



## UNVEILING PEDAGOGICAL INSIGHTS: INVESTIGATING ENGLISH TEACHERS' WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK STRATEGIES

Antonio A. Sumabat Jr.<sup>1i</sup>,

Dulce Marie A. Martinez<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty,

University of Mindanao,

Bansalan College

Davao del Sur, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Faculty,

Davao del Sur State College,

Matti, Digos City,

Davao del Sur, Philippines

### Abstract:

This qualitative phenomenological study explored the lived experiences of twelve English teachers in Davao del Sur, Philippines, concerning student essay correction. Employing purposive sampling, the research investigated the challenges faced, the written corrective feedback (WCF) strategies used, and teachers' perceptions of WCF efficacy. Using thematic analysis and content analysis, the themes were formulated. The teachers' experiences revealed navigating the complexities of balancing encouragement with critique, managing time, and addressing diverse writing issues through strategies like focused feedback and peer review. Their WCF strategies prioritize clarity via simple language and examples, encompassing metalinguistic explanations, direct correction, indirect guidance, and blended approaches. Post-feedback, teachers address clarifications and conduct discussions. Teachers perceived WCF as potentially enhancing engagement, writing improvement, and error correction, emphasizing clarity and contextual relevance. They noted the significant impact of student perceptions and emotions, stressing the need for constructive delivery to nurture a positive learning environment and meaningful writing development.

**SDG Indicator #4:** (Quality Education)

**Keywords:** English teachers, pedagogical, phenomenology, written corrective feedback, strategies

---

<sup>i</sup> Correspondence: email [antonio\\_sumabat@umindanao.edu.ph](mailto:antonio_sumabat@umindanao.edu.ph)

## 1. Introduction

Written corrective feedback (WCF) plays a crucial role in improving students' writing skills, but also presents challenges. Students often struggle with understanding teachers' comments and error codes and correcting errors based on feedback (Anggoro Kurnia, 2022). Effective WCF should be understandable, focused, and direct. Students prefer meta-linguistic explanations and direct WCF, facilitating writing proficiency and language knowledge (Rasool *et al.*, 2023). However, some students express concerns about ambiguous feedback that confuses them about their errors (Rasool *et al.*, 2023).

In the United States, a study revealed significant differences between student and teacher preferences regarding WCF amount, type, and focus. While most teachers value providing varied WCF strategies, their practices may differ. The teacher-student relationship is crucial in WCF effectiveness, influencing feedback amount, student clarification-seeking behavior, and revision accuracy. Factors shaping this relationship include goal alignment, expectation fulfillment, and power dynamics (Liu *et al.*, 2022).

In the Philippines, many students' works are written and completed virtually, necessitating the teachers to 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, delayed feedback, and ambiguous feedback are just of the problems observed by the students. As a result, students' motivation and interest in the teaching and learning process decrease (Bucol & Sangkawong, 2024).

In Davao City, the sudden shift in the learning setup during the pandemic 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 (Syting *et al.*, 2023).

Thus, both direct and indirect WCF are effective strategies, with direct WCF accompanied by metalinguistic explanations showing superior results in improving writing performance. Teachers believe in the positive impact of purposeful feedback, while students view WCF as essential for refining their writing skills, particularly for grammatical corrections (Adzhar & Nurhasmiza Sazalli, 2024). Interestingly, instructors prefer indirect WCF with metalinguistic comments, while students favor direct WCF with metalinguistic comments (Hamid *et al.*, 2021).

As discussed above, various studies emphasized the significance of written corrective feedback (WCF) in improving students' writing proficiency (Hamid *et al.*, 2021; Rasool *et al.*, 2023; Syting *et al.*, 2023). However, several gaps remain, particularly in understanding the WCF strategies employed by English teachers in Davao del Sur. In particular, the researcher has not come across a study that explores how English teachers employ written corrective feedback strategies in essay assignments of senior high school students during modular distance learning, about the language teacher cognition

framework. Also, there is a lack of related literature and studies about written corrective feedback in local and national settings in the Philippines. Hence, this study needs to be conducted. Also, this study is a significant research effort to provide insight into the complex and multidimensional nature of written corrective feedback (WCF) used by English teachers in private school environments.

By exploring the cognitive characteristics associated with the WCF practices used by English teachers in private schools, this study provides a more comprehensive understanding of the pedagogical principles that underlie these instructional tactics. These findings are crucial in improving the quality and effectiveness of English language teaching in private schools. It also contributes to the wider discussion on language education and ultimately positively impacts students' language acquisition and development. This study shall contribute to the generation of new knowledge and provide significant pedagogical implications in teaching writing; thus, there is a need to conduct this study.

The research tackled the urgent need to comprehend English teachers' written corrective feedback (WCF) approaches. This study is vitally needed to illuminate English language teachers' different strategies since feedback is crucial to language acquisition. With the worldwide relevance of English literacy in academic and professional settings, teachers must discover WCF best practices to improve their teaching methods and build more informed language education regulations. This research sought to provide evidence-based pedagogical principles to improve English language instruction.

This research on written corrective feedback strategies employed by English teachers aligns with several Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). First, it addresses SDG 4: Quality Education by focusing on enhancing the effectiveness of teaching methodologies in language education. By investigating and understanding the cognitive underpinnings of teachers' feedback practices, the study aims to improve the quality of instruction and ultimately lead to better learning outcomes for students in writing skills. Furthermore, emphasizing making feedback clear, understandable, and relevant contributes to equitable access to quality education, ensuring students are not hindered by ambiguous or ineffective feedback. The findings can inform teacher training programs and pedagogical approaches, fostering a more supportive and effective learning environment, which is crucial for achieving inclusive and equitable quality education for all. Additionally, improved English literacy skills, a direct outcome of effective WCF, can contribute to SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth by equipping students with the necessary communication skills for future employment and success in a globalized world.

The main purpose of this qualitative research employing phenomenological and content analysis approaches was to explore English teachers' written corrective feedback strategies. Specifically, it had the following questions:

- 1) What are the experiences of teachers in correcting students' essays?
- 2) What are the common written corrective feedback strategies employed by English teachers in correcting students' essay assignments?

- 3) What insights can the English teachers share with teachers about the efficacy of written corrective feedback in general?

## **2. Methods**

### **2.1 Study Participants**

The research focused on twelve (12) key informants (KIs) who were secondary English teachers. Purposive sampling was used to select twelve (12) Key Informants (KIs), with one representative from each school. Their responses were thoroughly verified through a semi-structured interview. The researcher also collected students' essays, including correction feedback provided by the key informants or teachers.

One-on-one interviews were the primary data collection method. The research aimed to delve deeply into the lived experiences of these English teachers. This qualitative method, provides a comprehensive and detailed examination of the phenomenon. The study sought to encapsulate the complex nature of participants' experiences by permitting them to articulate their personal accounts, encompassing the obstacles encountered, strategies employed for coping, and their insights (Neubauer *et al.* 2019).

### **2.2 Material/Instrument**

The research technique employs interviews, verified interview guide questionnaires, and voice recorders as the principal devices for data gathering. These methods allow researchers to obtain in-depth insights directly from participants, ensuring a thorough comprehension of their experiences. The interview guides are evaluated by an experienced panel of experts to verify their efficacy and relevance. This method includes gathering comments and suggestions for modifications, thereby improving the quality and rigor of data collection.

The interview guide questions were meticulously written to produce responses that delve into various aspects of the participants' experiences as English teachers utilizing written corrective feedback strategies. Utilizing existing research and literature pertinent to the study's subject, the questions are crafted to elucidate the intricacies and complexities of the participants' lived experiences. Moreover, the questions have been modified to align with the social circumstances of the participants, assuring relevance and sensitivity.

### **2.3 Design and Procedure**

The study used a qualitative research design, especially adopting a phenomenological and content analysis approach. The approach's main purpose was to come up with a description of the nature of the occurrence in question. Phenomenology is both a method and a process that requires researching a few subjects over a lengthy period to develop meaning patterns and relationships. The researcher puts his own experiences aside during this procedure to comprehend those of the study participants. The qualitative

technique helped improve and allowed the researcher to use his interpersonal abilities in the research exploratory processes (Alase, 2017).

## **2.4 Ethical Considerations**

The study prioritizes voluntary participation, providing participants with a clear explanation of the research's nature and allowing them to make an informed decision, all while adhering to rigorous ethical standards. Participants' data is protected by maintaining the seclusion and confidentiality of their personal or professional information. The informed consent procedure should be straightforward, free of technical jargon, and emphasize the potential advantages of the study. The questionnaire is distributed exclusively with the appropriate authorization. In order to safeguard the identity of the participant, informed consent is obtained. It is important to note that the research does not incorporate high-risk scenarios related to physical, psychological, or socioeconomic issues within its scope.

## **2.5 Data Analysis**

Data analysis involves systematically organizing and condensing data, requiring researchers to interpret the findings through extensive reading, thorough study, and reflection. This process demands active engagement due to its time-intensive nature, with researchers delving into textual content to uncover underlying meanings (Ravindran, 2019).

Thematic analysis, the qualitative data analysis methodology selected for this investigation, entails the identification of patterns or themes within the data (Villegas, 2022). In order to guarantee that the data is accurately represented, researchers designate titles and categorize these themes. These themes are subsequently analyzed by researchers to derive conclusions and insights from the data.

## **2.6 Trustworthiness of the Study**

The credibility, transferability, reliability, and confirmability of the findings are all improved by the meticulous participant selection, transparent methodologies, ethical considerations, and rigorous data analysis that underpin the study's reliability. The comprehensive participant selection process and engagement strategies serve to fortify trustworthiness. The selection of participants who voluntarily agreed to participate in the study interviews was facilitated by the use of random sampling, a recognized research procedure. Participants were granted the discretion to either approve or decline the interview, thereby guaranteeing ethical engagement practices and confidentiality.

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 Exam Lived Experiences of English Teachers in Correcting Students' Essay

Research question number one aimed to explore the lived experiences of the twelve (12) participants in correcting students' essays. There are four (4) emerging themes from the responses of the twelve (12) participants of this study, namely:

- 1) Challenges Encountered,
- 2) Bases for Checking,
- 3) Strategy, and
- 4) Student Reactions to Feedback.

##### 3.1.1 Challenges Encountered

The first theme is called *Challenges Encountered*. This theme captures the difficulties English teachers face in providing feedback to students. This theme is multidimensional, and it reflects the various obstacles English teachers experience in the feedback process.

The first significant challenge revolves around balancing criticism with motivation. Participants expressed difficulty in giving constructive feedback without discouraging students. They noted that while it is necessary to point out areas for improvement, doing so can sometimes lead to a decline in student confidence and motivation. Maintaining a positive tone while addressing weaknesses was seen as essential yet challenging, especially when students reacted negatively or became disengaged after receiving criticism. This is relevant to the study of Moussa *et al.* (2024), who stated that providing effective feedback is a complex task for educators, requiring them to navigate the delicate balance between identifying areas for improvement and fostering student motivation. In addition, how feedback is framed and delivered significantly impacts student reception and subsequent learning behaviors; this emphasizes the need for teachers to develop strategies that promote growth without undermining confidence (Gan *et al.*, 2021).

Participants 2 and 4 responded that:

*"Balancing constructive criticism with encouragement is sometimes challenging."* (P2)

(Balancing constructive criticism with encouragement can sometimes be challenging.)

*"Time constraints, varying student's profession and skill level, and ensuring that the feedback is both constructive and motivating."* (P4)

(Time constraints, varying student's profession and skill level, and ensuring that the feedback is constructive and motivating.)

One significant challenge revolves around students' writing ability. Participants expressed frustration when students struggled with basic grammar skills, had difficulty understanding corrections, or demonstrated poor penmanship. According to the participants, these struggles often led to a lack of confidence in students and slowed overall academic progress. This confirms the study of Akramovna *et al.* (2020), who found that teachers often face challenges when students exhibit weaknesses in fundamental writing skills, which can hinder the effectiveness of feedback and require teachers to adapt their instructional strategies. Moreover, addressing these writing skill gaps is crucial, but it can be time-consuming and necessitate differentiated approaches to meet diverse student needs (Nielsen, 2021).

Participants 6 and 4 narrated that:

*"Silang gi correctionan dili gihapon sila maka gets/makasabot. So mag sulat kog mas basic words, kaysa akong gi gamit na word, ilisan sya og mas sayon na word"* (P6)

(Even though they were corrected, they still don't understand. So, I will write using more basic words than those I used and replace them with easier words.)

*"Students are having difficulty in grammar/No basic grammar skills from elementary"* (P4)

(The students are having difficulty with grammar. They lack basic grammar skills from elementary school.)

Another key challenge is related to irrelevant essay content. Some participants found it difficult when students strayed from the topic, included unnecessary information, or did not understand the assignment. According to the participants, this often resulted in essays that lacked clear focus and coherence. They emphasized that these issues made evaluating students' true understanding and writing development challenging. This result validates the findings of Mumford and Atay (2021), who stated that teachers often struggle with students' essay content that deviates from the assigned topic or includes irrelevant information, as this can complicate the assessment process and require additional instructional focus on assignment comprehension and adherence.

Participants 2 and 9 narrated that:

*"Actually number 1 challenges jud kay syempre mag basa man ta labi nag kung ang students wala na aware sa point sa imong pangutana, rag malibog gyud ka like asa man sya gikan ani,"* (P2)

(Actually, the number one challenge is reading, especially when the students aren't aware of the point of your question. You can get confused, like, where did that come from?)

*"...the student has written their work is that prayer iyang gibutang didto sa pina ka middle sa ano sa essay. So as a teacher, if you will not read their work talagang ma deceived ka nila kay naay mga studyante na para taas lang gyud ang essay na isulat is they will insert any necessary information or contents sa essay para taas lang tan awon" (P9)*

(...the way the student has written his work is that he placed a prayer right in the middle of the essay. So, as a teacher, if you don't read their work, they can really. Deceive you because there are students who, to make their essay longer, will insert any unnecessary information or content into the essay just to make it look longer.)

Another significant challenge is related to the teacher's ability to give feedback. This includes the challenges and skills in providing students with effective and constructive feedback on their written work. This includes the capacity to balance positive reinforcement with necessary critique, creating feedback based on the individual student's needs and abilities, and ensuring that the feedback is clear, specific, and actionable for student improvement. As narrated by the participants, delivering meaningful feedback was often time-consuming and mentally demanding, especially when trying to tailor it for diverse learners. According to Mercader *et al.* (2020), how teachers frame and deliver their feedback significantly influences how students perceive and utilize it for their learning. Furthermore, teachers' confidence and training in providing effective written corrective feedback play a crucial role in the quality and impact of their feedback practices (Chen *et al.*, 2021).

Participants 2 and 4 narrated that:

*"Number 1 challenge pod is kaning Course time kay you need to spend time man gyud to read their essay sa content." (P2)*

(Another top challenge is the course time because you need to read the content of their essays.)

*"Siguro sir ang number of essays nga e check nako, and then time kay consuming man gud kayo ang mag check, specially pag ang bata is intelligence smart sya " (P4)*

(The number of essays I must check, and then the time because checking is very time-consuming, especially when the student is intellectually sharp.)

The next significant challenge is the time required for detailed feedback. This refers to the significant time investment necessary for teachers to provide comprehensive and individualized written corrective feedback on student essays. This includes reading each essay carefully, identifying errors across various aspects of writing, formulating specific and helpful comments, and ensuring the feedback is legible and understandable



for the student. According to the participants, the sheer volume of essays and the depth of attention required often led to fatigue and time constraints.

They explained that this sometimes forced them to give less detailed feedback than they would have preferred, potentially limiting its value for students' growth. As Paris (2022) stated, time constraints often pose a barrier to providing the level of detailed feedback teachers believe is most beneficial for student learning. Moreover, factors such as large class sizes and competing professional responsibilities can further exacerbate the challenge of allocating sufficient time for thorough feedback (Molavi, 2024).

Participants 1 and 3 narrated that:

*"For me, the most challenging one is to identify the mistakes themselves because I have many students who have capabilities in structures and are knowledgeable in grammar and other technical factors. So the challenge for me is to find the most or the most minimal mistakes they have."* (P1)

(For me, the most challenging thing is identifying the mistakes themselves because I have many students who are capable of structure and knowledgeable in grammar and other technical factors. So, the challenge for me is to find even the smallest or most minor mistakes they make.)

*"Students have difficulty understanding the teacher's handwriting."* (P3)

(Students have difficulty understanding the teacher's handwriting.)

Another significant challenge is that students disregard feedback. This describes teachers' challenges when students do not actively engage with or utilize the written corrective feedback provided on their essays. This can manifest as students not reading the feedback, not understanding the corrections, or not applying the feedback in their subsequent writing assignments. According to the participants, this lack of engagement often led to repeated errors and minimal improvement over time. They expressed frustration that their efforts to provide thoughtful feedback were frequently overlooked. According to Ajajawi *et al.* (2022), several factors can contribute to students disregarding feedback, including a lack of motivation, a perception that the feedback is unclear or unhelpful, or a lack of explicit instruction on effectively using feedback for revision.

In addition, this issue of students disregarding feedback requires teachers to implement strategies encouraging students to actively engage with and learn from the feedback they receive (Zhang & Hyland, 2022).

Participants 1 and 3 narrated that:

*"For me, the most challenging one is to identify the mistakes themselves because I have many students who have capabilities in structures and were knowledgeable in grammar and other technical factors."* (P1)

(For me, the most challenging thing is identifying the mistakes themselves because I have many students who are capable in terms of structure, knowledgeable in grammar and other technical factors)

*"Students have difficulty understanding the teacher's handwriting." (P3)*

(Students have difficulty understanding the teacher's handwriting.)

### 3.1.2 Bases for Checking

The second emerging theme is the basis for checking. This emphasizes the fundamental elements considered when evaluating student work. Whether the content focuses on reading the entire essay first, checking grammar, spelling, coherence, organization, and mechanics, or utilizing criteria and rubrics, this revolves around establishing a clear foundation for assessment. This theme focuses on having well-defined and applied standards when providing feedback to ensure a systematic and comprehensive evaluation of student output.

As narrated by the teachers, they first read the students' essays. Teachers take this initial approach when providing written corrective feedback, which involves reading the entire essay to better understand the student's ideas, arguments, and overall writing quality before focusing on specific errors. According to the participants, this method helps them better contextualize mistakes and provide more meaningful, targeted feedback. They noted that understanding the flow and intent of the writing first allowed them to respond more effectively to both content and form. This aligns with the study of Siekmann *et al.* (2022), who stated that the initial reading allows teachers to assess the essay's strengths and weaknesses regarding content, organization, and coherence, providing a context for subsequent, more detailed feedback. In addition, prioritizing holistic reading can also help teachers identify patterns of errors and modify their feedback to address the most significant areas for improvement in the student's writing (Yu & Liu, 2021).

Participants 2 and 8 responded that:

*"Usually, ang pina ka typical process when I am correcting students essay is first I'm going to read the whole essay, and then I'm getting the thought about the essay." (P2)*

(Usually, the most typical process when correcting students' essays is. First, I read the whole essay, and then I grasped the main idea of the essay.)

*"First, read the entire essay to understand the content, then provide feedback on organization, coherence, grammar, and mechanics. I also highlight strands and areas for improvement." (P8)*

(First, I read the entire essay to understand the content and then provide feedback on organization, coherence, grammar, and mechanics. I also highlight strengths and areas for improvement.)

Another basis for checking is the orthography of the students. This refers to the correctness of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization in student writing. According to the participants, consistent orthographic errors often interfered with the clarity and professionalism of students' work. They shared that addressing these issues was essential yet time-consuming, requiring careful attention to detail across each essay. According to Bahr *et al.* (2020), errors in orthography can sometimes impede understanding and affect the overall impression of the written work. While some teachers may prioritize higher-order concerns, such as argumentation and organization, in their feedback, solving significant and recurring orthographic errors is often necessary (Suzuki & Kormos, 2020). The decision on how much to focus on orthography in feedback can depend on factors such as the student's proficiency level, the purpose of the writing task, and the teacher's pedagogical approach (Al-Jarf, 2022).

Participants 9 and 2 narrated that:

*"So, if I'm going to describe my typical process and correcting students' essays, first I must identify their errors, especially in writing their essays. First, I must identify their misspelled words and grammar structures."* (P9)

(So, if I'm going to describe my typical process for correcting students' essays, first, I must identify their errors, especially in their writing. First, I have to identify their misspelled words and their grammatical structures.)

*"First, we always have criteria, right? For content alone, there are specific criteria. But when it comes to basing our criteria on their grammar, organization, punctuation, and spelling..."* (P2)

### 3.1.3 Strategy

The third emerging theme is strategy. As narrated by the teachers, the feedback process is a carefully considered endeavor, with strategy emerging as a key element. English teachers shared different strategies as an experience in correcting students' essays. One consistent strategic consideration is time management. Some strategies involve giving direct feedback, where specific comments and guidance are likely provided.

As shared by the teachers, they efficiently allocate time to provide meaningful and timely feedback on student writing. According to the participants, this careful time management allows them to thoroughly review each student's work and offer specific guidance for improvement. The students themselves noted that this feedback was instrumental in helping them understand their strengths and areas where they needed to focus. According to Pollock and Tolone (2020), effective time management is crucial for

ensuring that all students receive adequate attention and that feedback is provided while it is still relevant for student learning and revision. Additionally, teachers often need to balance the desire to give detailed feedback with the practical constraints of their workload, including the number of students they teach and other professional responsibilities (Alisoy, 2024).

Participants 1 and 3 responded that:

*"Time management because there is time for checking the different outputs and also there always a time for doing my workload." (P1)*

(Time management is challenging because I need time to check the different outputs and workload.)

*"Actually, naga take gyud ko og time to write a feedback sa diri school and outside sa school gina dala nako ang papel sa mga bata sa balay para I check sya og tama ba ilahang gipang butang didto sa content. So hirap sya e manage kung ikaw gyud na teacher na sa school lang dapat ka mag buhat ani na mga butang kay school work raman sya dili gyud sya makaya and kailangan mo extend gyud kag hours para to check and to give feedback sa ilang works." (P3)*

(I take time to write feedback both at and outside of school. I even bring the students' papers home to check if what they put in the content is correct. So, it isn't easy to manage if you're the kind of teacher who thinks these things should only be done at school because it's schoolwork. It's not doable, and you need to extend your hours to check and give feedback on their work.)

Another strategy implemented by English teachers encompasses the perceived effectiveness of providing spoken feedback to students on their writing, individually or in group settings. According to the participants, oral feedback facilitated a more direct and contextually rich explanation of areas for development. Furthermore, they observed that the interactive nature of this feedback modality enhanced student engagement and fostered a more personalized learning experience. This is relevant to the study of Schillings *et al.* (2021), who stated that verbal feedback can offer opportunities for immediate clarification, dialogue, and a more personalized approach to addressing student needs and questions. In addition, teachers may use verbal feedback to supplement written feedback, address common errors, or guide students through the revision process in real time (Link *et al.*, 2022).

Participants 4 and 6 responded that:

*"...normally dili ko naga hatag og feedback sailaha gyd, kanang verbally. Kanang gina normally lang, when I am returning their essays moingon lang ko 'okay kindly check your*

*essay kung unsay mga mali and then next time dapat you don't have to do that one na para less na ang errors. " (P4)*

(...normally, I don't give them feedback verbally. Usually, when I'm returning their essays, I say, 'Okay, kindly check your essay for any mistakes, and next time, you shouldn't repeat those so there will be fewer errors.)

*"Like gina ingnan gyud nako sila na mali ni, kuan sya murag more on unfocus, gina ana nako sila na mali ni, dapat mao ni so naay verbal." (P6)*

(Like, I tell them, 'This is wrong, this is... it's more unfocused.' I tell them, 'This is wrong, it should be this,' so there is verbal feedback.)

Moreover, English teachers implement peer feedback sessions. This refers to their practice of incorporating activities where students provide feedback to each other on their writing. According to the participants, these sessions cultivate a collaborative learning environment and empower students to critically evaluate their own and their peers' work. They also shared that engaging in peer review enhances students' understanding of assessment criteria and diverse writing perspectives. According to Fan and Xu (2020), peer feedback can offer several benefits, including increasing student engagement with the feedback process, developing their critical reading and analytical skills, and providing additional perspectives on their work. However, successful implementation of peer feedback requires careful planning, clear guidelines, and explicit instruction on how to provide constructive and helpful feedback (Wu & Schunn, 2023).

Participant 11 responded that:

*"I use peer feedback sessions to help students identify and revise errors." (P11)*

(I use peer feedback sessions to help students identify and revise errors.)

Furthermore, English teachers also provide comprehensive feedback. Teachers aim to provide feedback that addresses multiple aspects of student writing, including content, organization, argumentation, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. According to the participants, this multi-faceted approach ensures students receive a holistic understanding of their writing strengths and weaknesses across various dimensions. They emphasized that such detailed feedback empowers students to better understand effective writing practices. Carles and Winstone (2023) explain that comprehensive feedback seeks to offer a holistic view of the student's writing strengths and weaknesses, guiding them towards improvement across various dimensions. In addition, achieving comprehensive feedback can be challenging due to time constraints and the complexity of assessing multiple writing elements simultaneously (Golparvar & Rashidi, 2021).

Participants 8 and 11 responded that:

*"I use a combination of details comments for major issues and symbols or bricks for minor errors to save time while ensuring clarity." (P8)*

(I use a combination of detailed comments for major issues and symbols or brief notations for minor errors to save time while ensuring clarity.)

*"I categorize errors (e.g., grammar, organization, coherence) and comment on key improvement areas. (P11)*

(I categorize errors (e.g., grammar, organization, coherence) and comment on key improvement areas.)

### **3.1.4 Student Reactions to Feedback**

The fourth emerging theme is student reactions to feedback. As narrated by the English teachers, student reactions to feedback on their writing range from negative to positive. Some students feel frustrated, overwhelmed, or discouraged by extensive corrections. Others respond more constructively, showing appreciation, seeking clarification, and applying feedback to improve their work. The students have both negative and positive reactions to their teachers' feedback.

As described by the teachers, negative reaction describes the unfavorable responses and feelings expressed by students towards the written corrective feedback they receive on their essays. According to the participants, these reactions can manifest as frustration, demotivation, or reluctance to engage with future feedback. They posited that understanding the sources of these negative responses is crucial for refining feedback strategies and fostering a more positive learning environment. According to Zada *et al.* (2022), this can manifest in various ways, including feelings of demotivation, frustration, shame, or a perception that the feedback is overwhelming or unhelpful. Moreover, negative reactions can hinder students' willingness to engage with the feedback and utilize it for revision, potentially undermining the intended benefits of the corrective feedback (Mercer & Gulseren, 2024).

Participants 12 and 8 responded that:

*"I once had a student who ignored feedback completely until I gave personalized verbal guidance." (P12)*

(I once had a student who completely ignored feedback until I gave them personalized verbal guidance.)

*"A challenging moment was when a student felt discouraged, so I had to adjust my approach to be more encouraging." (P8)*

(A challenging moment was when a student felt discouraged, so I adjusted my approach to be more encouraging.)

Although English teachers experience negative reactions from students, they also experience positive reactions from their given feedback. Positive reaction describes students' favorable responses and feelings towards the written corrective feedback they receive on their essays. As shared by the teachers, these positive reactions often include increased motivation, a greater willingness to revise, and a stronger sense of accomplishment. According to the participants, such positive responses reinforce the value of their feedback efforts and contribute to a more engaged and receptive learning atmosphere. According to Fong and Schallert (2023), this can include feelings of appreciation, understanding, motivation to improve, and a perception that the feedback is helpful and contributes to their learning. Similarly, positive reactions are more likely to lead to students actively engaging with the feedback, implementing suggestions for revision, and developing a more positive attitude towards writing and learning (Zhang and Hyland, 2022).

Participants 12 and 9 responded that:

*"A student once thanked me because my feedback helped them win a writing competition."*  
(P12)

(A student once thanked me because my feedback helped them win a writing competition.)

*"They have different responses. First, those students are really intelligent; they accept feedback constructively."* (P9)

(They have different responses. First, those students who are intelligent accept feedback constructively.)

### **3.2 Written Corrective Feedback Strategies Employed by English Teachers in Correcting Students' Essay Assignments**

Research question number two aimed to explore the written corrective feedback strategies of the twelve (12) participants in correcting students' essay assignments. There are three (3) emerging themes from the responses of the twelve (12) participants and the corrected essays of the students, namely:

- 1) Main feedback strategies,
- 2) Feedback clarity, and
- 3) Post-feedback.

### 3.2.1 Main Feedback Strategies

The first theme is called Main Feedback Strategies. This theme captures the strategies employed by English teachers in correcting students' essay assignments. Teachers often use direct and indirect strategies when giving feedback on students' writing. Sometimes, they correct errors by writing the student the right word, phrase, or sentence. Other times, teachers underline or circle mistakes or use codes and symbols to point out the problem without answering. Teachers also use metalinguistic feedback, like writing questions or comments in the margins, to get students thinking more deeply about their errors.

The first significant main feedback strategy is a combination of feedback. Participants describe instances where they utilize a combination of explicit error correction and more suggestive feedback strategies. According to the participants, this blended approach allows them to directly address critical errors while encouraging students to actively engage in the revision process. They also shared that creating the balance between explicit and suggestive feedback depends on the individual student's needs and the specific learning objectives. This is relevant to the study of Shahab and Saeed (2024), who stated that direct feedback clearly points out errors and often provides the correct form, while indirect feedback highlights the error without giving the correction, prompting students to self-correct. Moreover, employing both approaches can cater to different learning styles and encourage varying levels of student engagement with error correction (Abdullah *et al.*, 2024). In addition, teachers might use direct feedback for more critical or frequent errors and indirect feedback to promote learner autonomy and deeper processing of grammatical rules (Toufaha, 2024).

Participants 7 and 10 responded that:

*"Ang duha gyud sir kanang direct feedback and indirect feedback, sa pag correct nako sa ilang essay."* (P7)

(The two main things, Sir, are direct and indirect feedback when correcting their essays.)

*"I use direct feedback for grammar errors and indirect feedback for content and coherence."* (p 10)

(I use direct feedback for grammar errors and indirect feedback for content and coherence.)

Another significant main feedback strategy is direct feedback. This refers to instances where teacher participants explicitly identify errors in student writing and often provide the correct form or explanation. As shared by the teachers, this approach is particularly useful for addressing recurring grammatical errors or unclear sentence structure. According to the participants, direct feedback offers clarity and can efficiently guide students toward accurate language use. According to Scherer *et al.* (2024), direct



feedback leaves little ambiguity about what needs to be changed and can be particularly helpful for lower-proficiency learners or for addressing systematic errors. In addition, while direct feedback can efficiently point out errors, it may offer fewer opportunities for students to actively engage in problem-solving and develop their error-detection skills (Manson & Ayres, 2021).

Participants 2 and 4 responded that:

*"Direct, kay sa direct man gud makita man gud sa bata asa ilang mali when it comes to spelling, when it come to the grammar, kay ako man syang correctionan, linginan or kung naay nasubraan imbis for example ashes I mean ash gihimong ashes e crash out tung na sumpay, then mohatag ko og feedback. As well as gina apply pod nako tung ginaingon na focus, usahay kanang mag correct kag phrase." (P2)*

(Direct, because with direct feedback, the students can see where their mistakes are in spelling and grammar, because I correct them for them. I circle it, or if there's something extra, for example, if they wrote 'ashes' instead of 'ash,' I cross out the extra 'es,' and then give feedback. I also apply focused correction, sometimes when correcting a phrase.)

*"Direct feedback or explicit feedback kasagaran but usually dili na nako gina explain ngano pero gina provide lang nako. Ang spelling, gina circle, tapos correct." (P4)*

(Direct feedback or explicit feedback is what I usually use, but I usually don't explain why; I correct. For spelling, I circle it and then write the correction.)

Moreover, English teachers also utilized indirect feedback as their main feedback strategy. As narrated by the participants, there are instances where they indicate the presence of an error in student writing without explicitly correcting it. According to the participants, this strategy aims to foster students' independent learning and problem-solving skills. They explained that prompting students to identify and correct their errors encourages deeper engagement with grammatical rules and writing conventions. This is relevant to the findings of Rasool *et al.* (2022), who stated that indirect feedback can take various forms, such as underlining or highlighting the error and using codes to indicate the error type. Similarly, indirect feedback encourages students to actively engage with their errors, develop their metalinguistic awareness, and become more autonomous learners (Pham, 2023).

Participants 3 and 9 responded that:

*"Yung encircle corrective, grammar og mali ang grammar encircle. Minsan yung encircle lang na word yung ikaw na ang bahala mag hanap ng mali and then oral." (P3)*

(I use encircling for corrections and grammar; if it is wrong, I encircle it. Sometimes, I encircle the word, and they are the ones who have to find the mistake. And then I also give oral feedback.)

*"...because of the heavy workloads as a teacher, I apply indirect feedback where I underline if it is too long and mali structures sa ilang sentence. I encircle if misspelled a language and if not necessarily ang word na ilang gi apply, I put x on it."* (P9)

(...because of the heavy workload as a teacher, I apply indirect feedback where I underline if it's too long and if the sentence structures are wrong. I encircle misspelt words, and if the word they used is inappropriate, I put an 'x' on it.)

Furthermore, English teachers used metalinguistic feedback to correct students' essay assignments. As narrated by the participants, there are instances where they provide explicit explanations about the nature of the error, often including grammatical rules or terminology. According to the participants, this type of feedback aims to enhance students' understanding of the underlying linguistic principles governing correct usage. They believed that by providing this explicit knowledge, students are better equipped to avoid similar errors in the future and develop a more sophisticated understanding of the English language. According to Liu and Hwang (2024), metalinguistic feedback aims to raise students' awareness of language structures and rules, facilitating deeper understanding and long-term learning. Similarly, metalinguistic feedback can be particularly beneficial for adult learners who may benefit from explicit grammatical explanations (Paraskeva & Agathopoulou, 2022).

Participants 12 and 9 responded that:

*"I provide marginal comments and end notes for deeper explanations."* (P12)

(I provide marginal comments and endnotes for deeper explanations.)

*"...I usually use a metalinguistic feedback where I ask questions, I give suggestions, and I give comments if necessary."* (P9)

(...I usually use metalinguistic feedback where I ask questions, give suggestions, and provide comments if necessary.)

### 3.2.2 Feedback Clarity

The second theme is called Feedback Clarity. English teachers provide clarity in feedback so students can easily understand written corrective feedback. As described by the teachers, ensuring clarity involves using precise language and avoiding jargon that might confuse students. According to the participants, when feedback is easily comprehensible,

students are more likely to engage with it effectively and implement the suggested revisions.

According to Roy *et al.* (2020), clarity in giving feedback involves using clear and simple language, providing specific examples when necessary, orienting students to any symbols or codes used, and ensuring that the handwriting is legible. Similarly, feedback that lacks clarity can confuse students, hindering their ability to understand and utilize the corrections for improvement. Teachers must be mindful of the language they use and how they present their feedback to maximize student comprehension (Winstone & Boud, 2022).

Participant 2 responded that:

*"Ako silang gi correctionan dili gihapon sila maka gets/makasabot. So mag sulat kog mas basic words, kaysa akong gi gamit na word, ilisan sya og mas sayon na word."* (P2)

(Even though they were corrected, they still don't understand. So, I will write using more basic words than those I used and replace them with easier words.)

### 3.2.3 Post-Feedback

The third theme is called post-feedback. This encompasses teachers' activities and strategies after providing written corrective feedback on student work. According to the participants, these post-feedback activities are crucial for ensuring that students actively process and utilize the feedback provided. They elaborated that these strategies aim to bridge the gap between receiving feedback and implementing meaningful revisions in subsequent writing tasks. According to Nguyen *et al.* (2021), this can include answering student clarifications, conducting individual or whole-class discussions about common errors and feedback points, and guiding students to revise their work based on the feedback received.

In addition, effective post-feedback strategies are crucial for ensuring that students actively engage with the feedback, understand how to apply it, and ultimately improve their writing skills (Williams, 2024). Research emphasizes the importance of incorporating opportunities for students to actively use and reflect on feedback to maximize its impact on learning. Furthermore, the studies above highlight the value of teacher-student conferences and peer feedback activities as effective post-feedback strategies that promote student engagement and revision.

### 3.3 Insights of English Teachers about the Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in General

Research question number three aimed to explore the insights of the twelve (12) participants about the efficacy of written corrective feedback in general. There are three (3) emerging themes from the responses of the twelve (12) participants, namely:

- 1) Effective feedback strategy leading to writing improvement,
- 2) Considerations when giving feedback, and

### 3) Correcting a misconception about feedback.

#### 3.3.1 Effective Feedback Leading to Strategy Leading to Writing Improvement

The first theme focuses on the teachers' insights on the importance of effective feedback and approaches that would be most helpful in enhancing students' writing skills. As highlighted by the teachers, effective feedback is considered a cornerstone of student development in writing. According to the participants, their approaches are designed to identify areas for improvement and empower students to become more self-aware and autonomous writers. According to Hattie (2007), effective feedback includes specific, actionable, timely, and focused on key areas for development (Mili *et al.*, 2024). Additionally, students often value feedback that identifies errors, explains why they are errors, and provides guidance on how to revise and improve their future writing (Mandouit & Hattie, 2023).

As narrated by the English teachers, it would improve their writing skills when the students heed feedback. This explores the conditions and student behaviors that lead to them paying attention to and utilizing the written corrective feedback they receive. According to the participants, students are more likely to heed feedback when it is clear, specific, and timely. They also noted that a positive student-teacher relationship and a classroom culture that values feedback play significant roles in student uptake. According to Kutasi (2023), factors such as the clarity and specificity of the feedback, the student's motivation to improve, their understanding of the feedback's purpose, and their belief in its usefulness affect students' perception of feedback. Similarly, when students actively engage with feedback and use it to revise their work, it is more likely to contribute to their writing development (Mao & Lee, 2024).

Participants 4 and 12 responded that:

*"It is really effective sa written corrective feedback, when compared to verbal feedback, kay kung verbal man gud dali ra kaayo nato malimta, specially sa students dali ra kaayo malimtan sa students, pero og written siya anytime pwede ma basa sa student, so effective kay sya."* (P4)

(Written corrective feedback is more effective than verbal feedback because we can easily forget verbal feedback, especially students who forget it very easily. But if it's written, the student can read it anytime, so it's very effective.)

*"It depends on the student's motivation—some improve significantly, while others do not utilize the feedback."* (P12)

(It depends on the student's motivation—some improve significantly, while others do not utilize the feedback.)

Moreover, the English teachers also shared that consistent and clear feedback helps students realize the errors in their essays. This emphasizes the importance of the nature of the feedback itself in facilitating students' understanding of their writing mistakes. As articulated by the teachers, providing feedback regularly and in an easily understandable manner enables students to identify patterns in their errors. According to the participants, this clarity and consistency contribute to a more profound awareness of their writing challenges and facilitate targeted improvement. This is relevant to the study of McTighe and Frontier (2022), who stated that feedback that is provided consistently across assignments and that is articulated clearly and unambiguously is more likely to help students identify patterns in their errors and develop a deeper awareness of the areas they need to improve. Additionally, when feedback is consistent and easy to understand, students are better equipped to internalize the corrections and apply them independently in future writing (Suliman, 2024).

Participants 1 and 3 responded that:

*"I believe that it is more effective rather than the students, will learn their mistakes by their own because it can trigger their thinking skills if someone corrects them." (P1)*

It is more effective than having students learn from their own mistakes because being corrected by someone can trigger their thinking skills.

*"They become aware that there is a mistake sa ilang pag write, grammar ba yan sya, punctuation's apil naman na sa grammar ang punctuation's, spellings specially spellings kay na observe pod namo karon sir, na many students don't know how to spell. So daghan gyud mga bata na ma mali og spelling sa subject-verb agreement. So para pod ay ingani di ay dapat ni diria, ngano ingani ako gibutang." (P3)*

(They become aware of a mistake in their writing, whether it's grammar – and punctuation is included in grammar – or spelling. Especially spelling, because we've also observed that many students don't know how to spell. So, many students make mistakes in spelling and subject-verb agreement. This makes them think, 'This should be here; why did I put it like this?')

On the other hand, the English teachers also shared that direct feedback is viewed as the most effective feedback strategy. This explores the perception of the teachers who explicitly point out errors and provide the correct form, which is the most helpful approach for students to learn from their mistakes. According to the participants, the immediacy and clarity of direct feedback minimize ambiguity and provide a clear path for students to correct their errors. They suggested that while other feedback methods have their merits, direct correction offers the most efficient means for students to grasp and rectify specific mistakes. According to Satake (2020), some students and teachers may believe that direct correction is more efficient and less ambiguous, leading to quicker

understanding and uptake of the feedback, especially for lower-proficiency learners or specific types of errors. This view contrasts with the idea that indirect feedback can promote deeper processing and learner autonomy.

Participants 9 and 4 responded that:

*"For me, students find most helpful feedback is direct feedback kasi most of them wanted a specific correction dili na sila mag hunahuna provided na gyud ang corrections sa mga teachers mao nang mas helpful sa ilaha. To do you want to address any misconception about the retail collective feedback." (P9)*

(For me, the feedback students find most helpful is direct feedback because most of them want specific corrections. They don't have to think anymore because the teachers already provide the corrections, which is why it's more helpful. Do you want to address any misconception about collective feedback?)

*"Siguro ang direct, kay ang direct feedback kay, its be direct man gyud kung baga parang na con-feed man gud nimo sila kung unsay tama og mali, kan sya compare sa lain na type of feedback." (P4)*

(Perhaps direct feedback is, well, direct. It's like you're directly feeding them what is right and wrong, compared to other types of feedback.)

### 3.3.2 Considerations When Giving Feedback

The second theme focuses on the teachers' considerations when giving feedback. When giving feedback, teachers should ensure it helps students improve and feel supported. As stated by the participants, written feedback is often more effective than verbal because students can go back to it anytime. Students must read and use the feedback to revise their work. Direct and clear corrections, especially with examples, are very helpful for beginners.

As narrated by the English teachers, they believe that effective feedback stems from the teachers' English proficiency. According to the participants, a strong linguistic foundation enables teachers to accurately identify errors and articulate feedback with precision and clarity. They implied that their expertise in English directly influences the quality and helpfulness of the feedback they provide to students. This suggests a perceived link between the teacher's command of English and their ability to provide high-quality, effective written corrective feedback. This implies that a strong grasp of grammar, vocabulary, and writing conventions enables teachers to accurately identify errors, articulate corrections clearly, and offer explanations that students can understand and utilize for improvement (Muharmah & Fauzan, 2024). Conversely, a teacher's language proficiency limitations hinder their capacity to provide precise and helpful feedback.

Participants 9 and 5 responded that:

*"...expert gyud ka sa imong field kay sabi nga nila you cannot give what you have, how can you correct misspelled word if you don't know the spelling and all. So ana lang be expert to your field." (P9)*

(...you have to be an expert in your field because, as they say, you cannot give what you don't have. How can you correct a misspelled word if you don't know the spelling? So, be an expert in your field.)

*"Study. Study grammar, vocabularies, spelling mao ng importante." (P5)*

(Study. Study grammar, vocabulary, and spelling. Those are important.)

Moreover, the teacher's assessment skills ensure the effectiveness of the feedback. As shared by the English teachers, their ability to accurately assess student work is fundamental to delivering impactful feedback. According to the participants, a keen understanding of writing conventions and learning objectives allows them to pinpoint crucial areas for improvement and offer guidance that directly supports student growth. This emphasizes the role of the teacher's expertise in evaluating student writing and identifying key areas for improvement. Teachers with strong assessment skills can provide targeted and insightful feedback that addresses students' specific needs and promotes meaningful development in their writing abilities. This is relevant to the findings of Taye and Teshome (2020), who stated that effective assessment skills involve not only recognizing errors but also understanding the underlying reasons for those errors and prioritizing feedback that will have the greatest impact on student learning.

Participants 6 and 4 responded that:

*"Be careful kung first pa lang ka be careful jud inig hatag og feedback kay dili tanan maka understand sa imoha specially sa imong construction sa imong mga words." (P6)*

(Be careful, especially if it's your first time, be very careful when giving feedback because not everyone can understand you, especially your sentence construction and word choice.)

*"Siguro mag base ko sa akong experience which is, syempre essay is, in one students he will take, pila baya ka minutes noh para mag sulat specially kung taas pa ang answer sa bata, siguro ang advise nako sa new teachers, in providing written corrective feedback siguro just give the students na instruction na, they have to answer the essay direct to the point, depending on the question given sa studyante." (P4)*

(Perhaps I'll base it on my experience, which is, of course, an essay... one student will take, how many minutes, right, to write, especially if the student's answer is long. So, my advice to new teachers in providing written corrective feedback is

perhaps just to give the students the instruction that they have to answer the essay directly to the point, depending on the question given to the student.)

In addition, the participants emphasized that affective aspects of learner must be considered when giving feedback. As narrated by the English teachers, the way feedback is framed can significantly impact students' receptiveness and motivation to improve. According to them, considering the affective domain involves being mindful of tone, offering encouragement alongside critique, and fostering a supportive learning environment where students feel safe to take risks and learn from their mistakes. According to Maag *et al.* (2022), feedback that is perceived as overly critical or discouraging can negatively impact student motivation and engagement with the learning process. Therefore, effective feedback often incorporates strategies that balance critique with positive reinforcement and focus on promoting a growth mindset in students (Panadero & Lipnevich, 2022).

Participants 6 and 9 responded that:

*"Make feedback constructive by balancing criticism with positive reinforcement."* (P6)

(Make feedback constructive by balancing criticism with positive reinforcement.)

*"be careful the way you write your corrections the way nimo kores- koresan ilang output dapat dili degrading sa ilang part and dapat knowledgeable ."* (P9)

(Be careful in the way you write your corrections, and the way you mark up their work. It shouldn't be degrading for them, and you should be knowledgeable.)

### 3.3.3 Correcting Misconception about Feedback

The third theme focuses on correcting misconceptions about feedback. As narrated by the participants, some students and even new teachers often misunderstand feedback, thinking it is purely a form of criticism aimed at pointing out mistakes. However, this is a misconception that needs to be corrected. Feedback, particularly written corrective feedback, is not meant to criticize or diminish a student's abilities, it is a tool for learning and growth. When given effectively, feedback guides students toward improvement by helping them become aware of their writing errors and understand how to fix them. It works best when it is specific, direct, and includes examples, while also balancing corrections with praise to maintain students' motivation and confidence.

As narrated by the English teachers, feedback is given to help students improve their writing skills, not to simply criticize their work. This reflects the teachers' explicit articulation of the primary purpose of providing written corrective feedback. According to the participants, their intention is to guide and support student learning, fostering a growth mindset towards writing. They emphasized that the goal of feedback is constructive development, encouraging students to view errors as opportunities for



learning rather than as indicators of failure. This finding is relevant to the study of Morris *et al.* (2021), a positive perception towards feedback emphasizes a formative approach to feedback, where the goal is to guide student learning and development rather than merely to identify and judge errors. In addition, teachers who hold this view often aim to frame their feedback in a supportive and encouraging manner, focusing on strategies for improvement and fostering a growth mindset in their students (Sharp & Messuri, 2023).

Participants 8 and 11 responded that:

*"Feedback is not mean to criticize but to guide improvement. Students should see it a learning should see it a learning tool."* (P8)

(Feedback is not meant to criticize but to guide improvement. Students should see it as a learning tool.)

*"Some students think feedback is criticism, but it's actually meant to help them grow."* (P11)

(Some students think feedback is criticism, but it's actually meant to help them grow.)

#### 4. Conclusions

Firstly, the findings emphasize the necessity for the Department of Education to champion and potentially mandate comprehensive professional development for English educators. This training should focus on equipping teachers with effective and efficient written corrective feedback strategies, including techniques for focused feedback, prioritizing error types based on student needs, and methods for streamlining the process. Furthermore, professional development should emphasize diagnostic assessment skills to create feedback appropriately, the ability to differentiate feedback based on learner proficiency and error types, strategies for positive framing to foster a growth mindset, and techniques for enhancing clarity. The Department might also consider developing guidelines or frameworks that support schools in managing teacher workloads, acknowledging the time-intensive nature of providing high-quality feedback critical for student learning.

Next, secondary schools play a crucial role in cultivating an environment where effective feedback is valued and practiced consistently. This involves fostering a school-wide culture that supports a dialogue around writing and feedback, moving beyond simple correction to interactive learning. Schools should facilitate collaborative platforms, such as professional learning communities, where English teachers can share best practices, discuss challenges, and collectively refine their feedback approaches. Encouraging and supporting teacher-led action research on feedback effectiveness within

the school context can further contribute to the development of contextually relevant and impactful feedback practices, ultimately creating a more supportive and empowering learning environment for students.

Moreover, school administrators and principals are key in enabling effective feedback practices. A primary implication is the need to address English teacher workload management, ensuring educators have adequate time allocated for the thoughtful preparation and delivery of meaningful feedback, recognizing its significance in student development. Administrators should actively support and provide resources for targeted professional development opportunities focused on enhancing teachers' feedback skills, as highlighted by the study's findings. They can also champion the establishment of collaborative structures within the school, enabling teachers to reflect on, evaluate, and improve their feedback strategies collectively.

For English teachers, this study highlights the importance of pedagogical flexibility and a student-centered approach to written corrective feedback. Recognizing challenges like time constraints and diverse student errors, teachers should employ a range of strategies, such as direct and indirect feedback, aligning them with learners' proficiency levels and specific error types. Emphasis should be placed on ensuring feedback clarity through simple language and concrete examples, and on constructive delivery that balances encouragement with critique, focusing on strengths alongside areas for improvement. Teachers are encouraged to engage students actively after feedback delivery through clarifications or conferences, fostering a dialogue. Ongoing reflection, experimentation with different feedback techniques, and consciously linking feedback to learning objectives and assessment criteria are crucial for maximizing its impact on student writing development.

Furthermore, students stand to benefit significantly from the application of these findings. Receiving feedback that is clear, focused, constructively delivered, and relevant to their learning goals enhances their ability to understand and act upon suggestions for improvement. When feedback is framed positively and emphasizes growth, it can bolster student motivation and self-efficacy, encouraging them to view writing challenges as learning opportunities. Engaging in post-feedback dialogues, such as asking clarifying questions or participating in conferences, empowers students to take a more active role in their learning process. Ultimately, refined feedback practices guided by these insights can help students become more self-aware, confident, and autonomous writers.

Lastly, this study opens several avenues for future research. Further investigation is warranted into the specific types of feedback strategies that prove most effective for distinct student profiles (e.g., varying proficiency levels, learning styles) and different categories of writing errors. Future researchers could employ quantitative or mixed-methods designs to rigorously measure the learning gains associated with various feedback techniques and delivery modes. Exploring student perspectives in greater depth – including their perceptions of feedback usefulness, their emotional responses, and how they engage with corrections – would provide valuable insights. Additionally, investigating the potential and impact of technology in facilitating more efficient,

personalized, and engaging feedback delivery presents a promising area for future inquiry.

### Funding Information

No funding involved

### Conflict of Interest Statement

We have no personal, financial, or other interest that could or could be seen to influence the decisions or actions we are taking or the advice we are giving during our research.

### About the Authors

**Antonio A. Sumabat Jr.** is a faculty member of the University of Mindanao, Bansalan College, Bansalan, Davao del Sur, Philippines.

**Dulce Marie A. Martinez** is a professor of Davao del Sur State College, Matti Digos City, Davao del Sur, Philippines.

### References

- Abdullah, G., Arifin, A., Saro'i, M., & Uhai, S. (2024). Assessing the influence of learning styles, instructional strategies, and assessment methods on student engagement in college-level science courses. *International Education Trend Issues*, 2(2), 142-150. <https://doi.org/10.56442/ieti.v2i2.466>
- Ajjawi, R., Kent, F., Broadbent, J., Tai, J. H. M., Bearman, M., & Boud, D. (2022). Feedback that works: A realist review of feedback interventions for written tasks. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(7), 1343-1356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1894115>
- Akramovna, M. S., Alimov, T. A., & Djurakulovna, F. N. (2020). Difficulties in teaching writing skills. *International Journal on Integrated Education*, 3(12), 453-457.
- Alisoy, H. (2024). The Role of Teacher Feedback in Enhancing ESL Learners' Writing Proficiency. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities*, 1(2), 65-71. <http://dx.doi.org/10.69760/1rmdzx45>
- Al-Jarf, R. (2022). Role of instructor qualifications, assessment and pedagogical practices in EFL students' grammar and writing proficiency. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices (JWEPP)* 4(2), 6-17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.32996/jweep.2022.4.2.2>
- Bahr, R. H., Lebby, S., & Wilkinson, L. C. (2020). Spelling error analysis of written summaries in an academic register by students with specific learning disabilities: Phonological, orthographic, and morphological influences. *Reading and Writing*, 33(1), 121-142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-019-09977-0>
- Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2023). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in higher education*, 28(1), 150-163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372>

- Chen, W., & Liu, G. Q. (2021). Effectiveness of corrective feedback: Teachers' perspectives. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research* 9(1).
- Eddington, B. E. B. (2014). *A modified approach to the implementation of dynamic written corrective feedback*. Brigham Young University. Retrieved from <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5388&context=etd>
- Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100775>
- Fong, C. J., & Schallert, D. L. (2023). "Feedback to the future": Advancing motivational and emotional perspectives in feedback research. *Educational Psychologist*, 58(3), 146-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2022.2134135>
- Gan, Z., An, Z., & Liu, F. (2021). Teacher feedback practices, student feedback motivation, and feedback behavior: how are they associated with learning outcomes?. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697045>
- Golparvar, S. E., & Rashidi, F. (2021). The effect of task complexity on integrated writing performance: The case of multiple-text source-based writing. *System*, 99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102524>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Kleinheksel, A. J., Rockich-Winston, N., Tawfik, H., & Wyatt, T. R. (2020). Demystifying content analysis. *American journal of pharmaceutical education*, 84(1). <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7113>
- Kutasi, R. (2023). Feedback: Unveiling its impact and enhancing its effectiveness in education. *Revista de Pedagogie*, 71(2), 7-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26755/RevPed/2023.2/7>
- Lee, I. (2019). Teacher written corrective feedback: Less is more. *Language Teaching*, 52(4), 524-536. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000247>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1743323>
- Liu, L. A., & Hwang, G. J. (2024). Effects of metalinguistic corrective feedback on novice EFL students' digital game-based grammar learning performances, perceptions and behavioural patterns. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(2), 687-711. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13400>
- Liu, Q., & Brown, D. (2015). Methodological synthesis of research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 66-81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.011>
- Maag, A., Withana, C., Budhathoki, S., Alsadoon, A., & Vo, T. H. (2022). Learner-facing learning analytic-Feedback and motivation: A critique. *Learning and Motivation*, 77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lmot.2021.101764>
- Mandouit, L., & Hattie, J. (2023). Revisiting "The Power of Feedback" from the perspective of the learner. *Learning and Instruction*, 84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2022.101718>

- Manson, E., & Ayres, P. (2021). Investigating how errors should be flagged and worked examples structured when providing feedback to novice learners of mathematics. *Educational Psychology*, 41(2), 153-171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2019.1650895>
- Mao, Z., & Lee, I. (2024). Student engagement with written feedback: Critical issues and way forward. *RELC Journal*, 55(3), 810-818. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221150811>
- McTighe, J., & Frontier, T. (2022). How to provide better feedback through rubrics. *Educational Leadership*, 79(7), 17-23. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1352751>
- Mercader, C., Ion, G., & Díaz-Vicario, A. (2020). Factors influencing students' peer feedback uptake: instructional design matters. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(8), 1169-1180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1726283>
- Mercer, M., & Gulseren, D. B. (2024). When negative feedback harms: a systematic review of the unintended consequences of negative feedback on psychological, attitudinal, and behavioral responses. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(4), 654-669. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2248490>
- Mili, I., Trabelsi, S., Mezigh, S., Mokrani, M., Golnik, K., & Boukari, M. (2024). Features of effective feedback. *Annals of Eye Science*, 9, 13-13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/aes-23-72>
- Molavi, H. (2024). Exploring stakeholder perceptions and policy implications for strategic managment of large-size classes: A systematic literature review. *Review of Education*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3481>
- Morris, R., Perry, T., & Wardle, L. (2021). Formative assessment and feedback for learning in higher education: A systematic review. *Review of Education*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3292>
- Moussa, A., Fisher, J., & Eddahmani, H. (2024). Transformative Insights: Global Perspectives on Feedback Quality for Elevating undergraduate students' Engagement and Motivation. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(3), 390-410. Retrieved from <https://www.ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/view/9742>
- Muharmah, A., & Fauzan, U. (2024). Grammatical Errors of the Ninth-Grade Indonesian EFL Students' Writing. *EDUCASIA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Pengajaran, dan Pembelajaran*, 9(3), 147-156. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21462/educasia.v9i3.262>
- Mumford, S., & Atay, D. (2021). Teachers' perspectives on the causes of rater discrepancy in an English for academic purposes context. *Assessing Writing*, 48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100527>
- Nguyen, N. L. T., Nguyen, B. T. T., & Hoang, G. T. L. (2021). Students' perceptions of teachers' written feedback on EFL writing in a Vietnamese tertiary context. *Language Related Research*, 12(5), 405-431. <https://lrr.modares.ac.ir/article-14-53676-en.pdf>

- Nielsen, K. (2021). Peer and self-assessment practices for writing across the curriculum: learner-differentiated effects on writing achievement. *Educational Review*, 73(6), 753-774. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1695104>
- Panadero, E., & Lipnevich, A. A. (2022). A review of feedback models and typologies: Towards an integrative model of feedback elements. *Educational Research Review*, 35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100416>
- Paris, B. (2022). Instructors' perspectives of challenges and barriers to providing effective feedback. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearningqu.10.3>
- Pham, L. N. (2023). The interplay between learner autonomy and indirect written corrective feedback in EFL writing. *TESOL Journal*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.694>
- Pollock, J. E., & Tolone, L. J. (2020). Improving student learning one teacher at a time. ASCD. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED610057>
- Rasool, U., Qian, J., Saqlain, M., & Abbasi, B. N. (2022). Written corrective feedback strategies: A systematic review. *Voyage Journal of Educational Studies*, 2(2), 67-83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.58622/vjes.v2i2.19>
- Roy, S., Beer, C., & Lawson, C. (2020). The importance of clarity in written assessment instructions. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 44(2), 143-155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2018.1526259>
- Satake, Y. (2020). How error types affect the accuracy of L2 error correction with corpus use. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 50. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100757>
- Scherer, S., Graham, S., & Busse, V. (2024). How effective is feedback for L1, L2, and FL learners' writing? A meta-analysis. *Learning and Instruction*, 93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101961>
- Schillings, M., Roebertsen, H., Savelberg, H., van Dijk, A., & Dolmans, D. (2021). Improving the understanding of written peer feedback through face-to-face peer dialogue: students' perspective. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 40(5), 1100-1116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1798889>
- Shahab, M. L., & Saeed, K. M. (2024). Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback: Lecturers' Perspectives. *The Qualitative Report*, 29(10), 2582-2603. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol29/iss10/3/>
- Sharp, E. A., & Messuri, K. (2023). A reprieve from academia's chilly climate and misogyny: The power of feminist, women-centered faculty writing program. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 30(4), 1236-1253. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12967>
- Siekmann, L., Parr, J. M., & Busse, V. (2022). Structure and coherence as challenges in composition: A study of assessing less proficient EFL writers' text quality. *Assessing Writing*, 54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2022.100672>



- Suliman, W. (2024). Using self-and peer-correction to enhance college students' writing ability. *Journal of the Nordic Academy of Wisdom*, 2(12), 170-186. Retrieved from <https://neacademys.com/externalUploads/6SE22.pdf>
- Suzuki, S., & Kormos, J. (2020). Linguistic dimensions of comprehensibility and perceived fluency: An investigation of complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language argumentative speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 42(1), 143-167. Retrieved from <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/studies-in-second-language-acquisition/article/abs/linguistic-dimensions-of-comprehensibility-and-perceived-fluency-an-investigation-of-complexity-accuracy-and-fluency-in-second-language-argumentative-speech/8889434839EE5442F4BE4767F2224DE3>
- Syting, C. J. O., Malisobo, J. R., Salce, M., & Roasol, M. (2023). Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback Strategies through the Lens of the Students. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 3(2), 171-186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v3i2.227>
- Tarrayo, V. N., Anudin, A. G., Mendoza, H. B., & Parungao-Callueng, E. S. (2022). Challenges and opportunities in teaching writing online amidst the pandemic: Voices from English language teachers in Philippine universities. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, 47(4), 74-90. <https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/informit.652800480467355>
- Taye, T., & Teshome, G. (2024). Investigating The Impact of Grammatical Mistakes on English Writing Skills: The Case of 1st-Year English Language and Literature Undergraduate Students at Mizan Tepi University. Retrieved from [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=4703351](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4703351)
- Toufaha, S. (2024). The effect of automated error corrective feedback on the improvement of EFL learners' writing and autonomy (Doctoral dissertation, University Kasdi Merbah Ouargla). Retrieved from [https://dspace.univ-ouargla.dz/jspui/bitstream/123456789/35662/1/SAHKI%20Toufaha\\_compressed.pdf](https://dspace.univ-ouargla.dz/jspui/bitstream/123456789/35662/1/SAHKI%20Toufaha_compressed.pdf)
- Williams, A. (2024). Delivering Effective Student Feedback in Higher Education: An Evaluation of the Challenges and Best Practice. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 10(2), 473-501. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1426687.pdf>
- Winstone, N. E., & Boud, D. (2022). The need to disentangle assessment and feedback in higher education. *Studies in higher education*, 47(3), 656-667. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1779687>
- Wu, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2023). Passive, active, and constructive engagement with peer feedback: A revised model of learning from peer feedback. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2023.102160>
- Yu, S., & Liu, C. (2021). Improving student feedback literacy in academic writing: An evidence-based framework. *Assessing Writing*, 48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100525>

- Zada, S., Khan, J., Saeed, I., Wu, H., Zhang, Y., & Mohamed, A. (2022). Shame: Does it fit in the workplace? Examining supervisor negative feedback effect on task performance. *Psychology research and behavior management*, 2461-2475. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S370043>
- Zhang, Z. V., & Hyland, K. (2022). Fostering student engagement with feedback: An integrated approach. *Assessing Writing*, 51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100586>

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions, and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of English Language Teaching shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).