Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback Strategies through the Lens of the Students

Christian Jay O. Syting[1], John Rick B. Malisobo[2], Marivic K. Salce[3], Michael O. Roasol [4]✉
[1234]College of Teacher Education, University of Mindanao, Davao City, Philippines
✉ email: m.roasol.496621@umindanao.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This descriptive-qualitative study was conducted to venture the written corrective feedback strategies employed by the College of Teacher Education teachers in a private university in Davao City, Philippines. The study utilized thematic analysis to analyze the data gathered from the in-depth interviews of eight selected participants through a purposive sampling technique. The data revealed teachers' seven written corrective feedback strategies: lexical written feedback, grammatical written feedback, organization in writing, motivating written feedback, metalinguistic feedback, and verification feedback. Additionally, this study uncovered the impact of written corrective feedback strategies, namely improvement of lexical skills, improvement of sentence structure, improvement of grammatical skills, development of the organization in writing, enhancement of self-regulation, a decrease of the affective filter, and improvement of learning productivity. The results of this study presented various written corrective feedback strategies for the teachers. It also unveiled the implications of the strategies employed. Hence, it is gainful for the administrators and teachers because they will be encouraged to use the strategies found in the study and practice them in the academe. It will also contribute to the students in a way that they will value the feedback.

Keywords: education; *descriptive-qualitative; thematic analysis; students; interview; Philippines.*

INTRODUCTION

Educational sectors have been compelled to transition from face-to-face to online classes because of the Covid-19 pandemic. Many of the students' works are written and completed virtually, necessitating the teachers provide written corrective feedback as effectively as possible. However, it is observed that teachers' feedback is inadequate or insufficient. The emphasis on students' errors and deficiencies (Agbayahuon, 2016), delayed feedback (Rabidoux & Rottmann, 2017) to ambiguous feedback (Henderson, 2017) are just among the problems observed by the students. As a result, students' motivation and interest in the teaching and learning process decrease.

The abovementioned problem has been supported by Agbayahuon (2016), stating that about two-thirds of the students viewed their teacher's feedback negatively. Specifically, 27.94% responded that it was discouraging, 22.05% said it was confusing, 10.29% found it overwhelming, and 04.41% perceived it useless. The study concluded

that students lose interest and motivation to improve because teachers provided error-focused feedback that highlighted the students' weaknesses and deficiencies. Moreover, Mese and Sevilan (2021) found in their study that negatively perceived feedback from teachers in online learning increases students' affective filters, hence, dropping their motivation.

Another study by Coman, îru, Schmitz, Stanciu, and Bularca (2020) supports the abovementioned problem by stating that delayed feedback happens because teachers in e-learning are not always available when students need help. Afify (2018) supports it by revealing that those students who receive delayed feedback from email and learning management system platforms feel dissatisfied. In his study, Yi (2021) found out that delayed feedback showed no significant results in the students' writings. The feedback has not allowed them to improve their previous outputs because they were given another task to finish. Consequently, the students' isolation in their learning intensified (Caduceus International Publishing, 2021). Additionally, Fu (2019) concluded in his study that delayed feedback has burdened the students' working memory because they need to connect the delayed feedback to the mistakes they have committed in their previous works. Hence, he suggested that teachers use immediate feedback more often than delayed feedback.

Additionally, Rabidoux and Rottmann (2017) claimed that in online learning, teachers usually overlook the significance of written feedback by just giving a letter or numerical grade. A National Student Survey found that students are frequently dissatisfied with the received feedback because it was not specific enough and was not given on time (Huang, Lehman, Lu, Tlili, & Wang, 2021). Moreover, Henderson (2017) revealed that teachers' feedback practices are lacking in detail, hardly understood, and confusing, which are useless to the students. Consequently, students were demotivated as they did not find any space for development. Yu, Wang, and Xia (2022) concluded that providing ambiguous feedback has created confusion among the students that hampered their learning process.

The sudden shift in our learning setup has brought numerous problems to the students regarding their teachers' written corrective feedback strategies in online learning. This problem happened because providing immediate and synchronous feedback has not always been possible for the teachers in an online setup because of the scheduling problems of the teachers and students (Canals, Granena, Yilmaz, Malicka, 2020). Thus, it created more problems in the quality of written corrective feedback that were supported by existing studies, namely emphasis on students' errors and deficiencies (Agbayahuon, 2016) and delayed feedback (Bularca et al., 2020), and ambiguous feedback (Henderson, 2017). Consequently, these challenges have decreased the students' motivation (Mese & Sevilan, 2021) and increased their sense of isolation (Caduceus International Publishing, 2021).

Although several studies have examined the teachers' written corrective feedback strategies in online learning by exploring students' perceptions (Ganapathy, Tan, & Phan, 2020), we have not encountered research that investigated online learners in the Philippines. In this research, we will also consider students outside language programs, which other researchers did not (Mohammad & Rahman, 2016). Hence, this study needs to be conducted since it is intended to discover the written corrective feedback strategies of the teachers in the academe regardless of the courses they are teaching. Moreover, it is evident in the supporting studies that the problem of written feedback in online learning exists. It is negatively affecting the students cognitively and effectively. Furthermore, Tamm (2020) revealed that investigating the

provision of student feedback in online learning is still an under-researched study, and it will also take some time to research it fully.

This descriptive-qualitative study aims to discover the written corrective feedback strategies employed by the College of Teacher Education teachers in online learning. It also aims to reveal students' insights towards their teachers' written corrective feedback strategies. Hence, this study formulated research questions that revolve around the written corrective feedback strategies of the teachers in the College of Teacher Education from the students' perspective. It also revealed insights that students have about the strategies.

The scope of this study is centered on unveiling the CTE teachers' written corrective feedback strategies in online learning. The researchers limit their participants to eight CTE students from a different major who has been studying for at least one (1) year in online learning. They are chosen as participants as they are fit for this study because they receive the teachers' feedback on the online learning setup. This study uses the participant's perceptions, experiences, and observations of their teachers' written corrective feedback strategies. This study is conducted through an interview with the use of an interview guide. Although the researchers have attained the objective, some situations limited the study. Firstly, the researchers only conducted it through an interview. It would have been better if the researchers had thoroughly observed and experimented throughout the semester. Secondly, the interview span would have been better if the participants were asked in a face-to-face setting rather than in an online setup. Lastly, the study is qualitative; several researchers could formulate interpretations and findings differently.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative design of research. Qualitative research is a holistic approach to learning that entails exploration. It is an unfolding model that takes place in a natural setting and allows the researchers to build a level of detail through active participation in the actual events (Creswell, 1994, as cited in Lanka, Lanka, Rostron, & Singh, 2021). Specifically, the researchers use descriptive qualitative. According to Kim, Sefcik, and Bradway (2017) descriptive research formulates data from a subjective perception that describe the who, what, and where of experiences. In this study, the descriptive research is conducted in an online context. It learns about the teachers' written corrective feedback strategies in the online classroom through the lens of the students. The researchers attempted to obtain in-depth data about the subject by providing detailed data.

The participants in this study were eight (8) students from the College of Teacher Education. The number of participants was supported by Dworkin (2012), stating that anywhere from five (5) to fifty (50) participants was an adequate number for qualitative research. The participants were selected using purposive sampling to choose appropriate participants for the study. The inclusion criteria include online learners who have been studying in online learning for at least one (1) year in any major of the College of Teacher Education. On the contrary, the exclusion criteria include students who have not had one (1) year of experience in online learning. These criteria allowed the researchers to select individuals or groups who are particularly educated or experienced in the College of Teacher Education teachers' written corrective feedback strategies in online learning (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

This study used an interview guide to gather efficient and useful participant data. The interview guide was formulated by the researchers and validated by the

expert pool. Moreover, the researchers conducted an unstructured and in-depth interview that allowed them to ask more questions spontaneously and gather enough responses.

The data gathered was analyzed through Creswell's Thematic Analysis. The analysis enabled the researchers to code the data collected. The following are the steps in the framework: be familiar with the data, generate initial codes, search for themes, review themes, define themes, and write up (Braun & Clarke, 2006 as cited in Delahunt & Maguire, 2017). First, reading and re-reading the transcripts happened. Second, organizing data in a meaningful and systematic manner began. The researchers reduced the data into small chunks through coding. Third, they examined the codes and fitted them together into a theme. More so, they organized the codes into general themes. Fourth, the preliminary themes in the third step were reviewed, modified, and developed. Fifth, the final development of the theme happened by identifying each theme with its essence. Last, the end-point of research happens in the form of a report, journal article, or dissertation.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the results of the Teacher's Written Corrective Feedback Strategies Through the lens of the students. The order of presentation is based on the research questions presented in the introduction.

Written Corrective Feedback Strategies of the CTE Teachers

Based on the analysis, several themes have emerged, as shown in Table 1. In this study, the written corrective feedback strategies that emerged are the following: Lexical Written Feedback, Structural Written Feedback, Grammatical Written Feedback, Organization in writing, Motivating Written Feedback, Metalinguistic Feedback, and Verification Feedback.

Table 1. Written corrective feedback strategies of the CTE teachers

Basic Themes	Organizational Themes	Global Themes
Teachers corrected the spelling of students [ST 4]	**Misspelled words feedback**	**Lexical Written Feedback**
Students are driven to read to enhance their spelling [ST 1]		
Students are glad being corrected with their word's choice. [ST 4]	**Incorrect word choice feedback**	
Students are taught to appropriately write in context. [ST 1]		
Students' ability to use punctuation is corrected.	**Punctuation errors feedback**	**Structural Written Feedback**

[ST 3]		
Students are mindful of using appropriate punctuation because of the error correction. [ST 4]		
Students receive corrections with the construction of their sentences. [ST 7]	**Sentence fragments error feedback**	
Students lessen their sentence errors. [ST 4]		
Students' use of verb tenses is corrected due to inconsistencies. [ST 1]	**Verb tense errors feedback**	**Grammatical Written Feedback**
Students know when to use the right tenses. [ST 2]		
Students receive multiple pronoun corrections in their writing composition [ST 2]	**Pronouns error feedback**	
Students are driven to study more the consistent use of pronouns. [ST 5]		
Students receive corrections in cohesion. [ST 6]	**Feedback on Cohesion**	**Organization in writing**
Students are able to know the dos and don'ts in writing. [ST 8]		
Students' ability to write in a coherent manner is corrected [ST 8]	**Feedback on Coherence**	
Students practice writing and allow more corrections to improve [ST 6]		
Students receive compliments in their works. [ST 3]	**Praises**	**Motivating Written Feedback**
Students do not feel disappointed of themselves because of the		

encouragement from teachers. [ST 1]		
Students feel motivated to do better upon receiving praises. [ST 2]		
Teacher's approach does not promote bias. [ST 5]	**Teachers' positive approach**	
Students do not receive demotivating approach from teachers. [ST 2]		
Students receive corrections in their works. [ST 2]	**Error-code feedback**	**Metalinguistic Feedback**
Students are given room for improvement. [ST 3 & 4]		
Students receive specific explanations from teachers [ST 7]	**Feedback with brief description**	
Students are able to determine what they need to work on. [ST 3]		
Students receive numerical from teachers. [ST 6]	**Numerical**	**Verification Feedback**
Students found big impact in numerical feedback. [ST 2 & 6]		
Students found the feedback objective not subjective because of rubrics. [ST 3 & 4]	**Rubric-oriented feedback**	
Students found the rubrics helpful. [ST 5 & 6]		

Lexical Written Feedback. The feedback is used to build the sense or meaning of a word (Nordquist, 2019). Teachers who use this strategy focus on grammar correction, specifically in analyzing the meaning of words concerning one another within a sentence. Irwin (2017) revealed that lexical feedback was one of the types of feedback used by teachers. Statistically, a total of 16.9% were categorized as lexical feedback. Hence, it is believed to have affected the lexical accuracy of the students. Several studies concluded that feedback, in the long run, may decline lexical errors and

increase accuracy. (Lira-Gonzales & Nassaji, 2020). Based on the interview, this feedback is realized through *Misspelled words feedback* (ST 4 & ST 1) and *Incorrect words choice feedback* (ST 4 & 1). They testified that they were encouraged to read more and more to know how to spell and use words in context.

Structural Written Feedback. This feedback assessed how a sentence's basic grammatical elements are put together. Teachers believed that sentence form provides a framework for clear written communication of ideas. Additionally, according to Surber (2021), the meaning of a textual context is influenced by its structure. As a result, teachers assist students in developing fluency and variety in their writing style. This theme emerged because of the *punctuation error feedback* (ST 3 & 4) and *sentence fragments error feedback* (ST 7 & 4). Students claimed that their ability to punctuate improved because it influenced them to be more attentive to the usage of punctuation (ST 3 & 4). Additionally, they expressed gratitude because their teachers specified the errors in their sentences, leading them to maximize those inputs to improve their writing skills. Hence, it supported the study of Goskoy and Nazli (2016), who concluded that the teachers' direct feedback on sentence structure, capitalization, word order, and punctuation errors were believed to be helpful.

Grammatical Written Feedback. Teachers use this method to improve their students' grammatical knowledge and proficiency. This theme originated because of the teachers' comments towards *incorrect verb tenses* (ST 1 & 2) *and pronoun usage* (ST 2 & 5). According to the interview, teachers rectified their tenses and pronouns because of inconsistencies. However, despite the corrections, they affirmed that it increased their mindfulness to consistently use verb tenses and pronouns. It supported the study of Amoli (2020) who revealed in her study that that the errors committed by the students in pronouns decrease during the period they are aided.

Organization Written Feedback. It refers to the arrangement of ideas, evidence, or details in a logical order (Nordquist, 2019). This feedback could help students write better essays, especially in arranging their ideas and thoughts. This theme manifested on the teachers' *feedback on cohesion* and *feedback on coherence* (ST 6 & 8). During the interview, students expressed that the unity and logical sense of their writing was corrected. It is consistent with Zhan (2016) who revealed that students testified that their teachers' feedback highlighted the content, organization, lexical, grammar, and mechanics. They further reported that among the feedback, they benefit most from the correction of organization of their teachers.

Motivating written feedback. This feedback refers to giving information to the students on how well they are doing their work. It is also about encouraging the students, enabling them to learn cognitively, socially, and emotionally (Demira & Sarsarb, 2021). This theme stems from the *praises from the teachers* (ST 1, 2, 3) and *teachers' positive approach* (ST 2 & 5). The students testified that they received compliments on their work. Hence, they do not feel disappointed in themselves. This result is congruent to Lipnevich and Smith (2009), as cited in Gan, An, and Liu (2021), who stated that praises presumably ranked as the second usual type of feedback employed in the classroom.

Metalinguistic Feedback. This type of feedback refers to providing comments, information, and questions about the students' work without directly correcting the work. The information gave the learners several hints for the possible reconstruction of the errors (Tamayo & Cajas, 2017). This theme emerged because of the *error-correction feedback* (ST 2 & 4) along with *feedback with a brief description* (ST & & 3). Students

affirmed that they received feedback emphasizing questions and description instead of direct error-correction. It supported the study of Wei and Cao (2020), stating that teachers employed error codes because they believed that students must learn from their mistakes.

Verification Feedback. This refers to a strategy of teachers that only provide numbers. Teachers rely heavily on the use of numerals with the absence of error correction and explanation. They usually provide the total scores where errors and corrects are only identified (Gan et al., 2021). This theme stems from *numerical* (ST 2 & 6) and *rubric-oriented feedback.* (ST 3, 4, 5, & 6). This is realized as students expressed that they were able to assess themselves through obtaining numbers in their work, which allows them to see their right and wrong. It supported Gan et al. (2021), who reported that teachers frequently employ verification feedback. Consequently, it enables the students to correct their fallacious knowledge, leading them to improve.

Insights shared by the participants

Based on the analysis, several themes have emerged, as shown in Table 2. In this study, the insights shared by the participants are the following: Improvement of lexical skills, Improvement of sentence structure, Improvement of grammatical skills, Development of organization in writing, Enhancement of self-regulation, Decrease of affective filters, and Improvement of learning productivity.

Table 2. Insights shared by the participants

Basic Themes	Organizational Themes	Global Theme
Students improve their spelling through reading a lot. [ST 1]	**Enhancement of Spelling**	**Improvement of Lexical Skills**
Students learn how to be careful and critical in spelling out words [ST 5]		
Students enhance their ability to use jargon. [ST 7]	**Enhancement of Words Choice**	
Students are able to avoid redundancy. [ST 8]		
Students are able to use words according to context. [ST 3]		
Students are able to learn the importance of punctuation [ST 1]	**Improvement of Punctuation**	**Improvement of Sentence Structure**
Students make sure that they apply appropriate		

punctuation mark. [ST 4]		
Students improve their ability to express their thoughts in the sentence. [ST 1]	**Improvement of Sentence Fragments**	
Students are able to employ techniques in writing sentences [ST 4]		
Students are able to avoid being too wordy. [ST 8]		
Students are able to maximize available resources to learn verb tenses. [ST 5]	**Development of Verb Tenses and Aspect**	**Improvement of Grammatical Skills**
Students learn to correct the inconsistencies of their verb tenses [ST 1]		
Students are able to choose right pronouns in writing stories and essays. [ST 2]	**Development of Pronouns use**	
Students are driven to learn and use pronoun consistently upon realizing there is still a need to improve. [ST 5]		
Students improve their ability to write in a coherent manner. [ST 6]	**Improvement of Coherence**	**Development of Organization in Writing**
Students are able to know what to and not to do in writing system. [ST 8]		
Students always seek for someone to correct them just to improve [ST 6]	**Improvement of Cohesion**	
Students are able to apply the corrections in their writing [ST 8]		
Students are driven to establish academic goals. [ST 3]	**Enhancement of Goal-Setting**	**Enhancement of Self-Regulation**
Students' learning goals do		

not end because they are encouraged to do more. [ST 2]		
Students can assess their performance [ST 3]	**Enhancement of Self-Assessment**	
Students can identify their strengths and weaknesses [ST 2]		
Students are able to reflect and improve their performance well. [ST 8]		
Students feel acknowledged [ST 6]	**Increase in Motivation**	**Decrease of affective filter**
Students are inspired to make their works better the next time. [ST 1]		
Students' confidence is boosted [ST 3]	**Increase in Self-Confidence**	
Students are inspired to participate and engage in the learning process [ST 5]		
Students gain some interest to improve for the future [ST 1]	**Improvement of learning interest**	**Improvement of Learning productivity**
Students heighten the level of their interest especially in improving not just for the teachers but for themselves as well. [ST 2]		
Students' learning experience become worth it and satisfying [ST 2 & 3].	**Improvement of learning experience**	
Students feel assured in their learning. [ST 4]		

Improvement of Lexical Skills. This refers to the students' ability to comprehend the words of a language as they develop. Students were able to establish a feeling of meaning for a word as a result of their teachers' feedback. This theme emerged because of the *students' enhancement of spelling (ST 1 & ST 5) and enhancement of words choice (ST 6 & ST7)*. They affirmed that their ability to spell and use words has improved because of the written feedback. This supported Zhang, Chen, Hu, and Ketwan (2021), who

found out in their survey study that students reported written corrective feedback as the most useful feedback for their grammatical, lexical, spelling, and punctuation errors. Zarei and Mousavi (2016) also added that when teachers use multiple and varied feedback, it contributes to their teaching and students' learning process towards lexical collocations.

Improvement of Sentence Structure. This implication relates to the students' capacity to construct grammatically correct sentences. As supported by Jennings (2021), students were able to develop a framework for clear written expression of concepts due to the teachers' feedback. This theme derived from the *students' efforts to improve punctuation* (ST 1 & 4) and *sentence fragment* (ST 1, 4, & 8). The students inferred that feedback aids in accentuating the emotion of a sentence. Additionally, they also avoided becoming excessively wordy. This is congruent with Tseng (2018), who found that the number of students' mistakes in their sentence structure, verb, and word categories has significantly reduced.

Improvement of grammatical skills. The grammar has improved as a result of the teachers' comments. This theme results from the perception of student growth in using *pronouns, aspect, and verb tenses.* (ST 1, 2, & 5). Students expressed that they learned to correct the inconsistencies of their verb tenses and pronouns because of the feedback. It led them to maximize those resources to be more consistent in their writing. This result agreed with Rouhi, Dibah, and Mohebbi (2020), who stated that plenty of studies found that various types of corrective feedback influence students' grammatical accuracy. Students who obtained teacher feedback were believed to improve in journal writing (Thananchai & Padgate, 2018).

Development of Written organization. This implication relates to improving students' capacity to structure their written work. This theme emerged because students affirmed their *improvement of coherence* (ST 6 & ST 8) and *improvement of cohesion* (ST 6 & 8). During the interview, they asserted that the feedback has widen their knowledge of the dos and don'ts in writing. Additionally, they were more acquainted with the cohesive devices. This claim is in line with Kao (2019) who concluded that teachers who provided more learning opportunities to students had enhanced their cohesion.

Enhancement of self-regulation. The enhancement of self-regulation was a benefit gained by the students from the teachers' feedback wherein the development of the ability and responsibility of the students to manage their learning and behavior happened (Harding, Galvao de Barba, & Goh, 2016). This theme stems from the *enhancement of goal-setting* (ST 3 & ST 2) and *enhancement of the students' self-assessment (ST 2, 3, & 8).* As obtained from the interview, students attested that they established goals more when they received feedback. It also boosted their motivation to achieving those goals. These results coincide with Rodgers (2019), who said that because of the teachers' feedback, students could establish personal goals and review their performances, which benefited their engagement in self-regulation.

Decrease of Affective filter. The affective filter is defined as a learner's negative feelings, such as lack of motivation, confidence, and anxiety, that impact their learning and achievement. Thus, a decrease of an affective filter refers to a decrease in anxiety and other emotional obstructions of the students in their learning. This theme is stems from the *increase in motivation* (ST 1 & 6) and *self-confidence* (ST 3 & 5) of the students. The students admitted that motivating feedback boosted their confidence and motivation. They received praise according to their submitted outputs, leading them to participate more in class. The decrease of affective filters is one of the things that impacted the students because of the teachers' feedback. This is congruent with Mese

and Sevilen (2021) who found that students perceived their feedback as satisfying. They found it a tool to boost their motivation and decrease the affective filter.

Improvement of learning productivity. This effect enabled the students to produce academic work effectively. It drives the students to engage in the learning process with the right motivation and interest (Brooks, 2021). This theme stems from improving students' learning interests (ST 1 & 2) and experiences (ST 2, 3 & 4). The students stated that despite producing activities if the teacher would employ encouraging feedback, the level of interest would likely increase. This supported Pearson (2016) who posited that good feedback minimizes the learners' ambivalence towards their current performance level. He further stated that establishing broad academic goals with appropriate feedback is pivotal in stabilizing the students' level of interest and engagement in their learning endeavors.

CONCLUSION

This study will impact the administrators, teachers, and students from the data gathered from the two research questions. Firstly, this study greatly showed how beneficial the feedback strategies are to the students. With this being said, the administrators may be able to create avenues such as orientation and training for the teachers to practice regularly and appropriately various written corrective feedback strategies. Secondly, this study may impact the teachers in several academic institutions so that they can effectively incorporate and employ various written corrective feedback strategies. The teachers may look after the various strategies found in this study and exercise those as students have found them very beneficial. Lastly, the student may be able to value the feedback provided by the teachers. This study will provide them better understanding how significant the teachers' feedback is. With this, they may be encouraged to note it or even take a screenshot for future reference. Moreover, this study will also give the students enough courage to ask for feedback from the teachers if they failed to provide some.

This study has highlighted the teachers' written corrective feedback strategies and the implication of their strategies. With this, a number of limitations were come across in the process of conducting this study that consequently left some spaces that might be significant to be explored to. Hence, should the future researchers venture this topic, they may consider the following:

Firstly, this study did not investigate the written corrective feedback strategies of the teachers in modular and face-to-face classes. Modular and face-to-face classes are far too different than online learning because various hindrances do not exist that do in online learning, such as distance and time. Hence, future researchers may venture this and investigate the number and effectiveness of the strategies in both learning set-up.

Secondly, they may take into account a comparative study. Since this study only accounted the written corrective feedback strategies in online learning, they may also incorporate oral corrective feedback strategies in the same set-up. Doing so will provide rich data that could investigate the effectiveness of both feedback in the teaching and learning process of the teachers and students.

Lastly, since this study has only delved into the lens of the students through an interview, future researchers may also consider diving in deeper than this. The researchers have only limited the data gathering through interviews and in the lens of the students. It would have been better to see in an actual manner what written corrective feedback strategies the teachers employed and how it affected the students progressively throughout the semester. Future research may take this into account to

see the students' lens towards the teachers' written corrective feedback strategies in an actual way.

While conducting the study, the researchers realized that the students' learning progress is not only governed by the teacher's discussion and activities. In other words, written corrective feedback is as important as providing learning materials and assessments to the students. The progress of the students may not that fully dependent to the feedback strategies of the teachers but it opens a way for the students to look deeper into the level of their learning. The students' responses and the many studies that the researchers have encountered made them realise that providing appropriate feedback to the students may greatly influence their knowledge and progress. It enables them to see their strengths and weaknesses which may further let them know their full potential. Moreover, providing written feedback also allows learners to build relationships with their teachers. It eases their affective filters and intensifies their confidence to do well in class. Hence, the researchers understood the value of providing appropriate written feedback strategies of the teachers.

REFERENCES

Afify, M.K. (2018). The Impact of Interaction between Timing of Feedback Provision in Distance E-Learning and Learning Styles on achieving Learning Outcomes among Arab Open University Students. https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/91619

Agbayahoun J.P. (2016). Teacher Written Feedback on Student Writing: Teachers' and Learners' Perspectives. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0610.01

Amoli, A.F. (2022). The Effect of Oral Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback on Learners' Knowledge of Pronoun among Iranian EFL Learners. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1006.07

Brooks, L. (2021). Classroom productivity: 5 Incredible ways to increase it. Retrieved from https://happyproject.in/classroom-productivity/.

Caduceus International Publishing. (2021, April 9). Combatting Lack of Motivation in Online Learning. https://www.cipcourses.com/combatting-lack-of-motivation-in-online-learning/

Canals, L., Granena, G., Yilmaz, Y., & Malicka, A. (2020). Second Language Learners' and Teachers' Perceptions of Delayed Immediate Corrective Feedback in an Asynchronous Online Setting: An Exploratory Study. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1288929.pdf

Coman, C., T, îru, L.G., Schmitz, L.M., Stanciu, C., &Bularca M.C. (2020). Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education during the Coronavirus Pandemic: Students' Perspective.

Creswell J., & Plano Clark V (2011). Designing and conducting mixed method research. 2nd Sage; Thousand Oaks, CA: 2011.

Delahunt, B., & Maguire, M. (2017). Doing a thematic analysis: A practical step-by-step guide for learning and teaching scholars. https://ojs.aishe.org/index.php/aishe-j/article/view/335.

Demira, Y. & Sarsarb, F. (2021). The effectiveness of emotional motivational feedback messages via online assignments in information technologies and software course academic achievement. Journal of Educational Technology & Online Learning, 4(2), 280-292.

Dworkin S. (2012). Sample Size Policy for Qualitative Studies Using In-depth Interviews.

Fu, M. (2019). The associations between individual differences in working memory and the effectiveness of immediate and delayed corrective feedback. DOI:10.1075/jsls.19002.fu.

Gan, Z., An, Z., & Liu, F. (2021). Teacher Feedback Practices, Student Feedback Motivation, and Feedback Behavior: How Are They Associated With Learning Outcomes? Frontiersin psychology, 12, 697045. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697045

Ganapathy, M., Phan, J., & Tan, D. (2020). Impact of written feedback on Malaysian ESL secondary students' writing performance. 10.17576/3L-2020-2603-11.

Goskoy, A.S., &Nazli, O.P. (2016). The effect of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on students' writing.https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/349051

Harding, S.M., Galvao de-Barba, P., & Goh, F. (2016). Teaching self-regulated learning skills. Retrieved from https://www.teachermagazine.com.au/articles/teaching-self-regulated-learning-skills

Henderson M. (2017). Universities are Failing their students through Poor Feedback Practices. https://theconversation.com/amp/universities-are-failing-their-studies-through-poor-feedback-practices-86756.

Huang R., Lehman, J. Lu, H. Tlili, A. & Wang, H. (2021). Investigating feedback implemented by instructors to support online competenct-based learning (CBL): a multiple case study. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00241-6

Irwin, B. (2017). Written Corrective feedback: Student preferences and teacher feedback practices. Volume 3 – Issue 2 – AFOR Journal of Language Learning

Jennings, D. (2021). How to Write Better by Improving Your Sentence Structure. https://study.com/academy/lesson/howtowritebetterbyimprovingyoursentencestructure.html#:~:text=Good%20sentence%20structure%20makes%20your,modifiers%20in%20the%20wrong%20place

Kao., C.,C., (2019). Development of Team Cohesion and Sustained Collaboration Skills with the Sport Education Model. Retrieved from sustainability-11-02348 (1).pdf

Kim H, Sefcik JS, Bradway C. (2017) Characteristics of qualitative descriptive studies: A systematic review. Research in Nursing & Health 40: 23–42.

Lanka, E., Lanka, S., Rostron, A. & Singh, P (2021). Why We Need Qualitative Research in Management Studies. https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2021200297.en.

Lira-Gonzales, M.L., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The Amount and Usefulness of Written Corrective Feedback Across Different Educational Contexts and Levels. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v37i2.1333

Meşe, E. &Sevilen, Ç. (2021). Factors influencing EFL students' motivation in online learning: A qualitative case study. Journal of Educational Technology & Online Learning, 4(1), 11-22.

Mohammad, T., & Rahman, T. (2016). English Learners Perception on Lecturers' Corrective Feedback. http://www.theartsjournal.org/index.php/site/index.

Nordquist, R. (2019). Lexical Meaning (Words). Glossary of Grammatical and Rhetorical Terms. https://www.thoughtco.com/lexical-meaning-words-1691048

Nordquist, R. (2018). What is cohesion in composition? Retrieved from https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-cohesion-composition-1689863

Pearson. (2016). Proving Educational Feedback. Retrieved from https://www.pearson.com/content/dam/onedotcom/onedotcom/us/en/pearson-ed/downloads/Feedback.pdf

Rabidoux S., &Rottmann A. (2017). How to Provide Meaningful Feedback Online. https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/views/2017/09/06/how-provide-meaningful-feedback-online-course.

Surber, K. (2021). What is Structure in Writing and How does it Affect Meaning? https://study.com/academy/lesson/what-is-structure-in-writing-and-how-does-it-affect-meaning.html

Rodgers, Linda. (2019). The Effects of Giving Effective Feedback Strategies in Reading with Elementary Students. Retrieved from Sophia, the St. Catherine University repository website: https://sophia.stkate.edu/maed/331

Rouhi, A., Dibah, M., & Mohebbi, H. (2020). Assessing the effect of giving and receiving written corrective feedback on improving L2 writing accuracy: does giving and receiving feedback have fair mutual benefit?.DOI:10.1186/s40862-020-00093-z

Tseng, C.H. (2018). Delayed Effect of Teachers' Error Correction on EFL Students' Ability in Self Correction in Writing: A Case Study. doi:10.30845/ijll.v5n4p20

Thananchai, P., & Padgate, W. (2018). The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback on grammatical improvement in journal writing of grade 9 students in a thai school. Journal of Education and Social Sciences, Vol. 11, Issue 1, (October) ISSN 2289-9855

Tamm, S. (2020). 10 Biggest Disadvantages of E-learning. https://e-student.org/disadvantages-of-e-learning/#online-student-feedback-is-limited

Tamayo, M.R., &Cajas, D. (2017). Strategies of Metalinguistic and Recast Feedback during Oral interactions. https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.11315 \.

Wei W, Cao Y (Katherine). Written Corrective Feedback Strategies Employed by University English Lecturers: A Teacher Cognition Perspective. SAGE Open. July 2020. doi:10.1177/2158244020934886

Yi, D. (2021). The Effects of Immediate Versus Delayed Teacher Feedback on L2 Writing. DOI:10.22158/selt.v9n3p69

Yu, M., Wang, H., & Xia, G. (2022). The Review on the Role of Ambiguity of Tolerance and Resilience on Students' Engagement. 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.828894

Zarei, A.A., & Mousavi, M. (2016). The Effects of Feedback Types on Learners' Recognition of Lexical Collocations. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.2p.150

Zhan, L. (2016). Written Teacher Feedback: Student Perceptions, Teacher Perceptions, and Actual Teacher Performance. English Language Teaching, v9 n8 p73-84 2016.

Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., &Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL Students' Preferences for Written Corrective Feedback: Do Error Types, Language Proficiency, and Foreign Language Enjoyment Matter? https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660564