

THE EFFECT OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK VIA A COMPUTERIZED COURSE ON OMANI EFL LEARNERS' WRITING PERFORMANCE

Ali AL GHAITHI

ORCID: 0000-0002-9653-508X
Foundation Department
Sohar University
Sohar, OMAN

Behnam BEHFOROZ

ORCID: 0000-0002-0078-2757
English Language Center
University of Technology and Applied Sciences
Shinas, OMAN

Received: 18/11/2021 **Accepted:** 28/04/2022

ABSTRACT

The present research investigates the efficiency of corrective feedback on learners' writing performance through electronic platforms. 94 Omani English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners were selected based on their assessment results. They were randomly assigned into one experimental group and one control group, including 47 students. Both groups were pretested by a writing test to collect the required data. The experimental group then received the treatment using corrective feedback, whereas the control group received only corrective input on the forms and structures of the final draft. A survey was distributed among the experimental group's participants to elicit the students' attitudes toward corrective feedback. The Mann-Whitney U test for comparing the control and experimental groups showed a significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups. Corrective feedback had a statistically significant effect on EFL learners' writing performance. Besides, the survey findings showed that participants emphasized the importance of receiving corrective feedback from their teachers. The current study results can have implications for teachers to implement more feedback sessions on students' writing tasks and other skills equally.

Keywords: Corrective feedback, computerized course, writing, EFL performance.

INTRODUCTION

Writing skill as a process motivates the learners to think, manage, and then generate ideas in the shape of a writing composition for the interactional purposes between the reader and the writer. Thus, a text writer should be able to produce the language correctly, organize the created writing well, and deduct the errors to avoid misunderstanding by the reader (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Khadawardi, 2020). Some researchers (e.g., Banaruee, 2016; Richards & Renandya, 2002) have clearly stated that writing skills can be considered one of the most challenging language learning and teaching areas. They also noted that the skills dealing with writing tasks are highly complicated if the learner's level of proficiency is not high. Therefore, the most crucial challenge is whether the errors or mistakes in the writing should be ignored or corrected. Banaruee and Askari (2016) stated that there is no guarantee of the effectiveness of existing feedback strategies on the learners' skills. They believe that the available literature and findings are not conclusive. The precise point is that the written correction feedback has recently received attention from many scholars (Bitchener & Storch, 2016; Papi et al., 2020). Mendez and Cruz (2012) stated that errors are considered something that must be

avoided or prevented. Based on Han's (2008) words, although correcting errors needs some types of direct and evident feedback, corrective feedback is a broad term that provides some general clues and corrections.

Leki (2001) asserted that implementing corrective feedback on the learners writing by teachers and students to fix the issues is a painstaking task in a foreign language (FL) context. One of the reasons for such a problem is selecting appropriate strategies for error feedback on writing skills. Most researchers have tried to provide and familiarize teachers with suitable existing strategies for giving feedback on learners' writing. The teachers are encouraged to practice the best technique of giving feedback, which helps learners practically implement, revise and edit their manuscripts. The learning environment can be considered an important factor in selecting the best corrective feedback strategies.

Whether the role of corrective feedback is discussed theoretically or empirically, the major issue is to understand the processes and procedures in a real FL learning class and how these theories are implemented authentically on the tasks (Mendez & Cruz, 2012). They also stated that the corrective feedback problems are categorized as follows: Firstly, the strategies used for the corrective feedback are inconsistent, ambiguous, or ineffective from the teacher's side (Allwright, 1975; Chaudron, 1977; Long, 1977). Secondly, teachers may provide non-systematic random feedback on the tasks (Lyster & Mori, 2006). Thirdly, error acceptance may hinder the communication process. Finally, various types of errors made by learners should be marked in corrective feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Nassaji (2009) believed that corrective feedback is one of the second language acquisition (SLA) facilitators. Thus, corrective feedback has received the attention of various scholars in the past decades. One of the significant theories claims that second language (L2) learning happens by providing comprehensible input (Panova & Lyster, 2002). According to Ellis (1994), some factors help learners produce native-like utterances in learning. They are as follows: firstly, the noticeableness of the type of feedback (Alavi, Voon Foo, Amini, 2015). Secondly, the noticeable terms of the previous statement must be adequate to assist learners in understanding the interlanguage structures of target language features (Schmidt & Frota, 1986).

LITERATURE REVIEW

An overview of the correction strategies for learners' writing during an EFL course reveals an evident change during the last thirty years. During the 1970s, behaviorism theory was the dominant educational context (Brown, 2007). The theory focused on immediate feedback and considered the teachers as those who can prevent the occurrences of errors. Lately, the attention to such types of error correction and the related ideology of such a matter has been reduced (Ferris, 2003). Lee (1997, 2004) believe that teachers are decision-makers to correct errors or not, identify the types of errors, and locate the errors directly or indirectly. However, some other scholars (Banaruee & Askari, 2016; Rueg, 2010, 2017, 2018) argue that the implementation of direct or indirect feedback from peers or teachers could effectively improve language components' performance. The controversial issue of written feedback has been at the center of arguments for the recent 30 years in second language acquisition (SLA) (Reinders & Mohebbi, 2018). Rouhi et al. (2020) stated that there is no apparent reason to show an efficient feedback strategy to improve the writing performance of language learners.

Corrective Feedback (CF)

Chaudron (1977) believed that corrective feedback is "any reaction of the teacher which transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance" (p. 31). He also stated that CF occurs in both comprehension and incomprehension situations. Teachers are beneficial in helping the learners understand the meaning and the form of the language through CF. Every teacher can have their way of CF, depending on academic qualifications, professional experience, etc. This also causes a diversity of CF approaches, either being totally against errors or seeing errors as part of the learning process, which is a matter of controversy. Previous studies differ in their conclusion about CF, i.e., some see it as an inefficient process (Chun et al., 1982; Chaudron, 1977), while others see it as a very effective one in language learning (Asassfeh, 2013; Carroll & Swain, 1993; Ferris, 1997; Ellis et al., 2001a, 2001b; Sampson, 2012). These studies find CF as a way to enhance language learning and enrich their interlanguage system.

Theoretically, many studies proved the effectiveness of CF in SLA. Schmidt (1990, 2001) proposed the Noticing Hypothesis, in which the learners of an L2 should pay full attention to be successful in the learning process. This hypothesis favors the role of CF in helping learners become conscious of forms and guiding them to pinpoint the differences between L1 and L2. Moreover, Long (1996) updated the Interaction Hypothesis and stated that CF plays a role in direct and indirect grammar teaching. This interaction and ordinary meaning negotiation patterns from the teacher to the learner and vice versa improve the learners' attention to the language input and the production of language output. In addition, Swain (1985, 1995) proposed the Output Hypothesis, in which students can learn through CF to produce accurate outcomes. CF can highlight related input and turn learners' attention towards it.

Rashtchi and Abu Bakar (2019) did a study on some ESL students. They found out that students are interested in direct, explicit feedback and expect the teacher to correct as many errors as possible.

The modification of the learner's output plays a significant role in SLA. As Swain (1995) highlighted, a modified outcome, which represents the model language for the learner's interlanguage, is achieved through convenient peer feedback. Lightbown and Spada (1999) discussed that CF is "any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect" (p. 171), which is a type of modified input. External feedback or peer feedback, implied or overt feedback, can help learners be aware of the problems they face in their language. In the absence of external feedback, learners lose this precious opportunity to test their language progress (Swain, 1995).

Swain (1997) suggested that no feedback means that learners may keep incorrect information and have unsolved problems in the language. This does not mean learning will not occur but will be inaccurate. Various research studies by some scholars (Boggs, 2019; Hadiyanto, 2019) revealed that exposing students to corrective feedback improves writing skills.

Carroll et al. (1992) tried to distinguish the results of explicit CF on learning morphological generalizations in an experimental context. Their study confirmed the effectiveness of the feedback in immensely improving learners' performance in acquiring the language. Carroll and Swain (1993) measured the effects of the various kinds of feedback on language acquisition of English learners, and all types of feedback were proven to lead to language learning. Overt or direct feedback had the most impact among all the other types of feedback.

Feedback can positively affect both content and form, as stated by Ferris (1997). She noticed that giving feedback on grammar helped learners write more competently. Moreover, in a study carried out by Ferris (2002), it was revealed that corrective feedback improved learners' accuracy in the short run. Participants were also found to have a better attitude toward the benefit of input to the extent they sought to review their writing independently. Adding to this, Ferris and Roberts (2001) suggested that beginner language learners profit from being corrected by their teacher, being guided toward their errors, and being prevented from feeling frustrated. They also indicated that indirect feedback incites the learners' sense of reflection, makes them more attentive to the errors they commit, and leads to language retention in the long run. Chandler (2003) explains why direct feedback is more efficient in language learning, saying that it is not confusing to learners but is more informational and instant. Direct corrective feedback is thus widely seen as the most proper type of feedback given to language learners.

Electronic Feedback (E-Feedback)

At the beginning of the Covid19 pandemic, most institutions shifted their teaching and learning to online platforms. The corrective feedback had happened, but in the electronic format, so it can be practical to talk about electronic feedback concisely.

One of the ordinary and familiar types of electronic feedback (e-feedback) is asynchronous feedback. It refers to the implementation of online and offline tools, including review features. MS Word, emails, Google Docs, and blogs are familiar among all the available platforms. It has been observed that e-feedback positively influenced the learners' perceptions and led to performance improvement (Chang et al., 2018). Some scholars (Guardado & Shi, 2007; Razi, 2016) reported that the anonymity feature of some platforms during peer feedback was positively analyzed by the students, resulting in honest, critical, and direct feedback. Studies regarding peer feedback through online platforms showed improvements in accuracy in grammar

(Van Beuningen et al., 2012), students became familiar with various written styles (Ho & Savignon, 2007), and it was predicted that global revisions would be provided (Yang, 2011; Guardado & Shi, 2007), critical thinking potentials would be promoted (Wu et al., 2015).

Writing teachers have been using e-feedback asynchronously and synchronously for quite a long time (Shintani, 2016; Ene & Upton, 2018). In the synchronous mode, there is immediate feedback when both parties are online (Kim, 2010). Concurrently, as the students produce their texts online, the teacher monitors them and prepares immediate feedback for the students (Chong, 2019). However, in the case of asynchronous feedback, students receive the teacher's comments after submitting their writing assignments. Shang (2017) stated that asynchronous feedback is more effective than the other one (synchronous) in facilitating the writing process of complex sentences by an EFL learner. In addition, Ene and Upton (2018) confirmed the same statement and believed that asynchronous is more beneficial because of the positive reinforcement it reveals.

Cho (2017) approved that voice chat allowed students to read and engage during the editing and revision sessions. Odo and Yi (2014) conducted a case study on using Skype to give feedback. They reported that despite the connection problems, students could negotiate and clarify their feedback with the tutor through video-conferencing, text messaging, and screen sharing. This type of collaboration engages the students more in their work, giving them a sense of agency toward it.

Some researchers (Gass, 2003; Long, 1996) have focused on feedback in recent years. They have stated that the corrective feedback strategies can facilitate the development of L2.

Omani students have been engaged in online learning and teaching since the beginning of COVID-19. They have been participating in online teaching and assessment. One of those modules was writing. Since the mode of the assessment and giving feedback transferred to online platforms, it is worth investigating the effect of providing corrective feedback to measure its effectiveness in Omani EFL learning and teaching contexts.

To find out the role of corrective feedback in an EFL context, this study aims to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: Does using the corrective feedback have any statistically significant effect on Omani EFL learners' writing performance?

RQ2: What are the perceptions of Omani EFL learners toward the implementation of corrective feedback?

Based on the first research question, the null hypothesis was formulated:

H0: Corrective feedback does not significantly affect Omani EFL learners' writing performance.

METHODOLOGY

This study investigated if corrective feedback significantly affects Omani EFL learners' writing skills. This section explains the comprehensive procedure, including sampling, instrumentation, data collection, and analysis, to find the solution to the research questions.

Participants

A number of 94 Omani EFL students studying at the Foundation Department in an Omani institution was the target population of the current study. Depending on the institution's policy, Omani students have to spend approximately one year and a half improving basic knowledge of English, IT, Math, Sciences, etc., to move to higher education and start their specialty. This is called Foundation Studies in Oman, and those students studying there are called Foundation Students. They spoke Arabic as their first language, and their ages ranged from 18 to 19 years old. These students were placed at a pre-intermediate level of proficiency based on two methods. The first method was through the college's placement test, so their results revealed that they belonged to the pre-intermediate level. The other way was placing the students who finished the elementary level successfully and progressed to the pre-intermediate level based on the required assessments. They were randomly divided into experimental and control groups, each including 47 participants.

Design of the Study

This study enjoys two types of research design. To answer the first research question, experimental research was designed in which the population of the study was randomly assigned into two groups: control and experimental. Then one pre-post-test research design was carried out. To answer the second research question, a qualitative study was implemented to analyze the items of the perception questionnaire. It is worth mentioning that the experimental group received feedback weekly-wise on their writing.

Instruments

Microsoft Teams

To provide feedback for the learners, language teachers use various tools such as Google Docs, Microsoft Word, and other online platforms to give video feedback (Chang et al., 2018). Since the beginning of April 2020, and due to the breakout of COVID-19, Microsoft Teams, as the primary electronic platform, has been used to conduct learning and teaching. Microsoft Teams has plenty of practical options, allowing teachers and students to give and receive instruction, video, feedback, etc. One of these options is SharePoint. Students of the experimental group needed to upload their writing papers on SharePoint, and the teacher gave them feedback individually and in the group.

Writing Test as the Pre/Posttests

Before implementing the treatment, a writing pretest was administered to the experimental and control groups to assess the students' initial knowledge of writing skills. The students were instructed to write a 250-word essay on the topic provided by the teacher-researcher. To assess the effectiveness of the treatment, a 250-word essay was administered as the posttest by the same teacher-researcher. To ensure the validity of these questions to be written by the students, two EFL teachers were selected, one internally and the other as an external reviewer outside of the current academic institution. They were both locals and ELT professionals, so they dominated the cultural concerns that might hinder the students from writing on the selected topics.

Perception Questionnaire

A questionnaire designed by Leki (1991, cited in Ishii, 2011) was used to determine the participants' perceptions of corrective feedback (see Appendix 1). The original questionnaire had three sections: language ability, students' awareness of feedback importance, and finally, students' preferences about the teachers' feedback. However, in this study, the section that included 9 questions through a five-point Likert scale (Not important at all, not important, neither, important, very important) was adopted from Ishii (2011). It should be mentioned that before administering the questionnaire in the main study, a pilot study was carried out to find any possible problematic items and estimate the time required to complete the questionnaire. Students were given unlimited time, but most completed the questionnaire in less than 15 minutes.

Google Form

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and to take precautionary measures, all the classes were online, so the questionnaire was designed on a Google Form in Google Drive, and the link was sent to the students through Microsoft Teams.

Correction Rubrics

Rubrics are a type of educational tool to assess the weaknesses and strengths of the students, and they ensure the objectivity of the marks. Writing rubrics were used in this research to mark the students' writing. Task Achievement, Organization, Grammar, Punctuation/Spelling/Mechanics, and Vocabulary were five measurements in which students' papers were marked accordingly. This marking measurement has been internally designed, piloted, validated, and implemented officially by the authorities of the aforementioned college where the study was run.

Procedure

The current research was done during the writing module of the fall semester in 2020-2021 for 12 weeks, which equals an entire semester at the college. The primary interaction of the class was from the teacher to the learners.

Prior to the study, a writing test was administered as the pretest for the experimental and control groups to ensure the proficiency homogeneity of participants in writing skills. The participants in both groups were asked to write a 250-word essay consisting of introductory, body, and concluding paragraphs based on a given topic.

The teacher was responsible for describing the types of writing, the planning stage, and the way to design and write paragraphs, topic sentences, and supporting ideas. In the experimental group, these explanations were supported by some on-the-spot examples for the students, and later on, the students were given time to ask their questions for further clarification.

The writing at the pre-intermediate level of the college should include five body paragraphs. Therefore, after the instructions, students of the experimental group had one week to design the related paragraph of that session and upload it on SharePoint. Meanwhile, students could ask questions, check their problems, and request further academic support from the teacher by communicating through accessible electronic platforms. On the other hand, the control group participants were told to submit their writing as a whole draft initially, and they received general feedback on form and structure later.

During the weekend, the students in the experimental group received feedback on every piece of writing individually. In this case, the teacher could enter the students' shared folder, open the Word Document file of the student, and write his feedback either inside the text or on the right side. Feedback was given based on the rubrics, which were in use to mark the students' papers. On the other hand, in the control group, students did not receive individual and specific feedback but general comments on the form and structure at the end of the draft.

As was mentioned earlier, two types of feedback were implemented for this module. The first type was individual feedback, where the teacher gave general feedback to the students individually, which motivated the participants to look for a solution to their problems. The second type of feedback was within-the-group feedback. In this case, the teacher ran an online session through Microsoft Teams. The teacher collected all tasks, for example, introductory paragraphs of the uploaded writing in one file, and shared it with the students in an online session. In this stage, the teacher gave the participants detailed and explicit feedback. The teacher tried to read the paragraphs one by one and analyze the sentences comprehensively based on meaning, lexicons, and grammar. The papers were presented anonymously. In this case, some extra time was given to the participants to share their ideas and correct existing mistakes or errors cooperatively. The logic behind giving online feedback was to provide further explanations for the student's errors, to give the opportunity to the students to reflect more on the errors and ask a question if they could not understand the point of error, and it would help the other students to stop similar errors in their future during writing sessions. Due to the existing limitations implemented by the institution's policies, the teacher of the class, one of the current study's researchers, gave feedback on the student's writing pieces. The second researcher was added to the class and also monitored the whole process.

The students received two types of feedback, individual and within-the-group feedback, and were given one more week to correct the errors and re-submit the related paragraphs. For comparison of the two drafts, students were not allowed to delete or replace the previously uploaded materials, but they should write the new paragraph under the previous one. This cycle of correction of errors and mistakes is repeated two times. After the experiment, another writing test was administered as the posttest. The participants in both groups were asked to write a 250-word essay entailing introductory, body, and concluding paragraphs different from one in the pretest. To guarantee the objectivity of scoring, a Ph.D. holder in Applied Linguistics was invited to mark the writing of students against the rubrics. He was an external marker and did not have any information about the students. Papers were given a code, so the marker measured them blindly.

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

In the current section, the investigation and the explication of the data collected for a period of 12 weeks are presented.

The research's first question was to find whether corrective feedback had any statistically remarkable effect on EFL learners' writing performance.

Table 1 reveals the descriptive statistics of the pretests and posttests of both groups.

Table 1. The Descriptive Statistics for the Writing Pre-tests and Post-tests Scores

	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Pre_Exp	47	0	16	12.21	2.702
Post_Exp	47	10	23	18.51	2.789
Pre_Con	47	0	17	12.09	2.992
Post_Con	47	3	19	13.17	2.657
Valid N (listwise)	47				

As shown in Table 1, the mean scores of the experimental group are 12.21 and 18.51 in pre-post tests, while the mean scores for the pretest and posttest of the control group are 12.09 and 13.17, respectively.

Since the assumption of normality of the data distribution was not met, the gain score comparison was run to check the difference between the posttest and pretest administration.

Table 2. The Result of the Test of Normality for Checking the Normal Data Distribution Assumption

	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre_Exp	.157	47	.006	.835	47	.000
Post_Exp	.110	47	.200	.950	47	.043
Pre_Con	.148	47	.011	.898	47	.001
Post_Con	.155	47	.006	.923	47	.004

The Kolmogoro-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests of normality show the abnormal distribution of the data for the two groups ($P < .05$). Therefore, as mentioned above, the gain score comparison, which is the difference between the posttest and the pretest, was taken into account and is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for the Gain Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups

	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	V
Con_Gainscores	47	-1.00	3.00	1.085	.802	.645
Exp_Gainscore	47	.00	15.00	6.297	3.236	10.475
Valid N (listwise)	47					

The mean and standard deviation of the control and the experimental groups are 1.08, .80, and 6.29, 3.23, respectively. Table 4 below shows the result of normality testing for selecting the appropriate inferential test.

Table 4. The Results of Normality Test the Control and Experimental Groups

	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Con_Gainscores	.288	47	.000	.850	47	.000
Exp_Gainscore	.165	47	.002	.947	47	.032

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests of normality show the abnormal distribution of the data for the two sets ($P < .05$). Thus, the Mann-Whitney U test can be a suitable option to compare the means of both groups. The result of this test is released in Table 5.

Table 5. The Result of the Mann-Whitney U Test for the Comparison of the Control and Experimental Groups

	Scores
Mann-Whitney U	200.000
Z	-6.957
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

As Table 5 above shows, there was a notable distinction between the mean scores of the two groups, $U = 200$, $p < .05$. Therefore, the researchers confidentially rejected the null hypothesis, i.e., using the corrective feedback had a statistically remarkable impact on Omani EFL learners' writing performance.

Table 6. The Reliability between the Pretest and Posttest of Writing

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.77	2

The reliability of the pretest and the posttest was checked for 47 participants by calculating the Cronbach's Alpha. As can be seen in Table 6, the test enjoyed a high-reliability index ($R = .77$).

In order to find whether there was an agreement between the two raters, the inter-rater reliability was calculated.

Table 7. The Inter-Rater Reliability for the Two Raters in a Pilot Study

Title	N of Raters	N of Participants	R	Sig
Writing	2	47	.89	.000

Table 7 above shows the result of the inter-rater reliability between the two raters and 47 participants in a pilot study. As can be seen, there was a perfect agreement, based on Landis and Koch's (1977) classification, between the two raters of the research, $R = .89$, $P < .01$.

To find the participants' perceptions toward the implementation of the written feedback in second research question, a questionnaire was distributed, and the following results were revealed respectively:

The first question investigated the percentage of students reading and checking their writing after the teacher gave it back to them. 44.4 % of the participants stated that they always checked it. 33.3% of students selected the option sometimes, and 22.2% of students chose usually. In this question, two options of not very often and never, were not selected by any of the participants. It means that most of the students reflect on their writings after receiving feedback.

The second question sought to find more details about the participants' intentions in checking teacher's feedback and correction. 77.8% of the participants selected the option always. 11.1% selected usually and the same percentage for sometimes. The answers show that almost all students carefully check the teacher's comments and corrections.

For the third question, which measured the importance of having few errors in English learning written work, 66.7% stated that it was very important, while 33.3% said it was important. The findings indicate that all students like to write as correctly as possible.

The fourth question dealt with the importance of highlighting the grammatical errors by teachers regarding the students' point of view. 66.7% selected very important, 22.2% important, and 11.1% selected the option neither. It means that most students need to have correction feedback dealing with their grammatical errors.

The fifth question elicited the participants' responses based on highlighting spelling errors by the teacher. 66.7% considered it as very important, 22.2% said neither of them, and 11.1% selected the option important. The answers show that for most students, it was important to receive comments about the spelling errors in their writings.

The sixth question investigated the importance of vocabulary errors given by the teacher. 55.6% of the participants considered it as very important, 22.2% selected important, and 11.1% chose the options neither and not important. It means that most students enjoy receiving corrective feedback on vocabulary errors.

In the seventh question, the responses of the students on punctuation errors given by the teacher were elicited accordingly. 55.6% of the participants stated that it was very important. 33.3% selected important, and 11.1% chose the option neither. The answers indicate the importance of punctuation errors and their effect on the students' writing.

The eighth research question concerned the structural errors, which the teacher highlighted. 66.7% of the participants stated the importance of it. 22.2% said it was important, while 11.1% selected neither. The students' opinions about this question show that structural errors play a significant role in students' writing.

Finally, question nine focused on the importance of receiving feedback based on the writing content. 44.4% considered it as very important, 33.3% important, and 22.2% stated neither. More than two-thirds of the students considered the errors in the content of their written work.

DISCUSSION

The current study aimed to determine the effect of corrective feedback on Omani EFL students' writing performance via electronic platforms.

The results of the first research question are consistent with the results of some studies (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 1995, 2003; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Khoshsima & Banaruee, 2017; Lalande, 1982; Ruegg, 2010, 2017) which revealed positive effects of corrective feedback on learners' performance. Banaruee and Askari (2016) stated that every corrective strategy is considered essential and can be implemented simultaneously. In another study, Maleki and Eslami (2013) found that the employment of corrective feedback effectively reduces morphological errors in students' writing. These findings are in line with the study carried out by Chandler (2003), who confirmed the positive effect of corrective feedback during learning.

However, the current study results are against the findings of Ghasemi et al. (2021). They were working on the writing performance of some Iranian EFL learners in the presence and absence of feedback and found out that there is no advantage in giving immediate feedback on writing or marking errors. Lee (2019) also stated that less corrective feedback outweighs more exposure to it.

After participating in the survey regarding the students' perception of corrective feedback, participants showed that such feedback was essential and fundamental for their learning and will help them improve their performance in a writing course and in all other skills they claimed.

The results above are in line with some other studies. For example, Loewen et al. (2009) stated that Arabic and Chinese learners had positive attitudes toward error correction. Schulz (1996) also stated that most participants had a positive attitude toward implementing corrective feedback. Listiani's (2017) findings showed that 94% of the learners had positive perceptions of corrective feedback.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results, the posttest scores of the students in the experimental group were positively and remarkably distinguishable from their pretest scores. On the other hand, the control group results in the pretest and posttest did not reveal any notable differences. Therefore, it can be stated that corrective feedback can play a vital role in writing tasks.

The study can have some implications for language teachers. As observed in the result section of the current study, the learners benefited from implementing corrective feedback, so teachers are encouraged to use similar strategies more often.

Considering this study, some suggestions can be made for other researchers to study this area further.

- To generalize the findings of this study, further research should be carried out with a bigger sample population in Oman by targeting various academic institutions and the students who are studying at Foundation Departments.
- The focus of the study was on writing skills, while further research can be conducted with the other receptive and productive main skills as well as subskills because students experienced online learning on all the modules, so it will be interesting if the investigation on all the skills could be implemented.
- The target community of this study was pre-intermediate students, while more studies can be conducted with various levels of language proficiency from elementary to advanced students.
- Since the number of students is increasing in online classes, there might not be enough time for the teacher to explain every paper of the student in detail. In this case, a study can be conducted to measure the level of students' autonomy after the treatment.
- Since the study focused on the impact of teacher's feedback on the writing performance of Omani EFL students, then further research could be more insightful if the effects of peer feedback could be measured accordingly.

BIODATA and CONTACT ADDRESSES of AUTHORS



Ali AL GHAITHI is an English Lecturer at Foundation Department of Sohar University in Oman. Currently, he is a Ph.D. candidate focusing on Applied Linguistics. Ali got his master's degree from University of Putra Malaysia. He started his career as an English Lecturer in 2018. Ali is interested in research studies that mainly implement Artificial Intelligence in teaching and learning processes. He has a few publications in various highly indexed journals such as Scopus and Web of Science.

Ali AL GHAITHI
Foundation Department
Address: Sohar University, 311, Sohar, Oman
E-mail: AGhaithi@su.edu.om



Behnam BEHFOROUIZ is an English Lecturer in English Language Center at University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Shinas, Oman. Currently, he is acting as the head of ELC Research Committee and a member of Research and Consultancy Committee at the university above. He has been teaching English in various Omani universities since 2009. His main areas of interest are TESOL, Applied Linguistics, Language Education, and Educational Technologies. Behnam has published 38 research articles in various journals and presented a few through webinars and conferences.

Behnam BEHFOROUIZ
English Language Center
Address: University of Technology and Applied Sciences, 324, Shinas, Oman
E-mail: Behnam.Behforouz@shct.edu.om

REFERENCES

- Alavi, S. S., Foo, T. C. V., & Amini, M. (2015). L2 learners' proficiency development through noticing feedback. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multi-religious Understanding*, 2(5), 25-41.
- Allwright, R. L. (1975). Problems in the study of the language teacher's treatment of error. In M. K. Burt & H. D. Dulay (Eds.), *New directions in second language learning, teaching, and bilingual education. Selected papers from the Ninth Annual TESOL Convention*. Washington, D.C: TESOL.
- Asassfeh, S. M. (2013). Corrective feedback (CF) and English-Major EFL learners' ability in grammatical error detection and correction. *English Language Teaching*, 6(8), 85-94.
- Banaruee, H. (2016). *Recast in writing*. Isfahan: Sana Gostar Publications.
- Banaruee, H., & Askari, A. (2016). *Typology of corrective feedback and error analysis*. Isfahan: Sana Gostar Publications.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 409-431.
- Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). Written corrective feedback for L2 development. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Brown, D. H. (2007). *First language acquisition. Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson ESL.
- Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 357-366.
- Carroll, S., Swain, M., & Roberge, Y. (1992). The role of feedback in adult second language acquisition: Error correction and morphological generalizations. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 13(2), 173-198.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), 267-296. doi:10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9
- Chang, C., Cunnigham, K. J., Satar, H. M., & Strobl, C. (2018). Electronic feedback on second language writing: A retrospective and prospective essay on multimodality. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 9(3): 405-428.
- Cho, H. (2017) Synchronous web-based collaborative writing: Factors mediating interaction among second-language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, 37-51. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2017.05.013.
- Chun, A., Day, R. R., Chenoweth, A., & Luppescu, S. (1982). Errors, interaction, and correction: A study of native-nonnative conversation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(4), 537-547.
- Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning*, 27, 29-46.
- Ellis, R. (1994). A theory of instructed second language acquisition. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit language learning* (pp. 79-114). London: Academic Press.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001a). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51, 281-318.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001b). Preemptive focus on form in the ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 407-432.
- Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 33-53. doi:10.2307/3587804
- Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 315-339.
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 161-184. [https://doi.org/10.6016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.6016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X)

- Gass, S. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224–255). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Guardado, M. and Shi, L. (2007) EFL students' experiences of online peer feedback. *Computers and Composition* 24: 443-61. doi:10.1016/j.compcom.2007.03.002.
- Han, Z. H. (2008). *Error correction: Towards a differential approach*. Paper presented at The Fourth QCC Colloquium on Second Language Acquisition. New York, NY. Retrieved from <http://www.tc.columbia.edu/academics/?facid=zhh2>
- Ho, M. C., & Savignon, S. J. (2007). Face-to-face and computer-mediated peer review in EFL writing. *CALICO Journal*, 24(2), 269–290.
- Ishii, Y. (2011). A survey of learners' preferences about teacher's feedback on writing. *Proceedings of the PAAL*. China, 16, 403-409.
- Khoshsima, H., & Banaruee, H. (2017). L1 interfering and L2 developmental writing errors among Iranian EFL learners. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(4), 1–14. doi:10.5281/zenodo.802945
- Lalande, J. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66(2), 140–149. <https://doi.org/10.6111/modl.1982.66.issue-2>
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159-174. PMID: 843571.
- Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for teaching. *System*, 25(4), 465–477. [https://doi.org/10.6016/S0346-251X\(97\)00045-6](https://doi.org/10.6016/S0346-251X(97)00045-6)
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 285–312. <https://doi.org/10.6016/j.jslw.2004.08.001>
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 203–218. <https://doi.org/10.6111/flan.1991.24.issue-3>
- Leki, I. (2001). Material, educational, and ideological challenges of teaching EFL writing at the turn of the century. *International Journal of English Studies*, 1(2), 197-209. Retrieved from <https://revistas.um.es/ijes/article/view/48301>
- Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Listiani, L. (2017). Students' perception toward teacher' s written corrective feedback in writing 3 class. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, 109(Aecon), 164–167.
- Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thomson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). L2 learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 91-104.
- Long, M. (1977). Teacher feedback on learner error: Mapping cognitions. In H. Brown, C. Yorio & R. Crymes (Eds.), *TESOL '77. Teaching and learning English as a second language: Trends in research and practice* (pp. 278-294). Washington D.C.: TESOL.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 269–300.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. doi:10.1017/s0272263197001034
- Maleki, A., & Eslami, E. (2013). The effects of written corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' control over grammatical construction of their written English. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(7), 1250–1257.
- Mendez, H. E., & Cruz, R. R. D. M. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *PROFILE*, 14 (2), pp. 63-75.

- Nassaji, H. (2009). Effects of recasts and elicitations in dyadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. *Language Learning*, 59(2), 411–452. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00511.x
- Odo, D. M. and Yi, Y. (2014). Engaging in computer-mediated feedback in academic writing: Voices from L2 doctoral students in TESOL. *English Teaching*, 69(3), 129-50. doi:10.15858/engtea.69.3.201409.129.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573–595. doi:10.2307/3588241
- Papi, M., Bondarenko, A., Wawire, D., Jiang, C., & Zhou, S. (2020). Feedback-seeking behaviour in second language writing: Motivational mechanisms. *Reading and Writing*, 33(2), 485–505. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-019-09971-6>
- Razi, S. (2016) Open and anonymous peer review in a digital online environment compared in academic writing context. In C. Gorla, O. Speicher & S. Stollhans (Eds) *Innovative language teaching and learning at university: Enhancing participation and collaboration* (pp. 49-56). Dublin: Research publishing.net. Retrieved on 14 December 2017 from <https://reference.research-publishing.net/publication/chapters/978-1-908416-32-2/404.pdf>
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.6017/CBO9780511667190>
- Ruegg, R. (2010). Who wants feedback and does it make any difference? In A. M. Stoke (Ed.), *JALT2009 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 683–691). Tokyo: JALT.
- Ruegg, R. (2017). Learner revision practices and perceptions of peer and teacher feedback. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 9(2), 275–300. doi:10.1558/wap.33157
- Ruegg, R. (2018). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on changes in EFL students' writing self-efficacy. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(2), 87–102. doi:10.1080/09 571736.2014.958190
- Sampson, A. (2012). Coded and uncoded error feedback: Effects on error frequencies in adult Colombian EFL learners' writing. *System*, 40(4), 494–504. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2012.10.001
- Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn* (pp. 237–326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 343-364.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1995). *Three Functions of Output in Second Language Learning. Principles and Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honor of H. G. Widdowson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (1997). The output hypothesis, focus on form and second language learning. In V. Berry, B. Adamson & W. Littlewood (Eds.). *Applying linguistics: Insights into language in education* (pp. 1–21). Hong Kong: The University of Hong Kong, the English Centre.
- Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning*, 62(1), 1–41.
- Wu, W. C. V., Petit, E., & Chen, C. H. (2015). EFL writing revision with blind expert and peer review using a CMC open forum. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 28(1), 58–80.
- Yang, Y. F. (2011). A reciprocal peer review system to support college students' writing. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(4), 687–700.

APPENDIX

How often do you read over your composition again when your teacher returns it to you?

Do you check your teacher's comments and corrections carefully?

How important is it to you to have as few errors in English as possible in your written work?

How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out grammatical errors in your written work?

How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your spelling errors in your written work?

How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out errors in vocabulary choice in your written work?

How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out punctuation errors in your written work?

How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in structure in your written work?

How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in content in your written work?