

# Individual Face-To-Face Feedback and the Saudi EFL Learners: Evaluating Enhancement of Writing Skills

Shatha Ahmed Abdulaziz Alkhalaf<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of English Language, College of Sciences and Arts in Methnab, Qassim University, Buraydah, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Shatha Ahmed Abdulaziz Alkhalaf, Department of English Language, College of Sciences and Arts in Methnab, Qassim University, Buraydah, Saudi Arabia.

Received: August 8, 2022

Accepted: October 18, 2022

Online Published: October 21, 2022

doi:10.5430/wjel.v12n7p45

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n7p45>

## Abstract

This research analyzed Saudi undergraduate students' writing before and after individual face-to-face feedback. The intervention was in the nature of individual written feedback on Saudi EFL students' paragraph writing. The participants were 23 EFL Saudi students exposed to a pre and post-test across six criteria that targeted to evaluate their writing with individual corrective feedback from the teacher. The intervention was one semester long. The study reported that individual corrective feedback plays an important role in developing students' writing skills. Results showed that development occurred in all the six criteria evaluation criteria adapted from Savage and Shafiei (2007), with significant statistical values (Sig. <.05). Furthermore, the criteria were ranked as: inclusion of specific words; inclusion of correct adjectives; writing good conclusion; writing good topic sentence; adding more descriptive details; and the use of background information. The study recommends making use of face-to-face corrective feedback in developing students' abilities in different language skills.

**Keywords:** efficient strategies, EFL, learner-centred, Saudi context

## 1. Introduction

Corrective feedback is something teachers do all the time in their everyday lives. Being involved in the classroom process, they normally know which aspect of learning is going well, which is not, and why. Feedback in the classroom is quite a natural activity, in fact, it is an ordinary, day-to-day activity for teachers (Grawemeyer et al.; 2015; Hattie & Timperley; 2007). The question is, why do teachers need to be aware of the feedback process, and also, what they can do with this awareness.

A classroom context is governed by many factors such as syllabus, learning objectives, materials, pedagogies, and technology. Each of these has a specific and indispensable role in the learning process. Teachers' feedback on the other hand, is the measure of how far any or all of these are successful in ensuring learning and set the learner firmly on the road to progress. It is a continuous process at the root of which lies course correction: Learners' errors or mistakes are an indicator of content that needs reinforcement or pedagogical modification. In this sense, corrective feedback holds as much importance for the teachers as for the learners. Changes in views on language and language learning in the last few decades have brought about changes in approaches to corrective feedback and in the role of teachers (Larraguibel 2018; Liu et al., 2020; Ryiz-Semmel, 2019). These changed views have also influenced the concept and practice of corrective feedback in the language classroom. In the changed paradigm, corrective feedback includes looking in a principled and systematic way at all the factors that affect learning. Ensuring merely that learners have secured adequate marks or grades to pass the exam is not enough to achieve the learning objectives, and is often not even the aim of the course. Detailed corrective feedback, on the other hand, evaluates on a day-to-day basis the various aspects of the teaching-learning process, and helps identify what content and pedagogies have been more effective than others and what appears to be of no use at all. Apart from the formal corrective feedback, there is always a minute-to-minute feedback process at work in class, and this mass of information shapes the professional activity of the teacher. Formal teacher feedback may be planned for two main purposes. One is to explain and confirm the content already delivered by the teacher, feasibility of the course materials, success of teaching methodology, and the testing/ assessment methods. The other aim of feedback is to bring about change. From the teachers' standpoint, corrective feedback can be used to suggest changes needed in the current practices.

From the learners' standpoint, put to proper use, feedback is an opportunity for changes in the process of internalization of knowledge by learners.

## 2. Literature Review

Several previous research has employed a variety of improvement criteria and permutations to examine the effects on EFL students' writing as a result of individual written feedback. Additionally, other research had methodological issues that made it challenging to come to any significant findings. To make the procedures and goals of this investigation clearer, a quick summary of earlier studies is presented here.

Several theoretical understandings have been noted in available literature on the impact of feedback on writing abilities of EFL students at Saudi colleges. The most important hypotheses among these are (Grawemeyer et al.; 2015; Hattie & Gan, 2017; Hattie & Timperley; 2007). Without a doubt, writing is the most important talent among all other language skills since it incorporates thinking ability, linguistic competence, and trained memory; it is a test for the writer's cognition levels (Kellogg, 2001). Writing is a challenging assignment for EFL students at Saudi institutions (Al-Ahdal & Abduh, 2021) thus personalized face to face feedback during classes is a blessing.

Feedback is essential in the development of writing skills. This is especially true in Saudi tertiary education, due to both tutors and staff's views, as well as a shift toward a more process-oriented approach to teaching writing. However, due to the limits imposed by examination-focused programs and the small number of students in each session, feedback is restricted. Feedback is information that can help students have a better understanding of how they learn (Adie et al., 2018; Hattie & Gan, 2017). Previous research on teacher feedback (e.g., Al-Bashir *et al.*, 2016; Brown, 2016; Grawemeyer *et al.*, 2015) has shown that feedback can enhance students' cognitive, emotional, and psychomotor domains during the teaching and learning process. Furthermore, according to Black and Wiliam (2018), feedback can assist students recognize and comprehend evidence regarding their skills, as well as enhance their ability for the following performance. This suggests that feedback is required to keep up the progress in learning.

Students may seek feedback from a variety of sources, including their instructor, peers, parents, or experiences depending on their performance (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). However, instructor feedback is the most important source for students to become aware of their aptitude in a certain area. When a teacher delivers feedback to students, it raises their awareness of their abilities (Black & Wiliam, 2018; Vattoy & Smith, 2019). As a result, instructor feedback may be seen as a factor that impacts learners' degree of comprehension. The majority of students who reported favorable feedback stated that instructor's inputs helped them improve their knowledge of their work in the target language. It means that instructor feedback improves students' present performance (Vattoy & Smith, 2019), assists students in identifying what they need to improve (Xiao & Yang, 2019), and improves their English language abilities (Chaudron, 1988).

Several studies have examined the revisions made by learners after receiving peer or teacher feedback and discovered that peer feedback leads to more meaning-level revisions and teacher feedback leads to more surface-level revisions (Ruegg, 2015; Yang et al., 2006). Despite the fact that there have been few published studies comparing a peer feedback group to a teacher feedback group, over the course of one semester, Fox (1980) contrasted peer feedback to instructor evaluation on writing skills. He found that there was no significant difference in writing ability between the peer feedback group and the teacher feedback group at the end of the semester and concluded that peer feedback is preferable because the learners in the peer feedback group gained confidence over the course of the semester. Finally, despite the considerable studies on written feedback, they constitute visibly far from enough research data for instructors to be certain how to assist writing. These findings imply that, when it comes to improving students' grammatical competence when writing in English, instructor feedback outperforms peer feedback in the case of Japanese university students learning English.

The purpose of the Al Saleh (2018) research was to investigate written corrective feedback techniques that improved EFL students' writing abilities in Riyadh. The research also looked at how learners felt about getting computer-mediated praise and criticism while using Showbie as a medium. According to the findings, Saudi students had different preferences for written corrective feedback techniques. The findings revealed that direct corrective feedback improved their performance whereas indirect corrective feedback received the least amount of attention in written remedial feedback. The study concluded that written corrective feedback strategies positively impacted the students' English writing performance and had a positive impact on writing abilities of EFL students.

According to Alsehibany (2021), in an EFL writing class, Saudi students showed a favorable attitude toward peer evaluation using a checklist. Researchers employed diverse methodologies to assure the authenticity of the data in this study, and they determined that peer feedback increased the writing quality of students who participated in the

study, as well as writing awareness, weaknesses, and errors. Finally, the findings show that peer feedback using a checklist is effective in similar instructional environments. Amalia et al. (2019) explored Saudi female students' attitudes toward peer feedback activity in writing courses using a list of questions for the students to follow throughout the activity, as well as the problems that may prohibit such activity from being used in Saudi EFL classrooms.

Further, Al Bashir *et al.* (2016) shed new insight on how to improve the feedback process in higher education. It transfers the emphasis from outdated feedback delivery strategies to more current, effective, and meaningful ones. Giving feedback is an important ability for professors in higher education since it has a significant impact on the quality of students' learning processes. It has been attempted, using the guidelines presented in the article, to contribute to a widespread recognition of various feedback approaches as key learning aids in higher education.

Even in this background, few research has been conducted to investigate how face-to-face feedback and technology-assisted feedback (or "e-feedback") interact in writing groups (Larraguibel 2018; Liu et al., 2020; Ryz-Semmel, 2019). To address this gap, the current study investigated how face-to-face feedback and e-feedback (generated on Moodle, WeChat, and Rain Classroom) used in different writing phases elicit diverse types of feedback, as well as how the combined use of these feedback approaches affects learners' self-efficacy and help-seeking.

Kaçar (2021) investigated the impact of online and in-person peer feedback on pre-service Turkish teachers EFL in academic writing. This mixed-method explored both teachers' attitudes towards and performance in a blended academic writing course in a postsecondary environment study. The peer feedback providing procedure included online and face-to-face written peer feedback on weblogs, as well as a six-hour peer feedback training phase. The study found that combining face-to-face and online peer feedback was seen as advantageous and effective by EFL pre-service teachers, and that it resulted in generally excellent academic writing performance. It is recommended that participants who are new with peer revision get training and ongoing scaffolding/guidance to guarantee the process's efficacy.

Likely, Liu and Zhou (2018) performed study and compared the effects of online instructor feedback and online peer feedback on foreign language writing as well as learners' attitudes toward online feedbacks. After doing their research, they discovered that writing in each group improved dramatically after using online feedback and also concluded that online feedback should be used in the teaching of foreign language writing. It is apparent that it is past time for lecturers to reconsider the feedback process in order to increase students' learning. The research attempted to present some essential concepts of appropriate feedback practice that may cover a wide range of reflections' cognitive, behavioral, and motivational characteristics.

Teacher feedback is valuable information for EFL students. It helps them identify their English learning gaps and skills. However, students' perceptions of instructor feedback may differ from the teacher's goals. The purpose of Putri et al. (2021) was to assess students' impressions of instructor feedback in the English class as well as their self-regulated learning after getting corrective feedback. The study found that EFL students had varied feelings about instructor feedback, although the majority of them saw it positively. Despite their differing perspectives on teacher feedback, they were able to enhance students' self-regulated learning qualities in English, such as goal setting, monitoring, motivating, requesting help, adopting, and self-evaluating. Thus, based on the findings of this study, EFL teachers should assess if their feedback has the potential to hinder or raise students' performance, and whether it is suitable input.

Vattoy et al. (2019) also checked students' perceptions of teachers' feedback practice in teaching English as a foreign language. When a teacher delivers feedback to pupils, it raises their awareness of their abilities (Black & Wiliam, 2018; Vattoy & Smith, 2019). As a result, instructor feedback may be seen as a factor that impacts pupils' degree of comprehension.

Johnson *et al.* (2020) studied the effect of face-to-face verbal feedback compared with no or alternative feedback on the objective workplace task performance of health professionals: a systematic review and meta-analysis and their research proved that face to face verbal feedback has positive impact on writing of health professionals. Lamm et al. recently (2019) combined the benefits of written and face-to-face feedback on the Teams app. The majority of students who reported favorable feedback stated that instructor input helped them improve their knowledge of their work and target language. It suggests that feedback from teachers improves pupils' present performance.

### ***Statement of the problem***

A great deal of what transpires in the classrooms is routine and that is also the reason why teachers are not fully conscious of the reasons why they do what they do. So it is with corrective feedback. Feedback is, in fact, such an integral part of the teachers' output that they at times deny giving it because things happen in such quick succession

during the teaching process that they are not even aware which of their reactions are in the nature of feedback. This is, however, within the purview of the ‘normal’ as the teaching-learning process is not a neat and predetermined set of intentions and outcomes. Apart from this, a variety of variables/ factors create incongruence between what is intended and what is achieved in the classroom. Corrective feedback, at the same time, is one of the pillars of the learning process and this makes it imperative to closely monitor its different aspects to ensure a more successful and enriching classroom experience for both learners and teachers. Teacher training in Saudi Arabia, however, does not adequately train the students in the use or methods of feedback. Consequently, as in-service teachers, a great deal of what needs individual feedback is relegated to the grey area of self-study or waiting for the learners to approach the teacher for assistance. In the special case of EFL, nevertheless, the stressors of learning are detrimental to either of these corrective measures. As a result, in the dearth of individual corrective feedback, learner needs remain unfulfilled while the teachers keep wondering why adequate learning is not happening. Studies such as this are expected to lift the veil off teachers’ ignorance by showing the efficacy of individual corrective feedback on improving EFL learners’ writing in English. Accordingly, the study at hand aims to be a pioneering investigation into the efficacy of giving students both positive and constructive individual feedback on their English writing assignments in a Saudi environment. The study's findings may be used to supplement those of earlier research on the efficacy of CF. The following questions are targeted to be answered in this study:

- RQ1: Does corrective feedback play a significant effect in the Saudi EFL students' writing performance?
- RQ2: Are there any significant differences between students’ scores in the pre and post-tests along the 6 variables?
- RQ3: In which areas of writing did the students show maximum improvement along the variables as a result of corrective feedback?

**3. Methods**

***Research design***

Corrective feedback in the individual domain being a micro mechanism in the language classroom, the researcher opted for a one group pre and post-test model in this study. Spontaneous paragraph writing was used to assess students in the pre and posttest to check the impact of corrective feedback on students.

***Participants***

Thirty-one students participated in the writing tasks. All the participants had studied English as a foreign language being enrolled in the writing course at Qassim University College of Language and Translation. The median age of the participants was 20 years and the group was homogenous in terms of years of learning English, residence type (rural/ urban), GPA scores in the past two semesters, and gender (all males). Though the initial group strength was 31, in the post tests, 8 answers were repeated, so the author deleted them from the analysis. Thus, the actual participants were 23 students. The researcher got an oral consent from the students to participate in the study.

***Instrument***

***Writing test***

Students were asked at the beginning of the semester to write a paragraph about a recent non-academic book they enjoyed. They submitted their initial writing samples in the first week of the semester. They were also requested to write another paragraph at the end of the semester after the researcher undertook individual corrective feedback for the entire semester. The students' performances were evaluated according to the criteria in Table 1.

Table 1. Students' evaluation criteria adapted from (Savage & Shafiei, 2007, p. 50).

Criteria	Not mention 0	Needs work 1	Fair 2	Good 3	Very good 4
Does the paragraph have a topic sentence that introduce the topic?					
Did you include background information about the thing you are describing?					
Did you include descriptive details about the things looks, seem, smells, sounds?					
Did you use specific words as part of your description?					
Did you use adjectives as part of your description? And do you use them correctly?					
Does the paragraph contain a conclusion sentence?					

### ***Treatment***

As stated earlier, during the semester, the group received individual face-to-face corrective feedback. They submitted their paragraphs individually and the instructor focused on all criteria set in Table 1. Every student submitted 6 paragraphs through the study semester. The researcher wrote down the comments on the student's paper and later discussed them individually. Every student was encouraged to modify the mistakes marked by the researcher and resubmitted the paragraph in the next week till the students could produce relatively acceptable versions of their initial writing.

### ***Data analysis***

Students' submissions were marked according to the criteria set by Savage and Shafiei (2007). However, the researcher reduced the criteria 6 because two criteria associated with adjectives in the original rubric were not suitable to the Saudi context. To check the validity of the test, Cronbach Alpha was obtained for the 12 criteria assessed, i.e., 6 in the pre and 6 from the post-test. The measure scored .740, which is considered good for applying the instrument. To check the reliability, all the pre and post writing paragraphs were numbered from (1 into 46) and given to a language specialist professor with more than 7 years of teaching experience with international non-native speakers of English. An intra-rater was performed on 4 papers that same instructor assessed twice at different times. The intra-rater scored .85%. Every criterion out of the 6 was subsequently scored out of 4 and every student paper was assessed for the pre and for the post test. Students' scores were calculated using SPSS (version, 22). To check the differences between students scores in the pre and posttests, two independent related test was performed.

## **4. Results**

### **RQ1: Does corrective feedback play a significant effect in the Saudi EFL students' writing performance?**

Table 2 shows that in the pre-test, the students scored a total mean score (M=12.2174, Std=2.48553) whereas they achieved higher in the post-test (M=17.9130, Std =2.93742). To check whether the improvement is significant, Wilcoxon test was conducted. Table 2 also indicates that the Z value ranged -3.929-a and the Sig. 2-tailed value (.000), it is a significant value.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pretest	23	12.2174	2.48553		.000
Posttest	23	17.9130	2.93742	-3.929 <sup>a</sup>	

### **RQ2: Are there any significant differences between students' scores in the pre and post-tests along the 6 variables?**

Table 3 shows the mean scores of the students in the pre and post-tests along the six criteria. In the topic sentence, students achieved in the pretest, (M=1.7826, Std=.95139) and in the post-test (M=2.7826, Std=.79524). The level of achievement seems significant. The Wilcoxon test value shows (.001). Further, in the background information, students got in the pretest (M= 2.0435, Std=.56232) and in the post-test they scored higher (M=2.7391, Std=.54082). Furthermore, the third variable, i.e., adding descriptive details, students scored in the pretest (M=2.5217, Std=.59311), their abilities in the post-test were enhanced as they got (M=3.3043, Std=.63495) with a significant level of difference as the Sig. value shows (.000). Inclusion of specific words has also been assessed; in this the students got in the pre-test (M=2.0435, Std=.56232) whereas they gained in the post-test (M=3.1304, Std=.62554) with a significant value (.000). Besides, the inclusion and correct use of adjectives where students achieved in the pre-test (M=1.8696, Std=.62554) and they showed some enhancement in the posttest (M=2.9565, Std=.47465) with a significant difference level (Sig. =.000). Finally, students gained in the pretest on writing a conclusion (M=1.9565, Std=.70571) whereas in the post test they scored (M=3.0000, Std=.73855). The improvement level is significant (Sig. = .001).

To sum up, all the six variables under study showed significant improvement in post-test and in the absence of any other change in the learning process, this can be attributed to the intervention.

Table 3. Students' mean scores in the pre and posttest along with Wilcoxon Test

Variables	Test	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Topic sentence	Pretest	23	1.7826	.95139	-3.363 <sup>-a</sup>	.001
	Posttest	23	2.7826	.79524		
Background information	Pretest	23	2.0435	.56232	-3.258 <sup>-a</sup>	.001
	Posttest	23	2.7391	.54082		
Descriptive details	Pretest	23	2.5217	.59311	-3.491 <sup>-a</sup>	.000
	Posttest	23	3.3043	.63495		
Inclusion of specific words	Pretest	23	2.0435	.56232	-3.866 <sup>-a</sup>	.000
	Posttest	23	3.1304	.62554		
Inclusion and correct use of adjectives	Pretest	23	1.8696	.62554	-3.727 <sup>-a</sup>	.000
	Posttest	23	2.9565	.47465		
Conclusion	Pretest	23	1.9565	.70571	-3.213 <sup>-a</sup>	.001
	Posttest	23	3.0000	.73855		

### RQ3: In which areas of writing did the students show maximum improvement along the variables as a result of corrective feedback?

Table 4 summarizes the level of differences between the mean scores of students in the pre and post-tests. According to Table 4, the highest level of improvement in students' writing that may be attributed to the impact of corrective feedback on their writing performance were in "inclusion of specific words, and inclusion of correct adjectives" (M=1.0869) for both variables. Furthermore, writing good conclusion also improved significantly in students' post-test score; it ranked 3. The mean scores between the pre and post-test were (M=1.0435). The fourth improvement was in the variable "writing good topic sentence", the students showed improvement on this count (M=1). Finally, the lowest improvement was in adding more descriptive details and the use of background information. Students scored in these two variables (M=, 0.7826, 0.6956) respectively.

Table 4. Level of improvement along the variables

Variables	Pretest mean	Posttest Mean	Range	Rank
Topic sentence	1.7826	2.7826	1	4
Background information	2.0435	2.7391	0.6956	6
Descriptive details	2.5217	3.3043	0.7826	5
Inclusion of specific words	2.0435	3.1304	1.0869	1
Inclusion and correct use of adjectives	1.8696	2.9565	1.0869	1
Conclusion	1.9565	3.0000	1.0435	3

## 5. Discussion

The study clearly established that individual face-to-face corrective feedback played an important role in developing students' paragraph writing skills. They scored in the pre-test (M=12.2174, STD=2.48553) they got in the post test higher (M=17.9130, Std=2.93742). This finding is in line with many previous studies (Lee, 2020; Mao & Lee, 2020; Zhang & Cheng, 2021) which revealed the positive impact of corrective feedback on students' performance. Kaçar (2021) investigated the impact of online and in-person peer feedback on pre-service Turkish teachers EFL in academic writing. The study found that combining face-to-face and online peer feedback was advantageous and effective for pre-service EFL teachers, and that it resulted in generally excellent academic writing performance.

Besides, the study revealed improvement in all the six criteria under study. This is a good sign for developing the students' writing ability. This finding partially agrees with (Algamal et al., 2021; Bin-Hady et al., 2020). Algamal (2021) found that Yemeni students suffered from including the background information. Similarly, the students encountered problems in writing good sentences. Furthermore, Al Saleh's (2018) investigation of written corrective feedback techniques that improved EFL students' writing abilities in Riyadh showed that Saudi students had different preferences for written corrective feedback techniques. It concluded that written corrective feedback strategies positively impacted the students' English writing performance and had a positive impact on writing abilities of EFL students. Moreover, Alsehibany (2021), in Saudi EFL writing class showed a favorable attitude towards peer evaluation using a checklist. Still, Amalia et al. (2019) explored Saudi female students' attitudes toward peer feedback activity in writing courses using a list of questions for the students to follow throughout the activity, as well as the problems that may prohibit such activity from being used in Saudi EFL classrooms.

Finally, the study found that the inclusion of specific words, and the inclusion of correct adjectives" were the criteria that improved the most in the study due to the treatment, followed by writing good conclusion and introduction, while adding descriptive detail and background information were the lowest. This is confirmed by Algamal (2021) who found that Yemeni students suffered from writing the bridge sentence. Likely, Bin-Hady et al., (2020) found

Yemeni students got good improvement in writing conclusion in their essays due to the intervention got via process genre approach. Studies showed that feedback has tremendous impact on developing writing abilities of EFL students (Albelihi & Al-Ahdal, 2021; Grawemeyer et al.; 2015; Hattie & Gan, 2017). Without a doubt, writing is the most important talent among all other language skills since it incorporates thinking ability, linguistic competence, and trained memory; it is a test for the writer's cognition levels (Kellogg, 2001).

## 6. Conclusion

This study has shed new light on the place of individual corrective feedback in the EFL paradigm of Saudi higher education. As one of the ways for enhancing students' learning results, teachers are expected to offer relevant feedback. Teachers must ensure that their feedback is appropriate for their students' needs, as appropriate feedback will aid students' learning progress. Students too need to be trained to grasp instructor feedback in order to enhance their learning since how students perceive the feedback determines whether or not they accept it. This has also been reported in a previous study (Gamlem & Smith, 2013). Moreover, learner behavior and attitude also influence how they read the feedback (Fitriana, 2017). Furthermore, students who comprehend the importance of instructor comments may improve the teacher-student connection. Feedback should be used as an essential component of teacher-student contact in order to achieve the goal of learning instead of being seen as a detriment to learning. The results in this study are based on the output of one group only which was exposed to a pre and post-test design. It is not easy to say conclusively whether the improvement in students' writing is attributable only to the treatment, because students have many other kind of learning exposures. This calls for further studies to recruit two groups and check the improvement at the end of the semester, by doing so, it is more reliable to attribute the improvement to the intervention. Further, gendered differences in the performance cannot be gauged in this study as it was based on an all-male learner group. Future studies may add to the results here with inclusion of females as well. Finally, learning being a lifelong process, a study that evaluated performance over a single semester leaves us with many unanswered questions. Other studies replicating the design of this research can opt for a longitudinal design to reach more usable conclusions.

## References

- Adie, L., van der Kleij, F., & Cumming, J. (2018). The development and application of coding frameworks to explore dialogic feedback interactions and self-regulated learning. *British Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 704-723. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3463>
- Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H., & Abduh, M. Y. M. (2021). English writing proficiency and apprehensions among Saudi college students: Facts and remedies. *TESOL International Journal*, 16(1), 34-56.
- Al-Bashir, 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.
- Albelihi, H. H. M., & Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H. (2021). EFL students' writing performance: A study of the role of peer and small-group feedback. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(4), 2224-2234.
- Algamal, A.A.M., Bin-Hady, W.R.A., & Ezzaldin AS. (2021). Paragraph writing efficacy among Yemeni EFL university learners. *Albaydha University Journal*, 3(Special issue 2), 874-863
- Al-Saleh, N. A. (2018). The impact of positive and corrective feedback via Showbie on Saudi students' English writing. *Arab World English Journal (ID Number: 2215)*, 1-121. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.24093/awej/th.215>
- Alsehibany, R. (2021). EFL Saudi Student's attitudes toward peer feedback activities in a writing class. *PSU Research Review* (ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/PRR-01-2021-0004>
- Amalia, Z. D. H., Fauziati, E., & Marmanto, S. (2019). Male and female students' uptake in responding to oral corrective feedback. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 9(1), 107-126. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v9i1.1047>
- Bin-Hady, W. R. A., Nasser, A. N. A. N., & Al-Kadi, A. T. (2020). A pre-experimental study on a process-genre approach for teaching essay writing. *Journal of Language and Education*, 6(4), 44-54. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2020.10347>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). Classroom assessment and pedagogy. *Assessment in education: Principles, policy & practice*, 25(6), 551-575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807>
- Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language teaching research*, 20(4), 436-458. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814563200>

- Chatta, B., & Haque, M. (2020). Improving paragraph writing skills of Saudi EFL university students using flipped classroom instruction. *Arab World English Journal*, 6, 228-247. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/call6.15>
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524469>
- Fitriana, R. (2017). Students' attitude toward correction. *Script Journal: Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching*, 2(2), 177-190. <https://doi.org/10.24903/sj.v2i2.107>
- Fox, R. F. (1980). Treatment of writing apprehension and its effects on composition. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 14(1), 39-49.
- Gamlem, S. M., & Smith, K. (2013). Assessment in education: principles, student perceptions of classroom feedback. *Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(2), 150-169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2012.749212>
- Grawemeyer, B., Mavrikis, M., Holmes, W., Hansen, A., Loibl, K., & Gutiérrez-Santos, S. (2015). The impact of feedback on students' affective states. In *CEUR Workshop Proceedings* (Vol. 1432, pp. 4-13). Retrieved from <http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1432/>
- Hattie, J., & Gan, M. (2017). Instruction based on feedback. In R. E. Mayer & P. A. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Learning and Instruction* (2nd ed., pp. 249-271). New York: Routledge.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hill, J., & West, H. (2020). Improving the student learning experience through dialogic feed-forward assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(1), 82-97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1608908>
- Johnson, C., Weerasuria, M., & Keating, J. (2020). Effect of face-to-face verbal feedback compared with no or alternative feedback on the objective workplace task performance of health professionals: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 10. e030672. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030672>
- Kaçar, I. (2021). The impact of online and face-to-face peer feedback on pre-service teachers in EFL academic writing. In *design solutions for adaptive hypermedia listening software* (pp. 124-163). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-7876-6.ch007>
- Kellogg, R. T. (2001). General conclusion. commentary on part II: Processing modalities and development of expertise in writing. In *Through the models of writing* (pp. 219-228). Springer, Dordrecht. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0804-4\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0804-4_8)
- Koo, M., & Kim, W. (2014). A Case Study on Face to Face Feedback in Process-oriented Korean Writing Education : Concentrated on Writing Compositions of Learners from Beginner's Stage. *Journal of the International Network for Korean Language and Culture*. <https://doi.org/10.15652/ink.2014.11.3.001>
- Lamm, E., Petkova, A., & Domingo, M. (2019). Time to face your feedback: combining the benefits of written and face-to-face feedback in teams. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 16307. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2019.16307abstract>
- Larraguibel, E., Remesal, A., & Rochera, M. (2018). Freshmen student teachers' assesment of virtual and face-to-face feedback. *Perspectiva Educacional*, 57, 3-23. <https://doi.org/10.4151/07189729-Vol.57-Iss.1-Art.597>
- Lee, I. (2020). Utility of focused/comprehensive written corrective feedback research for authentic L2 writing classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 49, 100734. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100734>
- Liu, F., Du, J., Zhou, D., & Huang, B. (2020). Exploiting the potential of peer feedback: The combined use of face-to-face feedback and e-feedback in doctoral writing groups. *Assessing Writing*, 47, 100482. 1. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100482>
- Liu, X., & Zhou, C. (2018). The effect of online feedback types on foreign language writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(7), 733-741. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0807.03>
- Mao, Z., & Lee, I. (2020). Feedback scope in written corrective feedback: Analysis of empirical research in L2 contexts. *Assessing writing*, 45, 100469. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100469>
- Putri, N. V. W., Munir, A., & Anam, S. (2021). Students' perceptions of teacher feedback in EFL English class and their self-regulated learning after receiving feedback. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 11(1), 42-60.

<https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v11i1.2237>

- Ruegg, R. (2015). The relative effects of peer and teacher feedback on improvement in EFL students' writing ability. *Linguistics and Education*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.12.001>
- Ryiz-Semmel, J., France, M., Bradshaw, R., Khan, M., Mulholland, B., Meucci, J., & McGrath, J. (2019). Design and implementation of a face-to-face peer feedback program for ambulatory nursing. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 49, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNA.0000000000000728>
- Savage, A., & Shafiei, M. (2007). *Effective academic writing 1: the paragraph*. Oxford University Press.
- Vattoy, K. D., & Smith, K. (2019). Students' perceptions of teachers' feedback practice in teaching English as a foreign language. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 260-268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.06.024>
- Xiao, Y., & Yang, M. (2019). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: How formative assessment supports students' self-regulation in English language learning. *System*, 81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.01.004>
- Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 179-200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.004>
- Zhang, L. J., & Cheng, X. (2021). Examining the effects of comprehensive written corrective feedback on L2 EAP students' linguistic performance: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 54, 101043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101043>

## Appendix

Delated students.

4, 5, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 26.

Appendix (A). Students' score in the pretest

Criteria name	Topic sentence	Background information	Descriptive details	Specific words	Use adjectives	Conclusion sentence
1.	0	2	3	2	3	1
2.	2	2	3	2	1	2
3.	2	3	3	3	2	3
4.	0	2	2	3	3	2
5.	1	2	3	2	2	2
6.	1	1	2	1	2	2
7.	1	3	3	2	2	1
8.	2	1	3	2	2	2
9.	2	2	3	2	1	2
10.	1	2	3	2	2	2
11.	3	2	3	2	2	3
12.	3	2	3	2	2	3
13.	2	2	3	2	2	2
14.	2	2	2	2	2	2
15.	3	2	3	2	2	1
16.	1	2	2	1	1	1
17.	3	3	2	3	3	2
18.	3	3	2	2	2	2
19.	2	2	2	2	1	3
20.	2	2	2	3	2	2
21.	3	2	3	2	2	3
22.	1	2	2	2	1	1
23.	1	1	1	1	1	1

Appendix (AB). Students' score in the pretest

Students' score in the post-test.

Criteria name	Topic sentence	Background information	Descriptive details	Specific words	Use adjectives	Conclusion sentence
1.	2	3	3	3	3	3
2.	3	3	4	3	3	3
3.	3	2	3	3	3	2
4.	2	3	3	3	3	3
5.	2	3	4	4	4	3
6.	1	1	2	2	2	1
7.	3	3	4	4	3	3
8.	2	3	3	4	3	3
9.	3	3	4	3	4	3
10.	2	3	3	3	2	2
11.	3	3	4	4	3	3
12.	2	3	3	3	3	3
13.	4	3	3	2	3	3
14.	2	2	2	2	2	2
15.	3	3	4	3	3	4
16.	3	2	3	3	3	4
17.	3	3	4	4	3	4
18.	3	2	3	3	3	3
19.	3	3	3	3	3	3
20.	4	3	4	3	3	4
21.	4	3	3	3	3	3
22.	3	3	3	3	3	3
23.	4	3	4	4	3	4

### 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/>).