

EFFECTIVENESS OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK STRATEGIES

KHUNAKENE FESWAY FACULLO

Baguio Central University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6505479>

Published Date: 29-April-2022

Abstract: Writing is one of the most important macro skills. Unfortunately, it is also one of the hardest. One suggested way for teachers to improve the writing skills of their students is through written feedback. Feedback has been proven to be effective in improving the performance of students. To probe deeper into the strategies in feedback processing is one of the aims of this study. This study also aims to identify strategies in feedback processing and its effectiveness in improving the writing skills of students. This study aimed to determine the different written feedback strategies used by teachers in improving the writing skills of students. It also aimed to measure the effectiveness of written feedback strategies. The perception of the students and teachers was compared to determine if there is a significant difference. It employed a quantitative research design and made use of a questionnaire as its main tool. Results show that. The students perceived Delayed Marking, Direct Correctional Feedback, and Indirect Correctional Feedback as the feedback strategies commonly used by their teachers. Teachers perceive that they are commonly using Delayed Marking, Direct Correctional Feedback, and Indirect Correctional Feedback as strategies to improve the writing skills of students. The perception of teachers and students of the feedback strategies are similar. Students find Delayed Marking, Indirect Corrective Feedback, and Direct Correctional Feedback as very effective. On the other hand, they find Color Highlighting as slightly effective while the rest of the strategies are effective.

Keywords: Effectiveness, Improving, Students, Teachers, Writing Skills, Written Feedback.

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing plays an important role in the lives of people. It is a complex metacognitive activity that draws on an individual's knowledge, basic skill and ability to coordinate multiple processes (Huy, 2015). Writing is a process that involves the sub-processes of planning, collecting data, drafting, revising, rewriting and editing. These sub-processes need not to be seen as sequential stages; they are rather highly dynamic, non-sequential and interactive processes. It is one way of transmitting thoughts or ideas to other people (Huy, 2015).

Writing provides records of information, opinion, feeling etc. that people may find useful through time. Since ancient times, writing is considered to be an extension of human language and has become a reliable means of transmitting information (Huy, 2015). Having that said, writing skills is the best supportive tool in keeping information needed in the present and future.

Writing is one of the main language skills. Effective writing is a skill that is grounded in the cognitive domain. It involves learning, comprehension, application and synthesis of new knowledge (Defazio, et.al; 2010). It also plays a major role in expressing thoughts and idea (Alfaki, 2015).

In the school setting, writing plays two distinct but complementary roles. First, it is a skill draws on the use of strategies to accomplish a variety of goal, such as writing a report on expressing an opinion with the support of evidence. Second, writing is a mean of extending and deepening student's knowledge; it acts as a tool for learning a subject matter (Key, 2000; Shanahan, 2004; Sperling and Freedman, 2001). Unfortunately, in education, writing is very commonly used as a means of evaluation (Al-Gharabally, 2015).

Writing is inevitable in all subject areas. Writing can be integrated even in examinations where students answer essay questions. Writing helps students go beyond what they have learned, and that writing is undertaken as an aid to learning. Through writing, students can express their ideas and thoughts that they cannot express orally. Also, writing encourages students to go beyond their imaginations using words. Writing requires knowing the factors that influence both its process and product (Younes and Albalawi, 2015). It contributes to the development of the development of the learners' cognitive skills in attaining the requires strategies in the learning process such as analysis, synthesis, inference (Bacha, 2002). Moreover, writing allows students to share their own opinions regarding a subject matter. Huy (2015) gave three main benefits of writing that students may acquire. Firstly, writing is a good way to help develop the ability of students in using vocabulary and grammar thus, increasing the ability of using language. Secondly, writing is an essential support to other skills. If a student has good writing ability, they can read or speak the text more effectively. Thirdly, writing is a way to approach modern information technology as well as the human knowledge.

Despite these good benefits that can be gained in writing, students still encounter uneasiness with such kind of evaluation tool. According to Al-Gharabally (2015), that students feel they are judged when someone reads what they have written. Students become conscious on the words they use and their grammar because they feel that if they make a lot of errors teachers may think they are not good. Studies also found out that many students come to think that English and writing are nothing but spelling and grammar and to them writing would mean inevitable failure. Perhaps this is because students are not aware of the importance of having good writing skills. Trioa (2003) suggests that the problems experienced by students in writing effectively are attributable in, part, to their difficulties in executing and regulating the processes which underlie proficient composing, planning, and revisions of their work. This is because one important element to consider in writing is the ability to critique one's own work as well as the work of classmates.

Students encounter problems due to the absence of mastering the prosodic features in writing. According to Byrne (1988), the writer has to compensate these prosodic features by keeping the channel of communication through his/her effort by selecting appropriate structures and using appropriate connective devices so the text can be interpreted on his own.

Written products are often results of thinking, drafting and revising procedures that require specialized skills (Brown, 2011) thus, writing demands of skill and conventions such as writing readiness and grammatical rules for the students to become proficient and effective writers (Younes and Albalawi, 2015). The writer to needs compensate the absence of the prosodic features in writing, he or she has to write with high degree of organization, careful choice of words, and using complex grammatical devices. Research also suggest that writing is one of the most difficult skills for students to acquire.

Writing is unlike spoken language in that it requires the reader or audience to understand and interpret what has been written (Younes and Albalawi, 2015). This was supported by Nunan (1999) where he stated that the most difficult to do in language learning is to produce a coherent, fluent, extended piece of writing, which is more challenging for learners. These are some of the reasons why students think that writing is hard. Other problems students encounter in writing are punctuation problems, capitalization problems, spelling problems, and content problems (Alfaki, 2015). Such problems encountered by students become hindrance in acquiring good writing skills.

With these problems in writing mentioned in various researches, one way to help students improve their writing skills is through feedback processing. Writing activities are affected by various factors including gender, age, teacher, school or the task itself (Ali, et.al, 2013). If the students find a writing task challenging, they may or may not exert effort into it depending on the motivational aspect from the teacher. These motivational aspects can come in the form of a feedback. In classrooms, writing activities concern the learning, the achievement, or the attitude about the task being taught (Sutton, Hornsey, and Douglas, 2011). In this context feedback is defined as information provided by an external agent (teacher, parent, peer, etc.) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding; it is aimed to drive students toward goals or to do more or do better (Hattie ad Timperley, 2007).

Feedback may typically be comprised of constructive criticism, and advice but could also be behavior, social interactions, and praise (Sutton, Hornsey, and Douglas, 2011). Teachers and parents may provide corrective information or alternative strategies to improve a student's performance in writing. With this, feedback can be a good strategy for teachers to help improve the performance in writing of students because giving feedback helps students internalize and process the demands of the task at hand and help them identify the things to be done to improve their writing skills. Thus, feedback is an essential component in improving the writing skills of students which if used appropriately can support and scaffold student learning (Hattie and Timperley, 2007) and lead to substantial learning.

Hattie and Timperley (2007) identified influences that are most effective in improving student performance including writing. They determined that effective feedback can almost double the average student growth over a school year. Dylan William (2010) states that on feedback typically note that the pace of student learning is accelerated by 50%. This means that through effective feedback students' skills in writing can be improved. Moreover, Black and William (2010) added that many of the studies show that feedback helps low achieving students improve their performance thus, feedback also bridges the gap between low and high achieving students.

Therefore, to prove the effectiveness of feedback processing in improving the writing skills of students is one on the main goals of this study. Also, it is to probe deeper on the perception of students on feedback and the the strategies employed by the teachers.

In addition, the researcher hopes that the findings of the study will help teachers acknowledge the effectiveness of feedback processing in improving the writing skills of their students. Moreover, the study hopes to help the teachers find out what strategies are to be utilized inside the classroom that students find effective not only to simply improve the writing skills of the students but also improve the performance in the different subject areas. Especially now that the Philippines has shifted to a performance-based curriculum where the bulk of the grade comes from the performance tasks given by the teacher. But suggesting strategies, teachers will know how to gear students improve their performance to be able to equip them in facing a globally competitive world.

Aside from the teachers, school administrators can also benefit from the study. By probing the effectiveness of written feedback, they can encourage their teachers to use feedback processing in their schools.

Parents can also benefit from the study because reinforcement at home will lead to better outcomes. Feedback processing also happens at home. If parents are made aware of the benefits of giving feedback to their children, they will help boost their children's writing abilities.

Statement of the Problem and Hypothesis

This study aimed to identify strategies in feedback processing and its effectivity in improving the writing skills of students.

Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What are the feedback strategies employed by teachers to improve the writing skills of students as perceived by:
 - a. Students
 - b. Teachers
2. What is the difference between the perception of students and teachers on the feedback strategies to improve writing skills?

Hypothesis: There is a significant difference between the perception of teachers and students on the strategies employed to improve the writing skills of students.

3. What is the level of effectiveness of the feedback strategies employed in improving the writing skills of students?

Research Design and Methodology

This research made use of the descriptive research design because it is concerned with the conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident or trends that are developing (Best and Kahn, 1998) to be able to describe the different feedback strategies in feedback processing that teachers can employ to improve students' writing skills. Specifically, it uses the survey research method because it will be gathering data from the respondents by asking questions.

Population and Locale of the Study

The respondents of the study were Grade 11 students of the University of the Cordilleras who took the subject Reading and Writing. They were chosen as the respondents of this study because the subject is focused on teaching students how to improve their reading and writing skills. Slovin's formula was used to determine the sample size from the 3,744 Grade

11 students of the University of the Cordilleras. Three hundred sixty-five Grade 11 students participated in the study through purposive sampling. Total enumeration was used for the teacher respondents and 15 teachers who taught writing classes participated in the study.

Data Gathering Instruments

To acquire the data needed, questionnaire was made based on the article given by Teacher Tool Kit as Marking and Feedback Strategies. It was also based on the research of Rod Ellis (2008) entitled "The Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types". The first part of the data gathering instrument was a survey that contains the different written feedback strategies used by teachers. This part of the questionnaire required multiple responses from the respondents which means the respondent can check as many strategies as they can as long as they have observed it being utilized by their writing teachers. Teachers also did the same procedure. They also check the column if they are employing the given strategies. Teacher respondents can also have multiple responses which means they can check more than one item as long as they are using or employing the strategy to improve the writing skills if their students.

The second part of the questionnaire measured the effectivity of the feedback strategies identified by the respondents. The questionnaire was close-ended with a Likert scale. Each item for the second part were measured as to the level of effectivity: ineffective, slightly effective, effective, very effective, and extremely effective. The respondents checked the corresponding column that indicated how effective the feedback strategy is in improving the writing skills of students.

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Feedback Strategies to Improve Writing Skills

Perceived Feedback Strategies by Students

Table 1 presents the perception of the students on the type of feedback strategy employed by teachers to improve the writing skills of students. The study revealed that the most common type of feedback strategy used by teachers are Delayed Marking with a percentage of 87.40; Indirect Corrective Feedback with a percentage of 84.38, and Direct Correctional Feedback with a percentage of 77.53. The study also revealed that the feedback strategies with the least frequency are Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback (16.71%), Plus, Minus, Equals (13.14%), and Color Highlighting (11.51%).

Table 1: Frequency of Feedback Strategies Employed by Teachers Based on the Perception of Students

Types of Feedback	Students		
	Frequency (f)	Percent (%)	Rank
Delayed Marking	319	87.40%	1
Re-Drafting	212	58.08%	4
Mastery Marking	171	46.85%	8
Student Marking	204	55.89%	5
Color Highlighting	42	11.51%	16
Plus, Minus, Equals	49	13.42%	15
Focused Marking	151	41.37%	12
Find and Fix	191	52.33%	6
Margin Marking	169	46.30%	9.5
Post-it Comments	165	45.21%	11
Direct Correctional Feedback	283	77.53%	3
Brief Grammatical Description	130	35.62%	13
Indirect Corrective Feedback	308	84.38%	2
Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback	61	16.71%	14
Focused Corrective Feedback	169	46.30%	9.5
Unfocused Corrective Feedback	172	47.12%	7

To have a deeper understanding on the results of the study, Delayed Marking, with a percentage of 87.40 got the highest percentage. This means that many of the students experienced this strategy in their writing classes. This means that their teachers are observed employing the strategy. Delayed Marking is done or happens when the teacher gives his/her written feedbacks on the student's work and afterwards gives guidance on how the students can improve his/her output. Time is essential in this strategy because the teacher needs to give ample time for the student to internalize and interpret the what the written feedbacks are. Afterwards, the teacher talks to the student on a one-on-one basis to explain to him/her what the comments are as well as discuss and explain to the student the mark or the score given (TeacherTollKit). Explaining the comments or written feedback to the students helps the students the written feedback provided by the teacher. Through this, the student learns and understands where he/she misled/confused the teacher in the written output (Keh, 1990). Feedback should be clear and easy to decode and understand, and the criteria for success should be clear to the students (White, 2007). Understanding the written

feedback to the student is very important because it helps them internalize the written feedback provided. Students are able to point out where they made a mistake, and it is explained to them why they made or had errors with their outputs.

Grading is one of the major functions, result, and outcome of assessment (Magno, 2010). In Delayed Marking, explaining the grade or mark given to the output of the student is important because it lets the student understand why he/she got a low mark or a high mark.

The second strategy with the highest frequency is the Indirect Corrective Feedback with a percentage of 84.98. This strategy is done by indicating or notifying the student that he/she has made an error without actually correcting it (Ellis, 2008). This is done by underlining or encircling the errors or using cursors to show omissions on student's output or by placing cursors in the margin next to the line containing the error. In effect, this involves deciding whether or not to show the precise location of the error (Ferris, 2006). Indirect Corrective Feedback allows students to do self-regulation where they are the ones who corrects their own errors in their outputs.

Indirect Corrective Feedback is employed by teachers because they want students to analyze their own outputs and reflect on how students can correct their own errors. According to Crandall (2000), there has been a gradual shift in the role of teachers, they have increasingly been in favor of raising awareness to students. In feedback processing, teachers train their students to become aware of their own errors and be able to correct it on their own.

Abayahoun (2016) also said that feedback should be suggestive, in the form of Indirect Corrective Feedback, in order to support students a sense of ownership in their writing. In this case, Indirect Corrective feedback simply notifies students that they committed errors. In doing so, the teachers allow the students to correct their own mistakes having him/her a sense of ownership where they feel that since they have corrected the errors on their own, they solely were able to make the output with confidence.

Indirect Corrective Feedback can be associated with metacognition. This is because this type of feedback involves reflection where students are given the chance to think about their out outputs. Since students are only notified that they have errors, Indirect Corrective Feedback lets students think about their output and reflect why they made the errors and are able to realize what their errors are and at the same time be able to correct the errors on their own. Just like in metacognition, students are also helped to be self-directed where they are on their own in making sure that their errors are corrected.

Direct Correctional Feedback has the 3rd highest frequency. In this strategy, the teacher provides the student the correct form of the error. As Ferris (2006) notes, this can take a number of forms- crossing out unnecessary word/s, phrase/s, or morpheme/s, inserting a word, or a morpheme, and writing the correct form above or below or near the erroneous form. This implies that the teacher is giving explicit feedback where students' errors are given the correct form immediately. This corroborates with the study of Lee (2005) where he found out that students think that it is the responsibility of the teacher to correct errors of the students. Students observe or experience this strategy from their teachers. This implies that students like the written feedback to be given by the teacher or corrections should be given by the teacher.

Direct Corrective Feedback is a strategy where the teacher explicitly corrects the errors of students by simply writing the correct form of their errors. This is beneficial to the students since all the have to do is re-write their outputs by injecting the right forms of their errors. This can also save time because the right forms of the errors are already provided.

The study also revealed that the feedback with the lowest frequencies are Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback, Plus, Minus, Equals, and Color Highlighting. These types of feedback allow students to do self-correction. For example, in color highlighting, students are the ones to identify the parts of their writings where they have shown improvements before they are marked. These types of feedbacks are too time-consuming that is perhaps the reason why teachers do not use this and also the reason why students think that these feedback strategies are not commonly used by their teachers in their writing classes.

Moreover, Amrhein and Nassaji's study in 2011 revealed that students needed specific advice on how they should improve their written outputs. Students also value feedback that is focused on emphasis where teachers explain the errors and give guidance on how to improve rather than self-correct (Davis and Dargusch, 2015).

Table 2 shows the frequencies and the percentage of the feedback strategies to improve the writing skills of students as perceived by teachers. As shown, Delayed Marking, Indirect Corrective Feedback, and Direct Correctional Feedback have the highest frequencies. The three strategies have the same percentage which is 93.33 percent. On the other hand, there are four strategies that have the least percentage. They are Brief Grammatical Description, and Post-it Comments with 26.67%, Plus, Minus, Equals with 13.33% and the one with the least percentage is Color Highlighting with 0%.

Delayed Marking is used because there is a need to elaborate feedback in order for students to achieve better scores. Explaining feedback to students fosters understanding and help students comprehend what the feedback is. Walker (2009) mentioned that sometimes teacher's written feedback only contains descriptions and judgements but does not mention alternative approaches that students may use. This means that written feedbacks only notify the student that they had an error or committed an

Perceived Feedback Strategies by Teachers

Table 2: Frequency of Feedback Strategies Employed by Teachers Based on the Perception of Teachers

Types of Feedback	Teachers		
	Frequency (f)	Percent (%)	Rank
Delayed Marking	14	93.33%	2
Re-Drafting	12	80.00%	4.5
Mastery Marking	11	73.33%	6
Student Marking	12	80.00%	4.5
Color Highlighting	0	0.00%	16
Plus, Minus, Equals	2	13.33%	15
Focused Marking	5	33.33%	12
Find and Fix	10	66.67%	8
Margin Marking	7	46.67%	10
Post-it Comments	4	26.67%	13.5
Direct Correctional Feedback	14	93.33%	2
Brief Grammatical Description	4	26.67%	13.5
Indirect Corrective Feedback	14	93.33%	2
Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback	6	40.00%	11
Focused Corrective Feedback	10	66.67%	8
Unfocused Corrective Feedback	10	66.67%	8

error. Delayed marking allows teachers to explain their feedbacks to their students so that students are better guided as to how they can improve their written works. Alongside with this, Weaver (2006) also said that if the teacher's written feedback is only focused on the descriptions, students become unsure of the descriptions; thus, delayed marking is used by teachers to elaborate on their comments by explaining to the students what their comments or feedback is all about and at the same time give guidance to the students on how they can improve their outputs.

This study also revealed that teachers are using both Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback. Ellis (2008) mentioned that Direct Correctional Feedback helps students to produce the correct form when students revise their writing because the teacher has already provided the corrections or the teacher has already written the correct forms of the student's error.

Direct Correctional Feedback instructs students to make changes which are necessary for their written works. Direct Correctional Feedback provides a sense of direction to students. It is a provided guide where students know what to do already because the teacher has given it to them. This is corroborated by the study of Leng (2013) where she found out that Direct Correctional Feedback can be useful for students in their revision as Direct Correctional Feedback provided them a sense of direction since they already know exactly what was needed to be corrected. This clearly shows that Direct Correctional Feedback offers a sense of direction to students (Hyland and Hyland, 2006).

This type of feedback is also advantageous to teachers. Since they already gave the necessary corrections, all students have to do is to re-write and inject the corrections making it easy for teachers to give a mark on the students' outputs. Direct Correctional Feedback is advantageous for both teachers and students because feedback is already provided which saves time and effort for both. This is supported by Chandler (2003) where it was revealed that Direct Correctional Feedback is the easiest and fastest way to correct the output of the student.

Although teachers use Direct Correctional Feedback, this study revealed that they also employ Indirect Corrective Feedback as a strategy to improve the writing skills of their students. This means that teachers also acknowledge the value of student autonomy and expect students to do their part by finding out how to correct their errors and making their own corrections.

This is where the role of the student in feedback processing is highlighted. In Indirect Corrective Feedback, the role of the teacher is to notify that the student committed an error. Correction of the error is done by the student himself/herself. According to Amrhein and Nassaji (2011), teachers use Indirect Corrective Feedback because they think that this strategy leads to self-correction which is useful because it would help students remember the errors they made and also leads to long-term learning (Ferris and Roberts, 2001). For instance, a student realizes the error he/she committed and at the same time is successful in correcting the error, the student will be able to remember the error as well as the right way to correct such error.

Indirect Corrective Feedback requires learners to engage in guided learning and problem solving. It can enhance the critical thinking of the students for this type of feedback allows students to analyze their errors and lets them think of how the error should be corrected. For Indirect Corrective Feedback to be successful, students must recognize that an error has been made because if the student fails to recognize that an error has been made, he/she might not be able to correct his/her own errors. Indirect Corrective Feedback has the potential to push students to engage in hypothesis testing- a process that Ferris (2002) suggests may induce deeper internal processing and promote the internalization of correct form and structure. Allowing students to do self-correction may pave way for lifelong learning of internalizing the errors and how to correct such errors.

This study also found out that the feedback strategies that teachers do not commonly use are Brief Grammatical Description, Post-it Comments, Plus, Minus, Equals, and Color Highlighting having 4, 4, 2, and 0 frequencies respectively. Based on the results of the study, these four has the lowest frequencies. One reason why teachers do not employ such a strategy is that it would require more time in giving feedback. One element in feedback processing is the ability of teachers to give immediate feedback as responding to students output is crucial in feedback processing (Agbayahoun, 2016). Teacher's strategies when it comes to error correction reflect their concern for their work load (Amrhein & Nassaji, 2011). Teachers have their concerns when it comes to using time-consuming strategies because they have other tasks to accomplish such as lesson plans, instructional materials and the like. This would also denote that teachers acknowledge the need for feedback but they also take into consideration the time frame for the feedback processing.

Color Highlighting for example would require more time in highlighting the output to show where the improvements were (Teacher Tool Kit). This would also mean more time is needed for students to re-write their final outputs. Another is the use of Post-it Comments. Using this type of feedback means the teacher will write his/her comments and suggestions on a post-it sticker and then place it on the paper. There is a probability of the post-it comments falling off the paper. If the paper fell off the feedback processing is re-done by the teacher which can become tedious on the part of the teacher and the student as well.

Difference in the Perception of the Students and Teachers on the Feedback Strategies

This section discussed the difference in the perception of teachers and students on the feedback strategies. A two-sample proportion z-test was used to determine if there exists a difference between the perception of students and teachers in feedback strategies.

Based on the results, it was found that there exists a significant difference between the perception of teachers and students in Mastery Marking (p-value= 0.044) and in Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback (p-value=0.020). Specifically, it shows that teachers perceived these strategies to be more used in improving the writing skills of students.

Mastery Marking is a type of feedback where the teacher only accepts the work of the student if the student's output has met the criteria/standard of the task (Teachertoolkit). This type of feedback allows students to re-submit their outputs as many times as they want to integrate the corrections needed until they achieve an A grade. Hattie (2007) mentioned that feedback is most effective when students do not have proficiency or mastery

Table 3: Comparison of perception of students and teachers on feedback strategies

Types of Feedback	Percent (%)		z	p-value
	Students	Teachers		
Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback	16.71%	40.00%	-2.32*	0.020
Mastery Marking	46.85%	73.33%	-2.01*	0.044
Student Marking	55.89%	80.00%	-1.85 ^{NS}	0.065
Re-Drafting	58.08%	80.00%	-1.69 ^{NS}	0.091
Focused Corrective Feedback	46.30%	66.67%	-1.55 ^{NS}	0.121
Unfocused Corrective Feedback	47.12%	66.67%	-1.49 ^{NS}	0.137
Direct Correctional Feedback	77.53%	93.33%	-1.45 ^{NS}	0.147
Post-it Comments	45.21%	26.67%	1.42 ^{NS}	0.157
Color Highlighting	11.51%	0.00%	1.39 ^{NS}	0.164
Find and Fix	52.33%	66.67%	-1.09 ^{NS}	0.276
Indirect Corrective Feedback	84.38%	93.33%	-0.94 ^{NS}	0.345
Brief Grammatical Description	35.62%	26.67%	0.71 ^{NS}	0.477
Delayed Marking	87.40%	93.33%	-0.68 ^{NS}	0.494
Focused Marking	41.37%	33.33%	0.62 ^{NS}	0.535
Plus, Minus, Equals	13.42%	13.33%	0.01 ^{NS}	0.992
Margin Marking	46.30%	46.67%	-0.03 ^{NS}	0.978

Legend: *- significant at 0.05 level of significance

NS- not significant

And thus, it thrives when there is error or incomplete knowing and understanding. Letting students re-do or re-write their outputs may increase their knowledge about their errors thus, it may lead to long term learning especially that in Mastery Marking, students are trained to re-submit their outputs until they get a high score by integrating all necessary corrections.

Teachers use this strategy to promote lifelong learning as it lets students be exposed to their own errors. Students can learn from their errors by making them re-do or re-write their outputs. Through this, retention will be improved since they remember the errors and try not to commit it again. Heimbeck, Frese, Sonnenta & Kieth (2003) noted that the more teachers let their students re-do a written output, it will increase the student's exposure to errors which can lead to higher performance. And the more they are exposed to errors, the easier for the teachers to correct. Mastery Marking helps students to be exposed to all their errors. Exposure to their own errors will help students learn from their own mistakes. This means that if students are exposed to the same errors over and over, over time, they learn to write the right forms of their errors especially that in Mastery Marking, the student's output will not be accepted not unless it yields a high score.

This strategy is be easier for teachers, once students are already exposed to their errors and know how to correct them. However, for students, it is not. One reason why student did not like this strategy is because it takes time. Time and effort are needed on the part of the students since resources like ball pen, papers are needed in re-writing the outputs.

The second strategy where there exists a difference in the perception of teachers and students is the Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback. In this type of strategy, the teacher uses error codes as abbreviated labels to correct the work of students. Ferris (2006) reported that error codes helped students to improve their accuracy over time in only two of the

four categories of error she investigated. Longitudinal comparisons showed improvements in total errors and verb errors but in noun errors, article errors, lexical errors, or sentence errors. This means that Metalinguistic Feedback helps in the aforementioned areas. Ferris & Roberts (2001) found out that error codes did assist the students to self-edit their writing but no more so than indirect feedback.

Overall, there is very limited evidence to show that error codes help writers to achieve greater accuracy over time and it would seem that they are no more effective than other types of corrective feedbacks in assisting self-editing. The effectiveness of this feedback may be lost because of the consistency of teachers in labelling. Consistency is very important in using this type of feedback so that students do not be confused with the error codes being used. If writing teachers are not consistent on the codes they are using, students might get confused on a later time if they encounter the errors. Another reason is that in the Philippines, students are also not that much exposed to the error codes. In the English curriculum, subjects introducing these codes, the copyreading and proofreading symbols, are only taught to student formally in their Reading and Writing classes. Exposure to these codes is a great help in letting students understand the written feedback provided.

In addition, this strategy is far less common because it is much more time consuming than using error codes and also it calls the teacher to possess sufficient metalinguistic knowledge to be able to write clear and sufficient metalinguistic knowledge to be able to write clear and accurate explanation for a variety of errors (Ellis, 2008). If teachers themselves are not knowledgeable of the metalinguistics or error codes, the feedback may not be substantiated as they will not be able to explain clearly to the students what their errors are.

It was also found out that the perception of teachers and students in the remaining 14 strategies are the same which means there is no significant difference in the perception of students and teachers. Harmer (2000) highlights the role of the teacher as feedback provider and considers it as a valuable aspect, central to the process approach to teaching writing. Silver and Lee (2007) view the teacher feedback as a crucial variable in the process approach as it helps to pinpoint students' strengths and weaknesses and helps them to be better motivated during the writing process. This is because feedback has been widely cited as an important facilitator of learning and performance (Shute, 2007) thus, both teachers and students must have a similar understanding on what the feedback is for the feedback processing to be successful. Teachers are the ones who are giving the feedback that students need so they can understand what to do (Bookhart, 2004). If students and teachers fail to understand each other or do not have the same understanding about the feedback given, the students may fail to do what should be done to improve. One of the main reasons why teachers use feedback strategies is to lessen the gap of students' current level of writing skills to a higher level. Using feedback would allow teachers to help students improve, however if students and teachers do not have the same understanding on the feedback, this purpose of feedback might become lose its purpose. Also, improving the writing skills of students might not be successful.

Level of Effectiveness of the Written Feedback Strategies Employed to Improve Writing Skills

This section presented and discussed the findings of the study regarding the level of effectiveness of the feedback strategies that teachers use in improving the writing skills of students.

Based on the results of the study, students perceived Feedback which actually has the highest mean (3.73). This result goes with the study of Bitchner & Knoch (2008) where they suggested that Indirect Corrective Feedback is the best because it requires students to engage in guided writing and problem-solving. As a result, this type of feedback promotes the type of reflection that fosters long-term acquisition as Pintrich (2002) asserts that students who knows or who are made aware of their errors and knows how to correct them and more likely to keep on practicing and avoid such errors. This result shows that Indirect Corrective Feedback lets students be engaged in metacognitive processes where students reflect on the feedback provided and think of the possible answers and ways to correct these errors. This strategy may also increase the student's ability to transfer and adapt to learning (Chick, 2019). This happens when students are made to do self-corrections. They do this by gaining a specific level of awareness above the errors that the teacher has underlined or encircles (Pintrich, 2002). When students are already made aware of their errors, they are given time by the teacher to analyze their outputs and think on how they can correct such errors on their own. Indirect Corrective

Level of Effectiveness of the Different Types of Feedback

Types of Feedback	Weighted Mean	Level of Effectiveness	Rank
Delayed Marking	3.60	Very Effective	3
Re-Drafting	3.03	Effective	9
Mastery Marking	2.57	Effective	14.5
Student Marking	2.84	Effective	13
Color Highlighting	2.43	Slightly Effective	16
Plus, Minus, Equals	2.57	Effective	14.5
Focused Marking	2.96	Effective	10
Find and Fix	3.07	Effective	7.5
Margin Marking	3.07	Effective	7.5
Post-it Comments	3.32	Effective	4
Direct Correctional Feedback	3.68	Very Effective	2
Brief Grammatical Description	3.25	Effective	5
Indirect Corrective Feedback	3.73	Very Effective	1
Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback	2.85	Effective	12
Focused Corrective Feedback	2.95	Effective	11
Unfocused Corrective Feedback	3.16	Effective	6

reflect on a specific topic such as their errors (Zohar & David, 2009).

Ellis (2008) also notes that Indirect Corrective Feedback is effective because it gives students the opportunity to engage themselves in deeper processing. Indirect Corrective Feedback gives students the opportunity to locate their errors and do self-correction. This already provides awareness to students regarding their errors. Awareness of the errors committed is very important on the part of the students. This means that they should be aware of their errors so that it will help them understand what their errors are all about. Through this, they are also be reflecting or think on how to correct such errors on their own which means that Indirect Corrective Feedback also caters to the problem-solving skills of students. This may lead to long-term learning as students are the ones correcting their own errors, therefor they get to internalize such errors which they may avoid later on.

The second strategy with the highest mean which is 3.68 is the Direct Correctional Feedback. This type of feedback is advantageous to those who are not knowledgeable of the correct form of errors because the teacher is the one to provide explicit guidance of how students should correct their own errors (Teachertoolkit). In this type of feedback, the teacher encircles or underlines the error and afterwards writes the correct form of the error near the identified error. That is why it becomes advantageous to those who are not aware of the errors. Moreover, Direct Correctional Feedback saves time for the students and teachers. This is because the error has already been identified and corrected by the teacher; all the student has to do is re-write their revised written output.

However, a disadvantage of this strategy is that it required minimal processing on the part of the learner. Although it helps them produce the correct form of the output when they revise their writing, it may not contribute to long-term learning (Ferris & Roberts, 2011). This is because Direct Correctional Feedback allows teachers to explicitly give the correct forms of errors thus, students do not process the errors well which may lead to less awareness of their mistakes. Also, students might become too dependent on the teacher's explicit feedback in order to correct their own output.

Sheen (2007) suggests that Direct Correctional Feedback can be effective in promoting specific grammatical figures. This is corroborated by the study of Bitchner, Young, and Cameron (2005) who conducted a study on 53 SL students in New Zealand. Their study found that Direct Correctional Feedback increased the student's accuracy in the use of articles and simple past tense. This probes the finding of the student where students perceived this type of feedback to be very effective.

The third strategy that was perceived to be very effective is Delayed Marking. This result is corroborated by Shute (2007) saying that feedback appears to be powerful if it provides information about a particular response. This means that feedback can be powerful if the teacher elaborates on the feedback and gives specific instructions or guidance on how students should improve their work.

In addition, providing feedback that is specific and clear for conceptual and procedural learning such as writing is a reasonable general guideline (Shute, 2007) can make the strategy effective. The teacher should know how to let the student understand the feedback he/she has given and provide specific ways on how the student revises their outputs.

Elaborating on the feedback is an essential element in using this type of feedback (Mason & Burning, 2001). This is where the heart of the strategy lies since this is where the teacher discusses how the student can improve their written output. Another element that should be considered when using Delayed Marking is the timing.

Written feedback can be delivered either immediately after the activity or delayed. Although immediate feedback can help fix errors in real-time, producing greater immediate gains and more efficient learning (Corbet & Anderson, 2001) Delayed Marking has been associated with better transfer of learning (Shute, 2007). Delayed Marking gives time for both teachers and students to talk and discuss about the feedback where the teacher explains and gives guidance or points on how students can improve their outputs.

Based on the results of the study, one strategy has been perceived to be slightly effective and this is Color Highlighting. This negates the results conducted by Mack (2013) where his study found out that students think Color Highlighting as a helpful strategy in improving their writing skills. An article written by Lancy (2016) also stated that students find this strategy to be effective because almost immediately, students were actively improving their responses. They were able to see their responses the way the teacher sees it. Lancy (2016) also mentioned that this type of feedback requires more time. And this is perhaps one of the reasons why students do not find this feedback effective.

Amrhein & Nassaji (2011) mentioned that students prefer explicit type of feedback where they can immediately correct their errors. Color Highlighting as a form of feedback requires time for the students since in using this strategy, the student highlights how he/she improved his/her output before giving it back to the teacher. Also, it can be costly for students need varied color highlighters to use this strategy. Moreover, Fawn (2015) acknowledges the usefulness of this type of feedback but at the same time said that this feedback can be challenging as it requires time for both students and teachers.

Feedback processing is essential in improving the writing skills of students especially if the teacher and the student have the same understanding on the feedback utilized. It comes in the form of implicit or explicit feedback. This research revealed that effective feedback strategies can be employed by teachers to improve the writing skills of students however, there still strategies that students perceive as slightly effective in helping them improve their writing skills.

III. CONCLUSION

In light of the findings of the study, the following are the conclusions:

1. a. Students are exposed to both implicit and explicit forms of feedback which are used as tools to improve the writing skills of students.
1. b. Teachers are employing explicit feedback that gives direction to students when they write. They also use implicit types of feedback to enhance the analytical skills of students by letting them self-regulation in their writing.
2. Teachers and students are on the same boat when they perceive the different feedback strategies employed to improve the writing skills of students.
3. Written feedback strategies are effective to students especially indirect corrective feedback, direct correctional feedback and delayed marking.

REFERENCES

A. Books

- [1] Bookhart, S. M. (2006). *Formative assessment strategies for every classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- [2] Brown, H. (2001). *Teaching by principle: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York. Addison-Wisley Longman. Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Byrne, D. (1988). *Teaching writing skills*. London. Longman Press

- [4] Daiute, C. (2000). *Writing and communication technologies. Perspective on writing: research and practice*. Newark, D.E. International Reading Association
- [5] Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Michigan. The Michigan Press
- [6] Deane, P., Odendahl, N., Quinlan, T., Fowles, M., Welsch, C., & Tatum, J. (2008). *Cognitive models of writing: writing proficiency as a complex integrated skill*. Princeton, NJ, Educational Testing Service.
- [7] Flower, L. (1994). *The construction of negotiated meaning: A social cognitive theory of writing*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- [8] Harmer, J. (2000). *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Longman.
- [9] Magno, C., & Ouano, J. (2010). *Designing written assessment for student learning*. Manila. Phoenix Publishing
- [10] McEwen, M., & Wills, E.M. (2014). *Theoretical basis for nursing*. Philadelphia. Wolters
- [11] Prior, P. (2006). A sociocultural theory of writing. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 54–66). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- [12] Sheen, Y. (2004). *Corrective feedback individual differences and the acquisition of articles by second language learners*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Nottingham.
- [13] Sperling, M., & Freedman, S.W. (2001). *Review of writing research*. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research teaching* (4th ed., 370-389) Washington DC. American Educational Research Association.
- [14] Sutton, R., Hornsey, M., & Douglas, K. (2011). *Feedback the communication of praise, criticism and advice*. Peter Lang Publishing. New York.
- [15] White, E. M. (2007). *Assigning, Responding, Evaluating: A Writing Teacher's Guide* (4th ed.). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

B. Journals

- [16] Agbayahoun, J. P. (2016). Teacher written feedback on student writing: teachers' and learners' perspective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 6 (10) 1895-1904 DOI 10.175071/tp1s.0610.01
- [17] Alfaki, I. (May 2015). University students' English writing problems: diagnosis and remedy. *International Journal of English Language Teaching* (Vol. 3, No. 3 pp 40-52)
- [18] Al-Gharabally, M. (August 2015). The writing difficulties faced by L2 learners and how to minimize them. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research* (Vol. 3, No. 5, pp 42-49)
- [19] Ali, S., Haider, Z., Munir, F., Khan, H., & Ahmed, A. (2013). Factors contributing to the students' academic performance: a case study of Islamia University of Bahawalpur. *American Journal of Educational Research* 1.8 pp283-289
- [20] Amrhein, H. R., Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: what students and teachers think is right and why. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13 (2) 95-127
- [21] Bacha, N. (2002). Developing learner's academic writing skills in higher education: a study for educational reform. *Language and Education*, 16(3), 163-173
- [22] Bitchner, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12 409 DOI 10.1177/11362168808809924
- [23] Bitchner, J., Young, S., & Cameron, N., (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 191-205. DOI 10.10115.5slw2005.08.001
- [24] Black, P., & William, D. (2010). Inside the black box: raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phil Delta Kappan* (92 (1), 81-90)

- [25] Chandler, J. (2001). The efficiency of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-296. DOI 10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9
- [26] Corbett, A. T., & Anderson, J. R. (2001) Focus of feedback control in computer-based tutoring: impact on learning rate, achievement and attitudes. In Proceedings of ACM CHI 2001 *Conference on Human Factors in Computer Systems*. New York: ACM Press
- [27] Davis, S. E., & Dargusch, J. M. (2015). Feedback iterative processing and academic trust- teacher education students' perceptions of assessment feedback. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40 (1).
- [28] De fazio, J., Jones, J., Tennant, F., Hook, S. (2010). Academic literacy: the importance and impact of writing across the curriculum-a case study. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Vol 10 number 2.
- [29] Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1 (1), 3-18
- [30] Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*.
- [31] Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: how explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 161-184
- [32] Hattie, J. A. C. (2009). Visible learning: a synthesis of 800+ meta-analyses on achievement. Routledge Oxford, UK
- [33] Hattie, J.A.C., & Timperley, H (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- [34] Heimbeck, D., Frese, M., Sonnentag, S., & Keth, N. (2003). Integrating error into the training process. The function of error management and the role of goal orientation. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 333-362
- [35] Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on the second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39, 83-101
- [36] Keh, C. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: a model and method of implementation. DOI 10.1093/elt/44.4.294
- [37] Keys, C. W. (2000). Investigating the thinking process of eight grade writers during the composition of a scientific laboratory report. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 37, 676-690
- [38] Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 classroom: what students think? *TESL Canada Journal*, 22, 1-16.
- [39] Leggette, Holli R.; Rutherford, Tracy; Dunsford, Deborah; and Costello, Lori (2015) "A Review and Evaluation of Prominent Theories of Writing," *Journal of Applied Communications*: Vol. 99: Iss. 3. <https://doi.org/10.4148/1051-0834.1056>
- [40] Leng, K. (2013). An analysis of written feedback on ESL students' writing. *Precedea-Social and Behavioural Sciences*. 123 (2016) 389-397.
- [41] Nunan, D. (1999). Second Language Teaching and learning. USA Heinle & Heinle Publishers of Oral Fluency. *English Language Teaching*.
- [42] Pintrich, D. R. & Zusho, A (2007). Student motivation and self-regulated in the college classroom. The scholarship of teaching and learning: an evidence-based perspective. *The Netherlands*. DOI 10.1007/11-4020-5742-3_16
- [43] Shanahan, T. (2004). Overcoming the dominance of communication: writing to think and learn. *Adolescent Literacy Research and Practice* pp 59-73.
- [44] Silver, R. & Lee, S. (2007). What does it take to make a change? Teacher feedback and student revisions. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 6 (1), 25-49.
- [45] Troia, G. A. (2003). Effective writing instruction across the grades: what every educational consultant should know. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 14 (1), 75-89
- [46] Walker, M. (2009). Investigation into written comments on assignments: do students find them usable? *Assessment and Evaluation in High Education*, 34 (1), 67-78

- [47] Weaver, M. R. (2006). DO students value feedback? Student perceptions of tutors' written responses. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31 (3), 379-394
- [48] William, D. (2010). The role of formative assessment in effective learning environments, the nature of learning: Using research to inspire practice, pp 135-155.
- [49] Younes, Z. & Alalawi, S. (2015). Exploring the most common types of writing problems among English Language and Translation among major sophomore female students at Tabuk University. *Multi-Disciplinary Journals*, 3 (2).
- [50] Yussoff, M. (2013). Using feedback to enhance learning. *Centre for Academic Excellence & Student Advisory and Development (CDAE)*. Bangunan H24, Kompleks Cahaya, Malaysia
- [51] Zohar, A., & David, B. A. (2009). Paving a way clear path in a thick forest: a conceptual analysis of a metacognitive component. *Metacognition Learning*, 4, 177-195.

C. Journals

- [52] Chick, N. (2019). Metacognition. Retrieved April 5, 2019 from <https://cft.vanderbit.edu/guides-sub-pages/metacognition/>
- [53] Fawn (September 16, 2015). Giving feedback with a highlighter. Retrieved July 10, 2018 from <https://giving-feedbackhighlighter>
- [54] Huy, N. T. (2015) Problems affecting learning writing skill of grade 11 at Thong Linh High School. *Asian Journal of Educational Research* (Vol. 3, No. 5) Retrieved June 25, 2017 from <https://www.google.com.ph/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=http://www.multidisciplinaryjournals.com/wpcontent/uploads/2015/03/PROBLEMS-AFFECTING-LEARNINGWRITING-SKILL-OF-GRADE-11>
- [55] Lancy, B. (April 7, 2016). Visual feedback: how three highlighters can improve student writing. Retrieved July 10, 2018 from <https://visualfeedback/highlighters-improve-student-writing-test>
- [56] Mack, N. (2013). Colorful revision: color coded comments connected to instruction. The National Council of Teachers of English
- [57] Mason, B. J., & Bruning, R. (2001). Providing feedback in computer-based instruction: what the research tells us. Retrieved July 10, 2018 from <https://dwb4.unl.edu/dwb/Research/MN/MasonBruning.html>
- [58] Narciss, S. (2013). Designing and evaluating tutoring feedback strategies for digital learning environments on the basis of the interactive tutoring feedback model. Retrieved June 25, 2018 from <https://greave.ub.edu/der/>
- [59] Shute, V. (2007). Focus on formative feedback. Retrieved July 10, 2018 from <https://www.ets.org/research/contact.html>