficacy of writing courses in classrooms where foreign languages are studied

Conclusion

Writing as a process approach, self and peer correction, and other valuable techniques may all be applied to the writing assignments found in standard English textbooks, and it can be concluded from this classroom experience. Through peer and self-correction, students learn to recognize their errors and make the necessary corrections. Moreover, they feel in command of their own education, this raises their level of independence from the instructor in contrast to what typically occurs in the classroom, where teachers show the common prevalent mistakes detected. It also motivates students to focus on their own mistakes in the tasks. Regarding assessment by peers, it has been noticed the students gave their partners guidance in an excellent, courteous way that gave them the chance to validate or disprove what they thought was right or wrong. Because the feedback was provided by a peer, the evaluation could occasionally be incorrect, but because the students were in the vicinity, they could question the student who gave the feedback for the explanation, and with the teacher's assistance, they could determine who was correct, resulting in learning. It was also noted that the students improved their evaluation and analytical abilities

starting with the second cycle because the number of errors decreased. Errors in pronouns, capitalization, spelling, and the rest that were made only once were all simple to fix. Even if peer and self-correction only somewhat aid students in improving their texts, the teacher will still have more time concentrating on problems that the students haven't been able to fix on their own. With the assistance of numerous sources, including error correction tools (the error log and error code), input from their peers and teachers, as well as their prior knowledge, the methodical processes of peer and self-correction helped students improve their writing abilities. The development of a learning community where everyone contributes to one another's learning may be the outcome of this formative mentality.

The study has been considered as an experimental, thus the researcher is not able to assert that peer and self-correction led to appreciable advancement. Nevertheless, during fulfillment semester, students were incredibly confident giving and taking peer critique, and attitudes toward writing appeared to develop. The researcher thinks that additional research should be done on both these procedures and their results. To achieve this, more English teachers in different program might receive training in the self- and peer-correction techniques as well as the writing as a process method. As a result, there is a better opportunity of examining their effects on the growth of writing skills and of giving learners consistency and homogeneity (at least to the extent possible and appropriate) in the method of handling errors and writing. This is particularly necessary in our situation since many of the students are aspiring English language teachers tasked with encouraging better literacy in their future students.

Recommendations

Students' writing abilities may be significantly improved through the implementation of continuous writing instruction that includes both self-correction and peer-correction strategies, according to the findings of this study. This shift in pedagogical emphasis aligns with the principles of foreign language education, which place greater emphasis on fostering students' language proficiency for effective communication rather than mere information transmission. By encouraging students to actively participate in the complexities of language and writing, this pedagogical approach develops a deeper understanding of linguistic errors and how to correct them. In the context of Saudi higher education, where English is often taught as a foreign language, the application of these strategies could potentially assist students in overcoming linguistic barriers and participating confidently in academic and occupational discussions. Furthermore, considering Saudi Arabia's endeavors to enhance its global reputation, the necessity for increasingly proficient English communication skills grows. By incorporating and applying these methodologies across diverse academic environments, one can potentially enhance student involvement, cultivate superior writing skills, and elevate language acquisition achievements. This study emphasizes the capacity of self-correction and peer-correction strategies to enhance writing aptitude in the context of foreign language instruction and bolster the effectiveness of inclusive education endeavors. Through the promotion of active participation and self-reliance,

educators possess the capacity to enable students to take charge of their own language acquisition endeavors and attain accomplishments in their vocational and academic endeavors.

Limitations

This study acknowledges several limitations that should be duly considered when interpreting the findings. It is important to acknowledge that while the study's limitations enabled the practical selection of twenty-two students as the sample size, this figure may not accurately represent the attributes of the entire college student body. The utilization of the convenience sampling method, which entailed participant selection predicated on their availability and voluntary engagement, introduces the possibility of bias. Moreover, it is important to note that the study's scope was restricted to a specific group of college students who were residents of Saudi Arabia. This limitation may hinder the generalizability of the findings to different educational or cultural contexts. Additionally, it is critical to mention that the data employed in this study were collected through self-report questionnaires, which is a response bias-prone technique that may not consistently reflect the students' actual behaviors and experiences. Due to the possibility that self-correction and peer-correction strategies will elicit varying responses from diverse student populations, it is prudent to exercise caution when interpreting the findings of this research in light of these limitations. To enhance the study's representativeness and overcome these limitations, future research should consider employing larger and more diverse samples, along with incorporating additional data sources such as interviews and observations, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the impacts of these strategies on writing proficiency.

References

1. Aghajani, M., & Zoghi-pour, M. (2018). *The comparative effect of online self-correction, peer-correction, and teacher correction in descriptive writing tasks on intermediate EFL learners' grammar knowledge the prospect of mobile assisted language learning (MALL)*. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 7(3), 14-22.
2. Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H., & Abduh, M. Y. M. (2021). *English writing proficiency and apprehensions among Saudi College students: Facts and remedies*. TESOL international journal, 16(1), 34-56.
3. Bhavya, B., Chen, S., Zhang, Z., Li, W., Zhai, C., Angrave, L., & Huang, Y. (2022). *Exploring collaborative caption editing to augment video-based learning*. Educational technology research and development, 70(5), 1755-1779.
4. Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). *The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing*. Journal of Second Language Writing, 14(3), 191-205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001>.
5. Blake, R. J. (2013). *Brave new digital classroom: Technology and foreign language learning*. Georgetown University Press.
6. Chun, D., Kern, R., & Smith, B. (2016). *Technology in language use, language teaching, and language learning*. The Modern Language Journal, 100(S1), 64-80.
7. Divsar, H., & Heydari, R. (2017). *A corpus-based study of EFL learners' errors in IELTS essay writing*. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 6(3), 143-149.
8. Edge, J. (1989). *Mistakes and Correction*. Addison Wesley: Longman
9. Escorcía, D., Passerault, J. M., Ros, C., & Pylouster, J. (2017). *Profiling writers: analysis of writing dynamics among college students*. Metacognition and Learning, 12, 233-273.
10. Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Routledge.
11. Hall, G. (2017). *Exploring English language teaching: language in action*. Routledge.
12. Han, Y. (2019). *Written corrective feedback from an ecological perspective: The interaction between the context and individual learners*. System, 80, 288-303.
13. Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
14. Jamrus, M. H. M., & Razali, A. B. (2019). *Using self-assessment as a tool for English language learning*. English Language Teaching, 12(11), 64-73.
15. Kadri, S., & Hamada, H. (2018). *The effect of blended learning on EFL learners' motivation and academic writing abilities* (Doctoral dissertation) Université Frères Mentouri-Constantine.
16. 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.

17. Leacock, C., Gamon, M., Mejia, J. A., & Chodorow, M. (2022). **Automated grammatical error detection for language learners**. Springer Nature.
18. Link, S., Mehrzad, M., & Rahimi, M. (2022). **Impact of automated writing evaluation on teacher feedback**, student revision, and writing improvement. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(4), 605-634.
19. Luna López, T. (2021). **The use of peer-correction strategies to improve speaking skills when learning English as a foreign language (Doctoral dissertation)**. Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León.
20. Menke, M. R., & Anderson, A. M. (2019). **Student and faculty perceptions of writing in a foreign language studies major**. *Foreign Language Annals*, 52(2), 388-412.
21. Nilson, L. B. (2016). **Teaching at its best: A research-based resource for college instructors**. John Wiley & Sons.
22. Patchan, M. M., & Schunn, C. D. (2015). **Understanding the benefits of providing peer feedback: how students respond to peers' texts of varying quality**. *Instructional Science*, 43, 591-614.
23. Shpit, E. I. (2022). **The use of Coh-Metrix by individual Russian novice writers for developing self-assessment and self-correction skills**. *International Journal of English for Specific Purposes*, 3(1), 6-33.
24. Sovacool, B. K., Axsen, J., & Sorrell, S. (2018). **Promoting novelty, rigor, and style in energy social science: Towards codes of practice for appropriate methods and research design**. *Energy research & social science*, 45, 12-42.
25. 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.
26. Topping, K., Buchs, C., Duran, D., & Van Keer, H. (2017). **Effective peer learning: From principles to practical implementation**. Taylor & Francis.
27. Wehmeyer, M. L. (1996). **Self-determination as an educational outcome: Why is it important to children, youth and adults with disabilities?** In D.J. Sands & M. L. Wehmeyer (Eds.), *Self-determination across the life span: Independence and choice for people with disabilities* (pp. 17-36). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
28. Wiegmann, D. A., & Shappell, S. A. (2017). **A human error approach to aviation accident analysis: The human factors analysis and classification system**. Routledge.

APPENDIX A: ERROR CODE (ZEMACH & RUMISEK, 2003)

sp = spelling	The boy was <u>afeared</u> of the dog. (afraid)
wf = word form	They were <u>education</u> in many different countries. (educated)
wc = word choice	We bought the rug after <u>describing</u> the price. (discussing)
wo = word order	Mona is <u>reading always</u> on her bed. (is always reading)
sing = singular noun	John works as an investment <u>brokers</u> . (broker)
pl = plural noun	There are many <u>advantage</u> of living abroad. (advantages)
art = article	<u>A</u> enthusiastic employee is an asset for a company. (An)
inf = too informal	The committee is not gonna change the plans of the project. (going to)
? = meaning unclear	The government plans to create every child goes to school. (plans to create a fund allowing every child to go to school)
pron = pronoun	The company's profits continue to be good, so it will expand <u>you</u> product line. (its)
s / v = subject/verb agreement	Several people from my country <u>attends</u> the class. (attend)
v-tense = verb tense	Last year, we <u>go</u> to visit relatives in a neighboring city. (went)
v-form = verb form	I <u>will be go</u> to the dentist next week. (will go)
v-pass = passive verb	The workers <u>forced</u> to work for twelve hours by management. (were forced)
cs = comma splice	The store ended its sale, it marked the remaining goods. (...sale, and it).
ro = run-on sentence	If the temperature drops, the lake will <u>freeze last year</u> it froze for several months. (...freeze. Last year...)
frag = fragment	<u>Because the cinema was old and no longer in use.</u> (Because...in use, it was closed and the property was sold.)
co = connecting word	<i>Examples:</i> <u>While</u> we finished dinner, we went to meet the new neighbors. (After) The laboratory lacks modern equipment, <u>or</u> it is still used for many experiments. (but)
Inf = ger = infinitive/gerund line through	The law attempts ending smoking in all public building. (to end)
Word = delete	
prep = preposition	Donations were given <u>into</u> the charity. (to)
punct = punctuation	The summer is long hot and humid (...long, hot, and...)
C = capitalization	The <u>white house</u> is the place of residence for the president of the United States. (White House)
π = start a new paragraph	
^ = add a word	Completion ^ the project is expected in six to eight months. (Completion of the projects...)(prep)

Appendix B: Error Log (Zemach & Rumisek, 2003)

Assignment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Type of error									
sp									
wf									
wc									
wo									
sing									
pl									
art									
inf									
?									
pron									
s/v									
v-tense									
v-form									
v-pass									
cs									
ro									
frag									
co									
Infin/ger									
x									
prep									
punct									
c									
¶									