

# Implementation of Remedial Feedback and Observable Progression System in GFP English Writing

Dr. Hilal Al Shandhodi<sup>1</sup> & A.S.M. Shamim Miah<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of English, University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Ibri, Oman

Correspondence: Dr. Hilal Al Shandhodi, Department of English, University of Technology and Applied Sciences, PO Box 512, Ibri, Oman. E-mail: hilal.alshandodi@utas.edu.om

Received: August 6, 2023

Accepted: September 25, 2023

Online Published: October 7, 2023

doi:10.5430/ijhe.v12n6p52

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v12n6p52>

## Abstract

Despite the fact that teachers and students disagree about feedback methods and its efficacy continues to be a major issue in higher education, it is universally understood that effective feedback improves students' performance. This highlights the necessity for a thorough study and greater justification of any potential discrepancies in practices and behaviour. This study aims to investigate and explore both teachers' and students' acceptance of written corrective feedback and concerted effort towards observable improvement. This study also intends to evaluate related narratives, methods, and constraints that prevent or augment such effectiveness. Furthermore, the outcome of this research will focus on designing and implementing the written corrective feedback as an observable improvement strategy in General Foundation Program (GFP) English writing classrooms. To substantiate the research objectives, an experimental and a control group consisting of 10 teachers each and 100 GFP English students with 25 from level 3 will be subjected for experimental evaluation.

**Keywords:** feedback, observable progression, improvement, writing, effective English, remedial, corrective

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Introduce the Problem

Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) refers to the process of providing written comments or corrections on a student's written work to improve their language accuracy and proficiency (Thi & Nikolov, 2021). It is an essential component of second language writing instruction (Chen & Renandya, 2020). Thi & Nikolov (2021) asserts that WCF aims to address errors and guide learners towards more accurate language use, thereby facilitating their language development. Direct corrective feedback involves explicit correction of errors, where the teacher directly points out mistakes and provides the corrected form (Mujtaba & Singh, 2023). WCF has been demonstrated to increase writing accuracy over time (Truscott, 1996). Bitchener and Ferris (2012) suggest that written corrective feedback (WCF) is an important part of second language acquisition (SLA) and second language writing. This study focuses on teacher WCF, which is the most common practice in English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL). While efforts to improve teaching and learning in higher education may take many different forms, augmenting students' GFP English writing performance is still essential to ensuring life-long effective writing aptitude. However, it appears that there is still much room for improvement in the way teachers and students conceptualise and perceive what constitutes good WCF and what results in more impact. It is clear that Oman's national level documentation of instructors' and students' attitudes and perceptions on this matter has gotten comparatively little attention. In terms of methodology, earlier studies on WCF sought to discover generalisations that require justifications that can help us understand what stands in the way of good WCF.

Recent WCF research has a cognitive focus and is partially driven by a desire to better understand how it might be offered. The literature has classified WCF into three major categories: direct, indirect, and metalinguistic. While indirect WCF refers to finding faults, direct WCF refers to finding errors and supplying the right forms. While sharing many of the same characteristics as indirect WCF, metalinguistic WCF also offers more details about the type and source of the problem. This study makes use of a custom writing booklet with 10 topics, 4 genres, and 3 drafts of each for each of the four types of WCF that differ in their degree of explicitness: direct, indirect, error code, and metalinguistic WCF.

### 1.1.1 Direct Written Corrective Feedback

Direct written corrective feedback involves teachers making explicit corrections to students' written work, aiming to address errors and guide them towards the correct form or structure. Examples include error correction, annotation, underlining, and insertion of missing information. Error correction corrects specific grammatical errors, while annotations explain incorrect phrases and suggest alternative options. Underlining highlights words or phrases that need improvement without immediate correction. Finally, insertion of missing information helps students construct coherent and grammatically correct sentences.

### 1.1.2 Indirect Written Corrective Feedback

Indirect written corrective feedback guides learners to discover their mistakes without explicitly pointing them out. It encourages reflection and revisions independently, using open-ended questions and model answers or sample sentences. This approach stimulates critical thinking and encourages active engagement in the learning process, fostering metacognitive skills and promoting autonomy. By presenting well-written examples, learners can analyse differences between their work and the model, enabling them to identify and correct errors independently.

### 1.1.3 Metalinguistic Written Corrective Feedback

Metalinguistic written corrective feedback encourages learners to reflect on their errors and develop a deeper understanding of underlying grammatical or linguistic rules. This approach involves providing explanations or comments about language errors without directly correcting them. Key words and combinations of keywords were used: written corrective feedback, direct feedback, indirect feedback, error correction, and second language acquisition/learning. Direct feedback involves providing the correct answer or expected response above or near the grammatical error. Metalinguistic feedback can include suggestions for self-correction or prompts for further exploration.

## 1.2 Importance of the Problem

The value of the various mechanisms used in WCF has always been an area of debate among scholars. As a part of a wider inquiry (Zhang, 2018) into the function of WCF in the development of GFP English in relation to several learner characteristics, this study intends to answer the following questions in order to further our understanding of learners' observable progression through WCF on several error types related to their writing skills in GFP English:

- (1) to explore how students' and teachers' conceptions of WCF may affect their behaviours and attitudes;
- (2) to determine the WCF techniques that teachers in Ibri CAS apply to improve the students' observable progress;
- (3) to identify the obstacles to observable progression & effective WCF;

## 1.3 Relevant Scholarship

Enhancing academic standards and seeking a culture of higher expectations have always been a common goal for higher education institutions (Bitchener & Cameron, 2005). Effectiveness of WCF is considered an indicator of achieving this goal. Nevertheless, the debate about the current WCF practices applied by teachers has been prominent in recent years (Sun, 2022). How teachers perceive and practice feedback, and how students react was the core of the debate (Ahea et al., 2016). Giving WCF was linked to better students' achievement. For instance, detailed WCF that students received on their writing was viewed to play a key role in improving writing proficiency (Parr & Timperley, 2010). Improvement in students' writing was also linked to timing and frequency of giving the feedback (Cotos, 2015). Furthermore, the technique teachers use in giving WCF to students seems a vital factor (Vo, 2022). However, there seems variations on what best to be used, ranging from automated feedback systems (Stevenson & Phakiti, 2014), adopting paper-making techniques to holding informal discussions and conversations with students (Diab, 2006).

In addition, research has shown discrepancies between teachers' and students' preferences of feedback techniques (Parr, & Timperley, 2010). Nevertheless, the issue of attaining better feedback impact seems far from resolved, which advocates a need to further investigate the issue in depth and from more than one perspective. Lee's (2017) taxonomy of WCF types, overt correction is the WCF type that is the most explicit, while underlining is the WCF type that is the least explicit. There is considerable curiosity about whether WCFs that are more explicit might enhance learners' L2 growth. The computational model of Gass (1997) theorises that in order for learning to occur, students must first pay attention to the target feature and recognize the The three different Word-Centred Learning (WCF) approaches—highly focused (just one error type is addressed), mid-focused (many error kinds, such as two to six), and extremely unfocused (all errors)—are the most crucial information in this article. While highly unfocused WCF is challenged for its lack of ecological validity and pedagogical usefulness for actual classrooms, highly focused

WCF is primarily concerned with theoretical assertions about the role of attention and comprehension. As a compromise, Lee (2019) advises instructors to utilise a mid-focused approach to WCF. It is important to look at how learners view the value of selective and comprehensive WCF since research suggests that resistance to it may develop when learners don't recognize its worth.

Recent research has shown that mistakes appear to have an impact on how learners perceive and react to word comprehension (WCF). Hanaoka (2007), for instance, discovered that WCF was more likely to draw Japanese English language learners' attention to lexical mistakes than other kinds of errors. Simard et al. (2015) discovered that although students could recognize WCF brought on by lexical mistakes, they occasionally mistook teachers' intentions to rectify word choice errors for spelling mistakes. According to Zhang (2018), lexical mistakes were more difficult for EFL learners to understand WCF than orthographic errors. No single kind of WCF can be anticipated to assist learners in addressing all kinds of mistakes, according to Truscott (1996).

#### *1.4 State Hypotheses and Their Correspondence to Research Design*

One hypothesis suggests that WCF can improve learners' grammatical accuracy by drawing attention to specific errors and providing appropriate corrections (Zhang et al., 2022). Another hypothesis proposes that WCF may enhance learners' linguistic knowledge by promoting noticing and internalizing correct forms (Lopez, 2020). Additionally, researchers have hypothesized that the effectiveness of WCF may vary depending on factors such as the type of error, learner proficiency level, and feedback delivery method (Chen & Renandya, 2020). By examining these hypotheses, we can gain insights into the potential benefits and limitations of WCF procedures in SLA settings (Brame & Biel, 2015). Within the research design of written corrective feedback procedures, several hypotheses have been proposed to investigate their effectiveness in improving second language (L2) writing skills (Chen & Renandya, 2020). One hypothesis suggests that direct error correction can enhance learners' accuracy by drawing attention to specific linguistic errors and promoting error awareness (Chen & Renandya, 2020). Another hypothesis posits that different types of corrective feedback, such as explicit correction or metalinguistic clues, may vary in their impact on learners' language development (Mohammadreza, 2022).

## **2. Method**

Through the use of a unique writing exercise booklet, the study investigates the usefulness of written corrective feedback and development attempts in English teaching. Four writing genres—process writing, cause and effect writing, comparison and contrast writing, and incident report writing—are covered in the booklet's ten (10) exercises spread across three revisions. Weekly attempts at these activities were needed of the students, who also received pre-feedback, post-feedback, and post-review feedback. The study assessed the effectiveness of associated narratives, techniques, and limitations. 100 GFP English students and 10 instructors comprised the experimental and control groups.

### *2.1 Research Design*

For the first phase of the study, a quasi-experimental study was used to answer the first two research questions. In this study, students participated in twice-weekly writing practice sessions for which a writing booklet containing instructions, worksheets, and rubrics was distributed to them quite early in the Spring 2023 semester. As a result, each week, students had to do three drafts of writing on 10 distinct topics (varying from pre-feedback to post-feedback and post-review feedback, or final draft). The four kinds of WCF on grammatical, lexical, orthographic, and pragmatic issues that are commonly discussed in the literature were examined in this study. It achieved this by combining quantitative and qualitative techniques. In particular, it questioned if the students advanced via repetitious WCF and developed problem-solving skills.

### *2.2 Participant (Subject) Characteristics*

The GFP English program at the College of Applied Sciences in Ibri, Oman, where English is the primary language of teaching, is where this study was carried out. Students at level 3 of their foundation year made up the study's participants.

### *2.3 Sampling Procedures*

Quota sampling was used in a non-probability selection process to choose the study's participants. There were a total of 6 General Foundation English level 3 groups, each with about 25 to 27 pupils. Out of the six groups, two were designated as the experimental group and the other two as the control group. According to the results of their exams, students performed essentially the same in each of these groups. The tutorials were delivered by several instructors who expressed interest in participating in the research and using the writing booklet in their classes. Teachers

evaluated students' writing for each of the controlled groups using the rubrics suggested by IBRI CAS. Each piece of writing required three drafts from the students. These were then assessed, and comments were provided. To show progress, the evaluation was stored in excel sheets. Only the experimental group's agreement was not necessary for the study. All other participants' consent was gained using a form that had been authorized by the UTAS ethical review board. These participants were predominantly GFP English level 3 students at the College of Applied Sciences, Ibri. The data analysis revealed no explicit portions of their vouched direct or indirect demographic data (see Figure 1: Ethical Consent, see Appendix 02. Ethical Form of Research Proposal V2).

### 2.3.1 Measures and Covariates

The main instrument in this study, a custom writing booklet that focuses on four genres of writing, including process writing, cause and effect writing, incident report writing, and compare and contrast writing, was used to derive the primary measures. This research will be conducted in the spring of 2023 over a 4-month (also known as a semester) level 3 GFP English course. The information obtained through the distribution of a questionnaire was then analyzed qualitatively.

### 2.3.2 Experimental Manipulations or Interventions

Throughout the research project, no experimental manipulations or interventions were made.

## 3. Findings and Discussion

The most crucial information in this study comes from attempts at pre-feedback, post-feedback, and post-review feedback (also widely termed as overt correction, indirect and metalinguistic correction) on the genres of process writing, cause and effect, incident report, and compare and contrast writing, in which students have made remarkable, visible progress despite expressing topic familiarity concerns. Thus, confirming that more explicit types of WCF can contribute to more learners' EFL development (e.g., Guo and Barrot, 2019). Findings show that the impact on writing improvement varies in each type as follows:

### 3.1 Corrective Pre-Feedback

The research has shown that providing corrective pre-feedback, which focuses on identifying and addressing writing errors prior to the final submission, can have a positive impact on writing improvement. Studies show that pre-feedback that highlights specific areas for improvement, such as grammar, organisation, or clarity, helps students revise their work effectively. Pre-feedback enables students to learn from their errors, leading to enhanced writing skills over time.

### 3.2 Post-Feedback

The research has shown that timely and constructive post-feedback plays a vital role in enhancing writing proficiency. Effective post-feedback focuses on providing clear explanations of strengths and weaknesses in the written work, along with specific suggestions for improvement. When students receive detailed and actionable post-feedback, they are more likely to make revisions that result in improved writing quality.

### 3.3 Post-Review Feedback

In this phase, feedback was provided to students after a comprehensive review of the entire writing process; that included three drafts. Our research findings have shown that post-review feedback is particularly effective in fostering writing development. This feedback allows students to reflect on their writing process, identify recurring errors or areas of improvement, and gain a deeper understanding of effective writing strategies. Students were encouraged to engage in metacognitive processes, leading to more substantial and long-lasting writing improvements.

Contrary to popular belief, however, a significant amount of visible progress was noted in the post-feedback and the progress was maintained in the post-review feedback attempts. Despite the addition of new grammar, sentence structure, lexical, and organisational targets, it is impressive that the performance was maintained in the follow-up tasks for all writing genres. Following the corrective feedback process, every single student asserted and affirmed their progress. The results also show that students who are tested on topics they are familiar with but in unfamiliar genres have difficulty with lexical variety, grammatical structure, and organisation (also known as cohesion and coherence) until they are repeatedly given the chance to write.

### 3.4 Statistics and Data Analysis

#### 3.4.1 Process Writing Task 1

One can infer from pre-feedback, post-feedback, and post-review feedback attempts on the process writing topic "how to make a cup of tea" that students have not only shown remarkable observable progress but also demonstrated

incremental accomplishments in post-feedback and post-review feedback attempts. Students were instructed to use passive voice in accordance with the target requirement of the approved delivery plan for Spring 2023 (See Table of Process Writing Task 1).

Table 1. Process Writing Task 1

Process Writing												
Task 1												
	Pre-Feedback				Post-Feedback				Final			
	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA
Achievers												
5 achievers	0%	5%	0%	0%	86%	81%	0%	5%	76%	86%	33%	43%
4 achievers	100%	90%	5%	48%	10%	19%	19%	76%	14%	14%	57%	48%
3 achievers	0%	5%	67%	43%	5%	0%	62%	19%	5%	0%	5%	10%
2 achievers	0%	0%	29%	10%	0%	0%	19%	0%	5%	0%	5%	0%
1 achievers	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### 3.4.2 Process Writing Task 2

However, the students have demonstrated topic familiarity concerns when employing passive voice to respond to a similar topic, "how to make a paper boat," which goes against the norm. As a result, every single student who attempted the task 2 draft 1 scored between 1 and 2 out of 5. But in the post-feedback, impressively discernible progress was seen, and the progress was sustained in the post-review feedback attempt (See Table of Process Writing Task 2).

Table 2. Process Writing Task 2

Process Writing												
Task 2												
	Pre-Feedback				Post-Feedback				Final			
	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA
Achievers												
5 achievers	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	86%	19%	10%	90%	95%	48%	71%
4 achievers	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	14%	33%	81%	10%	5%	48%	29%
3 achievers	0%	0%	0%	0%	86%	0%	38%	10%	0%	0%	5%	0%
2 achievers	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
1 achievers	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### 3.4.3 Process Writing Task 3

Despite the unfamiliar topic and the addition of a new grammatical target, that is, the imperative structure, the performance in task 3 of the process writing was maintained. Except for a meagre 33 percent of the students who had trouble with the new grammatical challenge, all of the students have claimed and validated their improved progression after acting upon the corrective feedback (See Table of Process Writing Task 3).

Table 3. Process Writing Task 3

Process Writing												
Task 3												
	Pre-Feedback				Post-Feedback				Final			
Achievers	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA
5 achievers	29%	57%	5%	14%	67%	71%	24%	48%	100%	100%	48%	90%
4 achievers	29%	43%	29%	81%	29%	29%	52%	48%	0%	0%	52%	10%
3 achievers	43%	0%	33%	5%	5%	0%	24%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2 achievers	0%	0%	19%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
1 achievers	0%	0%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### 3.4.4 Cause & Effect Writing Task 1

Similar to the process writing tasks, in the first cause and effect writing task, which asked students to write an essay on the topic "These days many people get their news from social media such as Facebook and Instagram. What do you believe are the causes of this, what effects do you think this has, and in your opinion are the effects positive or negative?", about 80% of the students scored 3 to 5 out of 5, with nearly 20% having difficulty getting into the satisfactory range. However, approximately 100 percent of the students received scores of 5 out of 5, indicating the observable progression and effectiveness of the corrective feedback approach in the post-feedback and post-review feedback (See Table of Cause & Effect Writing Task 1).

Table 4. Cause &amp; Effect Writing Task 1

Cause & Effect Writing												
Task 1												
	Pre-Feedback				Post-Feedback				Final			
Achievers	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA
5 achievers	0%	14%	0%	0%	14%	14%	0%	10%	86%	67%	14%	81%
4 achievers	43%	14%	38%	52%	57%	57%	57%	67%	14%	33%	76%	19%
3 achievers	52%	48%	48%	29%	24%	29%	43%	24%	0%	0%	10%	0%
2 achievers	5%	19%	14%	19%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
1 achievers	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### 3.4.5 Cause & Effect Writing Task 2

The students were next required to write about an unknown topic in task 2 of the same genre writing assignment, "Many people eat from restaurants. What causes do you think this is, what impacts do you think this has, and are these effects beneficial or harmful in your opinion?" As a consequence of post-feedback and post-review feedback former familiarity, over 90% of the students scored 3 to 5 out of 5 on their first attempt, increased from 2 to 3 percent in the draft 2, and finally proved sustainable progression (See Table of Cause & Effect Writing Task 2).

Table 5. Cause &amp; Effect Writing Task 2

Cause & Effect Writing Task 2												
	Pre-Feedback				Post-Feedback				Final			
	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA
Achievers												
5 achievers	0%	5%	0%	5%	14%	57%	0%	14%	86%	95%	14%	95%
4 achievers	24%	43%	38%	38%	52%	24%	57%	76%	14%	5%	86%	5%
3 achievers	57%	43%	48%	48%	14%	14%	33%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2 achievers	14%	10%	10%	10%	10%	5%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
1 achievers	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### 3.4.6 Incident Report Writing Task 1

Student writing on the topic of "write an email to your department head reporting about an incident of cheating and writing an examination even after the time was over" also showed outstanding, clearly discernible progress. However, performance improved in draft 2 attempts by 10 to 24 percent, and eventually revealed stability in the final draft by demonstrating 100 percent scoring between 3 and 5. Notably, in draft 1 of the task, around 86 to 100 percent of the students scored between 3 and 5 out of 5, but the performance improved in draft 2 attempts by 10 to 24 percent (See Table of Incident Report Writing Task 1).

Table 6. Incident Report Writing Task 1

Incident Report Writing Task 1												
	Pre-Feedback				Post-Feedback				Final			
	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA
Achievers												
5 achievers	5%	5%	0%	0%	19%	52%	0%	33%	95%	86%	5%	67%
4 achievers	19%	38%	14%	67%	71%	43%	48%	38%	5%	14%	95%	33%
3 achievers	52%	52%	71%	33%	5%	5%	48%	29%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2 achievers	19%	5%	14%	0%	5%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
1 achievers	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### 3.4.7 Incident Report Writing Task 2

Surprisingly, in the second task of the same genre—writing a report to the plane's manager to report an incident of a passenger who failed to comply with the mask wearing requirement—performance remained consistent despite topic familiarity concerns. Progress is clearly sustained, retained, and carried over in order to demonstrate the effectiveness of the corrective feedback method of evaluating the writing skills of the students in GFP from pre-feedback to the post-review feedback (i.e., draft 1 to the final draft, See Table of Incident Report Writing Task 2).

Table 7. Incident Report Writing Task 2

Incident Report Writing Task 2												
	Pre-Feedback				Post-Feedback				Final			
Achievers	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA
5 achievers	100%	43%	0%	10%	67%	100%	29%	71%	100%	100%	48%	100%
4 achievers	0%	24%	90%	86%	33%	0%	62%	29%	0%	0%	52%	0%
3 achievers	0%	33%	10%	5%	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2 achievers	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
1 achievers	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### 3.4.8 Compare and Contrast Writing Task 1

Finally, students started off predictably well in the compare and contrast writing task that challenged them to contrast and compare the sources of happiness in their community. In their pre-feedback attempts, 79 to 90 percent of the students obtained scores between 3 and 5 out of 5, which in the post-feedback attempts increased by 10 to 21 percent, and in the post-review feedback attempts further improved to indicate 100 percent progress (See Table of Compare and Contrast Writing Task 1).

Table 8. Compare and Contrast Writing Task 1

Compare and Contrast Writing Task 1												
	Pre-Feedback				Post-Feedback				Final			
Achievers	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA	TA	OG	GA	LA
5 achievers	10%	29%	5%	0%	33%	38%	10%	24%	48%	100%	10%	33%
4 achievers	57%	48%	33%	86%	48%	43%	57%	62%	52%	0%	90%	67%
3 achievers	24%	24%	62%	14%	19%	19%	29%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2 achievers	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
1 achievers	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

## 4. Discussion

According to researchers like Truscott (1996) and Truscott and Hsu (2008), WCF is inefficient at enhancing the writing skills of L2 learners and may possibly be detrimental to the learning process. Moreover, recent research has shown that error types appear to have an impact on how learners perceive and react to WCF. When learners make linguistic errors in their writing, WCF happens (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012). Hanaoka (2007) demonstrates that WCF was more likely to draw Japanese English language learners' attention to lexical errors rather than additional types of errors. Similar results were found in a research by Garcia Mayo and Labandibar (2017) that involved Spanish-speaking English learners. No single kind of WCF, according to Truscott (1996), can be anticipated to assist learners in addressing every kind of error. According to learners' perceptions of WCF, grammatical errors were the most common type of error, followed by lexical, spelling, and punctuation problems (Amrhein and Nassaji, 2010). Therefore, this study additionally examines WCF kinds (i.e., overt correction, underlining, error code and metalinguistic) as a combination with regard to non-grammatical errors, including as lexical, orthographic, and coherence and cohesion errors, in addition to grammatical errors that often occurred in GFP English student writing.

### 4.1 Process Writing Analysis

The most important details in this study are that from pre-feedback, post-feedback and post-review feedback attempts on the process writing topic, "How to make a cup of tea", students have shown remarkable observable

progress, but also indicated topic familiarity issues. However, contrary to the general expectations, the entire 100 percent of the students have scored 1 to 2 out of 5 in the task 2 draft 1. Yet, remarkably observable progress was noticed in the post-feedback and sustenance of the progress was seen in post-review feedback attempts. Notably, the performance was carried on in the task 3 of the process writing despite the introduction of a new grammar target, i.e. imperative structure. The entire 100 percent of the students have asserted and confirmed their progression following the corrective feedback method, except for a meagre 33 percent who struggled with the new grammar challenge.

#### *4.2 Cause and Effect Writing Analysis*

The most important details are the results of two cause & effect writing tasks. In the first task, 80 percent of the students scored 3 to 5 out of 5 with nearly 20% struggling to attain the satisfactory range. However, in the post-feedback, and post-review feedback, almost 100 percent of the students scored 5 out of 5. In the second task, 90 percent of the students scored 3 to 5 out of 5 on their first attempt, which incremented in the draft 2 by 2 to 3 percent, and finally confirmed sustainable progress as a result of post-feedback and post-review feedback on their attempt number three.

#### *4.3 Incident Report Writing Analysis*

Students showed significant progress in writing on a task involving cheating and examination writing. In draft 1, 86 to 100 percent of students scored 3 to 5 out of 5, but improved in draft 2 by 10 to 24 percent. In the final draft, 100 percent scored between 3 to 5. Despite familiarity concerns in the second task, performance remained stable. The corrective feedback method of assessing writing skills in GFP showed sustained, retained, and carried over progress from pre-feedback to post-review feedback.

#### *4.4 Compare and Contrast Writing Analysis*

Lastly, students performed well in a compare and contrast writing task comparing reasons of happiness in their community. Pre-feedback attempts showed 79-90% of students scoring 3-5 out of 5 in all rubric categories. Post-feedback progressed by 10-21%, and post-review feedback showed 100% progress. This indicates a positive learning experience.

Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) is referred to responses to linguistic errors in learners' written work, is a conventional tool L2 teachers use to help their learners improve accuracy in writing, except in the GFP English in Oman. More recent studies have shown that WCF could have a positive effect on the progression of L2 writing accuracy (e.g. Bitchener & Knoch, 2009a, 2009b, 2010a; Bitchener & Storch, 2016; Sheen, 2010; Van Beuvingen, De Jong, & Kuilken, 2012). Since the debate initiated by Truscott (1996) on the effectiveness of WCF, there has been increasing evidence that WCF can facilitate improved accuracy in subsequent writing, immediately and over time (for meta-analyses, see Kang and Han, 2015; Lim and Renandya, 2020). However, such effect appears to be linked to linguistic factors (e.g., feedback or error types) and depends upon learners' perceptions of WCF, particularly their preferences for WCF types, delivery mood, timing, and affective factors such as positive emotions.

### **5. Limitations**

According to researchers like Truscott (1996) and Truscott and Hsu (2008), WCF is inefficient at enhancing the writing skills of L2 learners and may possibly be detrimental to the learning process. Moreover, recent research has shown that error types appear to have an impact on how learners perceive and react to WCF. When learners make linguistic errors in their writing, WCF happens (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012). Hanaoka (2007) demonstrates that WCF was more likely to draw Japanese English language learners' attention to lexical errors rather than additional types of errors. Similar results were found in a research by Garcia Mayo and Labandibar (2017) that involved Spanish-speaking English learners. No single kind of WCF, according to Truscott (1996), can be anticipated to assist learners in addressing every kind of error. According to learners' perceptions of WCF, grammatical errors were the most common type of error, followed by lexical, spelling, and punctuation problems (Amrhein and Nassaji, 2010). Therefore, this study additionally examines WCF kinds (i.e., overt correction, underlining, error code and metalinguistic) as a combination with regard to non-grammatical errors, including as lexical, orthographic, and coherence and cohesion errors, in addition to grammatical errors that often occurred in GFP English student writing.

### **Acknowledgements**

Researchers couldn't be more grateful for the collaboration, support, and consent that they obtained from a variety of sources throughout the project. But we additionally intend to express our sincere thanks and appreciation to the people listed here:

Dr. Rashid Al Hinai, Dean, CAS, Ibri

Dr. Asma Al Kalbani, HOD, Scientific Research Department, CAS, Ibri

Dr. Amal Al Muqurshi, Member, Scientific Research Department, CAS, Ibri

Dr. Edward Langcay, HOD, Department of English, CAS, Ibri

Ms. Sara Al Yaqoubi, Lecturer, Department of English, CAS, Ibri

Ms. Amna Al Manthari, Lecturer, Department of English, CAS, Ibri

Mr. Rafiq Massoudi, Lecturer, Department of English, CAS, Ibri

All the students who formed the participants' groups for this study.

## References

- Ahea, M., Ahea, M., Kabir, R., & Rahman, I. (2016). The Value and Effectiveness of Feedback in Improving Students' Learning and Professionalizing Teaching in Higher Education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(16), 38-41.
- Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: what do students and teachers prefer and why? *Can. J. Appl. Linguist.*, 13, 95-127.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203832400>
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 193-214. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp016>
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207-217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.10.002>
- Bitchener, J., and Storch, N. (2016). *Written Corrective Feedback for L2 Development*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783095056>
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 191-205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001>
- Chen, & Renandya. (2020, September 27). *Is L2 Written Corrective Feedback Effective? – Willy's ELT Corner*. Retrieved September 5, 2023, from <https://willyrenandya.com/is-l2-written-corrective-feedback-effective/>
- Cotos, E. (2015). Automated Writing Analysis for writing pedagogy: From healthy tension to tangible prospects. *Writing and Pedagogy*, 6, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v7i2-3.26381>
- Diab, L. (2006) Error Correction and Feedback in the EFL Writing Classroom: Comparing Instructor and Student Preferences. *English Teaching Forum*, 44(3), 2-13.
- García Mayo, M., & Labandibar, U. (2017). the use of models as written corrective feedback in English as a foreign language (EFL)writing. *Annu. Rev. Appl. Linguist.*, 37, 110-127. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190517000071>
- Gass, S. (1997). *Input, Interaction, and the Second Language Learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Guo, Q., & Barrot, J. S. (2019). Effects of metalinguistic explanation and direct correction on EFL learners' linguistic accuracy. *Read. Writ. Q.*, 35, 261-276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2018.1540320>
- Hanaoka, O. (2007). Output, noticing, and learning: an investigation into the role of spontaneous attention to form in a four-stage writing task. *Lang. Teach. Res.*, 11, 459-447. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807080963>
- Kang, E., & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: a meta-analysis. *Mod. Lang. J.*, 99, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12189>
- Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom Assessment and Feedback in L2 School Contexts*. Singapore: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9
- Lee, I. (2019). Teacher written corrective feedback: less is more. *Lang. Teach.*, 52, 524-536. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000247>
- Lim, S. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Efficacy of written corrective feedback in writing instruction: a meta-analysis. *TES-EJ*, 24, 1-26.

- Mujtaba, & Singh. (2023, February 24). *The Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in ESL/EFL Context: A Synthesis of Present and Past Studies*. Retrieved August 25, 2023, from [https://www.mextesol.net/journal/index.php?page=journal&id\\_article=46403](https://www.mextesol.net/journal/index.php?page=journal&id_article=46403)
- Parr, J. M., & Timperley, H. S. (2010). Feedback to writing, assessment for teaching and learning and student progress. *Assessing Writing*, 15(2), 68-85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.05.004>
- Simard, D., Gu nette, D., & Bergeron, A. (2015). L2 learners' interpretation and understanding of written corrective feedback: insights from their metalinguistic reflections. *Lang. Aware.*, 24, 233-254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2015.1076432>
- Sun, H., & QI, W. (2022). Effects of Written Corrective Feedback on College EFL Students' Writing Accuracy and Linguistic Knowledge Acquisition. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 45(3), 445-461. <https://doi.org/10.1515/CJAL-2022-0310>
- Thi, & Nikolov. (2021, November). *Feedback Treatments, Writing Tasks, and Accuracy Measures: A Critical Review of Research on Written Corrective Feedback*. Retrieved August 25, 2023, from <https://tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume25/ej99x/ej99a16/>
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Lang. Learn.*, 46, 327-369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
- Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Lang. Learn*, 62, 1-41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00674.x>
- Vo, T. (2022). A Study of Students and Teachers' Preferences and Attitudes towards Correction of Classroom Written Errors in Saudi EFL Context. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 128-141. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p128>
- Zhang, T. (2018). *The Effect of Focused Versus Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback on the Development of University-Level Learners' Explicit and Implicit Knowledge in an EFL Context*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis), The University of Sydney, Sydney.
- Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., & Ketwan, P. (2021, March 5). EFL Students' Preferences for Written Corrective Feedback: Do Error Types, Language Proficiency, and Foreign Language Enjoyment Matter? *Frontiers*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660564>

## Appendices

Appendix A Writing Booklet

Appendix B Ethical Form of Research Proposal - v2

Appendix C Table of Process Writing Task 1

Appendix D Table of Process Writing Task 2

Appendix E Table of Process Writing Task 3

Appendix F Table of Cause & Effect Writing Task 1

Appendix G Table of Cause & Effect Writing Task 2

Appendix H Table of Incident Report Writing Task 1

Appendix I Table of Incident Report Writing Task 2

Appendix J Table of Compare and Contrast Writing Task 1

For any information about the appendices, please write to the corresponding author by email: [hilal.alshandodi@utas.edu.au](mailto:hilal.alshandodi@utas.edu.au)

## Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).