

Impact of Corrective Feedback on the Writing Performance of English as Second Language Learners

Aslima M. Casim

Mindanao State University-Main Campus, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600026>

Received: 20 May 2026; Accepted: 25 May 2026; Published: 16 June 2026

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the impact of Corrective Feedback (CF) on the writing performance of thirty (30) Grade 12 Humanities and Social Science (HUMSS) strand students of Ibn Siena Integrated School Foundation, Inc. during the School Year 2023–2024, as well as its perceived benefits. A mixed-method research design was employed: the quantitative component examined the effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) through statistical treatment, while the qualitative component utilized Focus Group Discussion (FGD) interviews for triangulation. The intervention consisted of eight (8) essay-writing sessions, after which a post-test was administered to determine measurable improvements. Subsequently, an FGD with ten (10) selected participants was conducted to gain deeper insights into learner perceptions of the intervention. Findings revealed that the efficacy of WCF varies depending on its form. Within-session revision analyses showed that indirect corrective feedback produced statistically significant gains, while direct corrective feedback did not yield statistically significant within-session differences - though observable score improvements were noted and overall pretest-to-posttest gains were significant across both feedback types. Indirect feedback was particularly effective in promoting critical thinking, self-reflection, and long-term writing development. The results confirm that WCF is an effective pedagogical approach, as learners acknowledged and valued remedial feedback, particularly when provided by their teacher. Based on these findings, the researcher developed an enhancement program in writing instruction, highlighting the importance of tailoring WCF to students' needs and preferences.

Keywords: language teaching, writing performance, feedback, indirect CF, direct CF, mixed-method, ESL learners, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

Corrective feedback is an essential component of the writing process and plays a central role in developing this skill. It helps learners assess their performance, identify areas for improvement, and refine their writing to achieve satisfactory levels of competence. Feedback refers to the information students receive regarding the quality of their performance on a specific task. Teachers provide this through comments, notes, or evaluations to help learners understand their progress and areas for development (Wlodkowski & Jaynes, 1990). In English classrooms, corrective feedback may be categorized as direct or indirect.

Although the effectiveness of written corrective feedback has been widely debated since Truscott's (1996) arguments against it, studies by Hyland and Hyland (2006) and Sheen, Wright, and Moldawa (2009) provided evidence of its benefits. However, in the local context, limited studies have examined the impact of corrective feedback on students' writing performance.

This study addresses this research gap by examining the impact of corrective feedback on the writing performance of English as Second Language learners, exploring students' preferred types of feedback and their perceptions, and using the findings as a basis for designing an enhancement program in English language teaching.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Corrective feedback (CF) has long been recognized as a pivotal component of second language (L2) acquisition and pedagogy. It refers to the responses teachers provide to learners' linguistic errors in oral or written form, serving both evaluative and instructional functions (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Its theoretical foundations lie in interactionist (Long, 1996) and cognitive frameworks (Schmidt, 1990), both emphasizing feedback's role in noticing gaps and restructuring interlanguage.

Written corrective feedback (WCF) enables learners to identify recurring patterns of error (Ferris, 2010), enhances substantive revisions (Montgomery & Baker, 2007), and fosters learner autonomy (Beuningen, 2010; Corpuz, 2011). Empirical studies by Lalande (1982), Ferris and Roberts (2001), Almasi and Tabrizi (2016), Hartshorn and Evans (2015), and Dabboub (2019) demonstrate that both direct and indirect WCF, when systematic and sustained, significantly improve linguistic accuracy, although long-term effects on overall proficiency remain inconclusive (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

Learners generally hold positive attitudes toward CF, yet preferences vary by proficiency level and context: lower-proficiency students prefer direct/overt correction, while higher-proficiency learners favor indirect/coded feedback that promotes self-correction (Zhang et al., 2021; Westmacott, 2016; Chen et al., 2016). Regional studies in Asia consistently show CF is valued, with many learners favoring direct feedback for clarity (Tangkiengsirisin & Kaira, 2016; Saragih et al., 2021; Agbayani & Sy, 2022; Sambodatu, 2022; Sanguila, 2023).

Despite substantial evidence supporting CF's benefits, three major gaps persist: (1) mixed findings on the superiority of direct versus indirect CF, (2) discrepancies between teacher intentions and student interpretations, and (3) limited evidence of long-term effects beyond grammatical accuracy. In the Philippine ESL context, empirical research remains scarce. The present study therefore investigates the impact of different types of corrective feedback on Filipino ESL learners' writing performance and perceptions to provide evidence-based foundations for an enhancement program in English language teaching.

Research Questions

This study tried to determine the impact of corrective feedback to the writing performance of the participants. Specifically, it sought to answer the following:

What is the writing performance of the participants in terms of the following:

- a. pretest, and
- b. posttest?

What is the writing performance of the participants in terms of:

- a. Direct Corrective Feedback, and
- b. Indirect Corrective Feedback

Is there a significant difference between the following:

- e. Pretest and Posttest?
1. What is the impact of Corrective Feedback on the writing quality of the participants?
2. What are the perceptions of the participants on the use of corrective feedback?
3. What possible Enhancement Program on Writing Feedback in English Language Teaching can be recommended?

METHODOLOGY

This study used a mixed-methods design (Creswell & Clark, 2010; Denzin, 1970) to examine the effects of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) on writing performance. The quantitative strand assessed pretest and

posttest essays, while the qualitative strand explored student perceptions via a focus group discussion (FGD).

The study was conducted at Ibn Siena Integrated School Foundation (ISISF), Marawi City, with 30 Grade 12 HUMSS students purposively selected. For the FGD, ten students were chosen based on posttest performance—five with the highest and five with the lowest scores.

Data collection included essays scored using Jacob’s ESL Composition Profile (1981), a guided perception survey, and the FGD. Participants completed a pretest, four writing tasks with indirect WCF for the first two essays and direct WCF for the latter two, followed by a posttest. Ratings were conducted by the researcher and validated by two independent raters.

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS with descriptive statistics, t-tests, and Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances. For the pretest-posttest comparison, a paired-samples t-test was employed, as both scores were collected from the same participants across two time points, making the paired design statistically appropriate. For the within-intervention comparisons between original and revised essays under each feedback condition, an independent-samples t-test was used, treating original and revised drafts as distinct data sets. Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances was applied prior to each independent-samples t-test to verify that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met, ensuring the validity of the t-test results. An alpha level of .05 was set as the criterion for statistical significance throughout all analyses. Qualitative data underwent thematic analysis (Woods, 2011). Ethical approval was obtained from the MSU Research Ethics Board and the host school, ensuring informed consent, confidentiality, and withdrawal rights.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Writing Performance of the Participants in Pretest

Measuring the students’ writing performance through a pretest is essential to establish a reliable baseline that reflects their initial proficiency level before any corrective feedback intervention. As presented in Table 4 on the next page, the participants obtained mean scores of 11.80 in content, 11.57 in organization, 11.00 in vocabulary, 10.89 in language use, and 10.72 in mechanics. All these scores were interpreted as “good to average.” This indicates that their writing was somewhat developed but lacked depth and coherence in ideas. The organization was fairly logical but needed clearer transitions and paragraph structure. Vocabulary use was adequate but not precise, while language use and mechanics revealed occasional errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation that did not seriously affect comprehension.

Table 4 Performance of the Participants in the Pretest

	Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanics	Total Score
Participants’ Overall Mean	11.80	11.57	11.00	10.89	10.72	55.98

Overall Description Legend₁: 68-75 = Excellent, 60-67 = Good, 46-59 = Satisfactory, 0-45 = Needs Work

Category Legend₂: 12-15 = Excellent to Very Good, 8-11 = Good to average, 4-7 = Fair to Poor, 1-3 = Very Poor

The overall pretest mean score of 55.98, described as satisfactory, shows that the participants met minimum standards but still had areas for improvement. This suggests that before applying corrective feedback, the participants’ writing performances varied and reflected common difficulties in using English for academic writing. Such difficulties were linked to limited exposure to English writing conventions and grammar rules. Harmer (2002) emphasized that writing follows certain rules involving handwriting, spelling, layout, and punctuation, while Kroll (1990) explained that writing demands active thinking and attention to grammar, vocabulary, and structure.

The results also support Krashen’s Monitor Hypothesis, which states that learning functions as a monitor that edits language output after it is produced. The pretest served as a measure of baseline knowledge and readiness.

The findings imply that teaching methods at the time were not sufficient to improve the writing performance of HUMSS students, who are expected to have proficiency in grammar and formal writing for academic purposes. Therefore, interventions such as corrective feedback are necessary to address these weaknesses and enhance the students' writing skills.

Writing Performance of the Participants in Posttest

Table 5 Performance of the Participants in the Posttest

	Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanics	Total Score
Participants' Overall Mean	13.71	13.28	13.19	12.71	13.89	66.78

Overall Description Legend: 68-75 = Excellent, 60-67 = Good, 46-59 = Satisfactory, 0-45 = Needs Work

By category Legend: 12-15 = Excellent to Very Good, 8-11 = Good to average, 4-7 = Fair to Poor, 1-3 = Very Poor

After eight sessions of intervention, posttest results (Table 5) revealed that participants achieved “excellent to very good” ratings across all categories (12–15), reflecting marked gains in content accuracy, logical organization, vocabulary variety, language precision, and mechanics. The overall posttest mean reached 66.78, compared to the pretest mean of 55.98, confirming substantial improvement.

These results demonstrate that both direct and indirect corrective feedback effectively enhanced writing performance, consistent with Goldstein (2004), Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006), and Hyland and Hyland (2006), who highlighted feedback's role in improving revisions, building self-confidence, promoting self-regulated learning, and guiding error correction. Thus, corrective feedback significantly elevated the participants' overall writing quality of writing.

Writing Performance of the Participants in Indirect Corrective Feedback

Table 7 Performance of the Participants in the Indirect Corrective Feedback (1st Essay)

	Content		Organization		Vocabulary		Language Use		Mechanics		Total Score	
Essay	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁
Participants' Overall Mean	10.26	11.38	9.86	10.76	9.34	10.81	10.42	11.14	11.34	12.23	51.22	56.32

Legend 1: E₁- Original Essay , R₁- Revised Essay

Overall Description Legend: 68-75 = Excellent, 60-67 = Good, 46-59 = Satisfactory, 0-45 = Needs Work

By category Legend: 12-15 = Excellent to Very Good, 8-11 = Good to average, 4-7 = Fair to Poor, 1-3 = Very Poor

Table 8

	Content		Organization		Vocabulary		Language Use		Mechanics		Total Score	
Essay	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁
Participants' Overall Mean	10.71	11.81	10.30	11.17	10.18	11.19	10.38	11.84	11.74	12.64	53.81	58.66

Legend 1: E₁- Original Essay , R₁- Revised Essay

Overall Description Legend: 68-75 = Excellent, 60-67 = Good, 46-59 = Satisfactory, 0-45 = Needs Work

By category Legend: 12-15 = Excellent to Very Good, 8-11 = Good to average, 4-7 = Fair to Poor, 1-3 = Very Poor

Performance of the Participants in the Indirect Corrective Feedback (2nd Essay)

Table 8 showed notable improvement in participants' writing performance after receiving corrective feedback. In the first essay, mean scores rose from 51.22 (satisfactory) in the original draft to 56.32 in the revised version. In the second essay, scores increased from 53.31 to 58.66—remaining within the satisfactory range but reflecting clear progress. Although errors in language use, punctuation, spelling, and paragraphing persisted, their frequency decreased after revision.

Qualitative data revealed a strong preference for indirect corrective feedback (underlining/circling errors). Participants reported that it enhanced critical thinking and enabled independent error correction:

R2: "I prefer the one in which my errors were underlined... It is helpful, and I have to analyze the corrections... to identify the right terms, tense, or rules to apply."

R5: "I want the indirect... because I can independently work on my errors... And it gives me a thrill to work on words and think of other suitable replacements."

These findings align with Linh (2018), who argued that indirect feedback fosters long-term writing development by requiring active student engagement, and with Ellis (2009), Lalande (1982), and Ferris and Roberts (2001), who found that indirect feedback promotes guided learning, reflection, and sustained accuracy.

In conclusion, both direct and indirect corrective feedback positively impacted writing performance, but indirect feedback was particularly effective in developing critical thinking, learner autonomy, and lasting linguistic accuracy

Writing Performance of the Participants in Direct Corrective Feedback

After implementing the Indirect Corrective Feedback intervention, Direct Corrective Feedback was administered to determine its effectiveness in enhancing the learners' writing skills.

Table 9 Performance of the Participants in the Direct Corrective Feedback (1st Essay)

	Content		Organization		Vocabulary		Language Use		Mechanics		Total Score	
Essay	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁
Participants' Overall Mean	12.86	13.37	12.61	13.14	12.51	12.89	11.99	13.04	12.90	13.42	62.87	62.87

Legend 1: E₁- Original Essay , R₁- Revised Essay

Overall Description Legend: 68-75 = Excellent, 60-67 = Good, 46-59 = Satisfactory, 0-45 = Needs Work

By category Legend: 12-15 = Excellent to Very Good, 8-11 = Good to average, 4-7 = Fair to Poor, 1-3 = Very Poor

As shown in Table 9, there was a notable improvement in the participants' scores. The mean scores in content (12.86), organization (12.61), vocabulary (12.51), and mechanics (12.90) were all described as "Excellent to Very Good," indicating that participants demonstrated a clear understanding of the topic, logical organization, appropriate vocabulary use, and accuracy in mechanics. The only category rated as "Good to Average" was language use (11.99), showing that while participants generally conveyed ideas clearly, some inconsistencies in grammar and sentence construction remained. The mean score of the original and revised essays was 62.87 and 65.87, respectively, both described as "Good." This indicates clear improvement in clarity, organization, and grammatical command.

Table 10 Performance of the Participants in the Direct Corrective Feedback (2nd Essay)

	Content		Organization		Vocabulary		Language Use		Mechanics		Total Score	
Essay	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁	E ₁	R ₁
Participants' Overall Mean	12.79	13.30	12.42	13.11	12.34	12.98	12.29	13.22	13.31	13.76	63.16	66.37

Legend 1: E₁- Original Essay , R₁- Revised Essay

Overall Description Legend: 68-75 = Excellent, 60-67 = Good, 46-59 = Satisfactory, 0-45 = Needs Work

By category Legend: 12-15 = Excellent to Very Good, 8-11 = Good to average, 4-7= Fair to Poor, 1-3 = Very Poor

Table 10 presents similar findings for the second essay, with mean scores of 63.16 and 66.37, again described as “Good,” affirming consistent progress across writing tasks.

Participants reported that Direct Corrective Feedback provided them with clear guidance on specific errors, enabling them to understand their weaknesses and make precise revisions. One participant expressed those direct corrections “allow us to see exactly where we went wrong and understand how to make corrections,” while another noted that it “helps to improve my own writing style.” These reflections confirm that learners found the explicit feedback beneficial in developing their writing proficiency.

Table 11 Mean Score of the Participants in the Intervention Provided

	First E ₁ IDCF	First R ₁ IDCF	Second E ₁ IDCF	Second R ₁ IDCF	First E ₁ DCF	First R ₁ DCF	Second E ₁ DCF	Second R ₁ DCF
Mean Score	51.22	56.32	53.31	58.66	62.87	65.87	63.16	66.37

Legend 1: E₁- Original Essay, R₁- Revised Essay, IDCF- Indirect Corrective Feedback,

As summarized in Table 11, the mean scores from both interventions showed that Direct Corrective Feedback yielded higher gains than Indirect Corrective Feedback. This suggests that direct feedback is more effective in improving immediate writing performance. These findings align with Ferris and Hedgecock (1998, as cited in Celce-Murcia, 2001), who emphasized that carefully executed editing feedback can enhance students’ text accuracy. Similarly, Ellis (2009) noted that direct feedback provides explicit guidance beneficial for learners unable to self-correct. Although it may require less cognitive effort and contribute less to long-term learning (Ferris & Roberts, 2001), Sheen (2007) found that it effectively promotes the acquisition of grammatical accuracy.

Overall, the results imply that direct corrective feedback significantly improves students’ writing performance by providing explicit error identification and immediate guidance. This type of feedback helps learners develop grammatical accuracy, enrich vocabulary, and strengthen sentence structure while fostering accountability and awareness of their writing weaknesses.

Significant Difference between Original and Revised Indirect Corrective Feedback.

The comparison between the mean scores of the first original and revised essays determined the effectiveness of Indirect Corrective Feedback

Table 12 Significant Difference between the First Original Essay and Revised Indirect Corrective Feedback

Writing Performance Mean Score	Levene's Test <i>t</i> -test independent samples				Remark
	<i>F</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value	<i>t</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value	
First Original	.664	.418	-2.298	.025	Significant
First Revised Indirect Corrective Feedback					

Table 12 presents the results. The Levene's Test ($F = 0.664$, $p = 0.418$) confirmed that the variances of the two groups were equal. The t -test result ($t = -2.298$, $p = 0.025$) was less than the 0.05 level of significance, indicating a significant difference between the two groups. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 13 Group Statistics of the First Original and Revised Indirect Corrective Feedback					
Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Data	Indirect1_orig	30	51.2167	8.97383	1.63839
	Indirect1_revised	30	56.3233	8.22484	1.50164

Table 13 indicates a significant improvement in participants' writing performance, with mean scores increasing from 51.216 in the original drafts to 56.323 after revision—a mean gain of 5.106. This demonstrates the effectiveness of the Indirect Corrective Feedback intervention. The positive results may be attributed to learners' motivation and active engagement with teacher feedback, consistent with Joan's (2016) view that written comments clarify strengths and weaknesses, and Brown's (1994) assertion that motivation enhances cognitive processing. Hendrickson (1980) also supports the idea that writing improves through repeated practice and error correction.

However, the two-month duration of the intervention may have constrained the extent of improvement. As noted by Daboub (2019), longer implementations may yield stronger outcomes. Extending the intervention to a full semester could further enhance writing accuracy and better demonstrate the long-term impact of Indirect Corrective Feedback.

Significant Difference between the Second Original and Revised Indirect Corrective Feedback

Table 14 Significant Difference between the Second Original and Revised Indirect Corrective Feedback

Writing Performance Mean Score	Levene's Test		<i>t</i> -test independent samples		Remark
	<i>F</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value	<i>t</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value	
Second Original	3.449	0.68	-4.099	.000	Significant
Second Revised Indirect Corrective Feedback					

Table 14 below presents the results. The Levene's Test ($F = 3.449$, $p = 0.068$) indicated equal variances, confirming that the two groups were comparable. The t -test result ($t = -4.099$, $p = 0.000$) was less than the 0.05 level of significance, showing a significant difference between the two groups. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 15 Group Statistics of the Second Original and Revised Indirect Corrective Feedback					
Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Data	Indirect2_orig	30	53.3100	5.73792	1.04760
	Indirect2 revised	30	58.6567	4.25560	.77696

As shown in Table 15, the mean scores increased from 53.31 (original) to 58.65 (revised), resulting in a mean difference of 5.34, which was significant. This improvement further confirms the effectiveness of Indirect Corrective Feedback in enhancing writing performance.

Ferris (2011) supported this result, asserting that Indirect Corrective Feedback promotes deeper understanding of language use and critical thinking, leading to more substantial improvement than direct correction. Similarly, Lyster (1997) explained that this approach fosters learner autonomy, self-monitoring, and reflective practice. By guiding students to self-correct through hints and suggestions, Indirect Corrective Feedback develops metacognitive awareness and encourages ownership of learning. The significant gain observed between original and revised essays confirms the effectiveness of this method in improving writing proficiency.

Significant Difference between the first Original and Revised Direct Corrective Feedback

Table 16 Significant Difference between the First Original and Revised Direct Corrective Feedback

Writing Performance Mean Score	Levene's Test t-test independent samples				Remark
	F-value	p-value	t-value	p-value	
First Original	1.016	0.318	-1.638	0.107	Not Significant
First Revised Direct Corrective Feedback					

Table 16 shows the comparison of mean scores for the first original and revised essays showed that Direct Corrective Feedback did not produce a statistically significant improvement within this single revision cycle. Levene's Test indicated equal variances ($F = 1.016$, $p = 0.318$), and the t-test result ($t = -1.638$, $p = 0.107$) exceeded the 0.05 significance level, leading to acceptance of the null hypothesis. It is worth noting, however, that the mean scores themselves did improve from 62.87 to 65.87, suggesting a practical gain of three points even if the difference did not reach statistical significance. This discrepancy may be partly attributed to the relatively small sample size of 30 participants, which reduces statistical power and increases the likelihood of a Type II error. Furthermore, at this stage of the intervention, learners were already performing within the "Good" range, leaving narrower room for measurable improvement in a single revision cycle—a ceiling effect that may have constrained statistical detectability. Truscott (1996) similarly argued that direct error correction offers little long-term benefit and may distract learners from meaningful language use; however, the observable score gains suggest the practical impact should not be entirely dismissed. These findings imply that more balanced feedback approaches, combining explicit correction with developmental support, and examined over larger samples and longer periods, may be more effective in promoting sustained writing improvement.

Table 17 Significant Difference between Second Original and Revised Direct Corrective Feedback

Writing Performance	Levene's Test F-value	Levene's Test p-value	t-value	p-value	Remark
Second Original vs. Second Revised Direct Corrective Feedback	2.157	0.147	-1.404	0.166	Not Significant

Table 17 showed that Direct Corrective Feedback did not produce a statistically significant improvement between original and revised drafts within the same session. Levene's Test indicated equal variances ($F = 2.157$, $p = 0.147$), and the t-test result ($t = -1.404$, $p = 0.166$) exceeded the 0.05 significance level, leading to acceptance of the null hypothesis. Similar to the first essay, this lack of significant difference suggests that the immediate, session-level impact of Direct Corrective Feedback on revision scores was limited. It is important to note that this finding does not contradict the overall effectiveness of direct feedback observed in the pretest-posttest comparison. Rather, it indicates that the gains attributable to direct feedback may be more gradual and cumulative in nature, manifesting across multiple sessions rather than within a single revision cycle. This may be due to its emphasis on surface-level corrections (e.g., grammar and spelling) rather than higher-order skills such as content, organization, and coherence. When feedback focuses primarily on linguistic accuracy, improvements in overall writing quality within a single revision may remain modest. These findings highlight

the need for a more comprehensive feedback approach that addresses both form and meaning to facilitate substantial gains in writing proficiency.

Significant Difference between Writing Performance of the Participants' Pretest and Posttest

Table 18 T-Test for the Participants (Pretest and Posttest Scores)

	Paired differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Interpretation
	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
Pre-test vs. Post-test	10.80	12.870	2.349	Lower	Upper	4.651	29	.000	Significant
				6.124	15.735				

Table 18 shows that the participants' writing performance significantly improved after receiving corrective feedback. The pretest mean score was 55.98, while the posttest mean score rose to 66.78, yielding a mean gain of 10.80. The computed t-value of 4.651 ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$) indicates a statistically significant difference. Consequently, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between pretest and posttest writing performance is rejected.

These results demonstrate that corrective feedback was effective in enhancing students' writing performance. The findings align with Ryan (1997, as cited in Otara, 2022), Goldstein (2004), and Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006), who highlighted feedback's role in helping learners recognize strengths and weaknesses, meet instructor expectations, and develop self-regulated learning. The improvement also supports Bitchener (2008, 2009a, 2009b) and Sheen (2007) on the development of explicit knowledge and greater linguistic accuracy, as well as Gass (1988) and Long's (1981) information processing models, which link corrective input to more accurate output.

Overall, the significant gain confirms that corrective feedback is essential for improving content, organization, and grammatical accuracy, while fostering a growth mindset and viewing writing as a skill that develops through practice and reflection.

Impact of Corrective Feedback to the Writing Quality of the Participants

Table 19 presents the comparison of the participants' writing quality in the pretest and posttest based on five rubric components: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The mean scores showed a clear improvement in all areas as pretest interpreted all in Good to Average, while the posttest to Excellent to Very Good. This indicates that after the implementation of both Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback, the participants became more proficient in developing ideas, organizing content, choosing appropriate words, applying grammatical rules, and mastering writing conventions.

Table 19 Writing Quality of the Participants as shown in the Rubric after Pre and Post-test

Rubric		N	Mean	Std. deviation	Qualitative Description
Content	Pretest	30	11.80	2.37	Good to Average
	Posttest	30	13.71	1.19	Excellent to Very Good
Organization	Pretest	30	11.57	2.24	Good to Average
	Posttest	30	13.28	1.38	Excellent to Very Good
Vocabulary	Pretest	30	11.00	2.34	Good to Average
	Posttest	30	13.19	1.34	Excellent to Very Good
Language Use	Pretest	30	10.89	2.50	Good to Average
	Posttest	30	12.71	1.36	Excellent to Very Good

Mechanics	Pretest	30	10.72	2.58	Good to Average
	Posttest	30	13.89	0.89	Excellent to Very Good

Legend: 12-15 = Excellent to Very Good, 4-7= Fair to Poor

8-11 = Good to average, , 1-3 = Very Poor

These results affirm Krashen's (1981) assertion that feedback helps teachers identify learners' specific difficulties, guiding them in selecting effective teaching strategies and materials. The findings further support earlier studies (Bitchener, 2008; Ferris, 2010; Shintani et al., 2014) which demonstrated that written corrective feedback significantly improves writing performance, particularly in grammar, content, and organization. Similarly, Bitchener et al. (2005) and Hartshorn et al. (2010) emphasized that feedback focusing on content and structure enhances the overall quality of writing, while Bitchener and Knoch (2008) highlighted the importance of combining direct and indirect feedback with metalinguistic explanations to deepen learner understanding.

The results of this study confirm that written corrective feedback is an effective pedagogical tool for improving writing quality. It enables learners to identify and correct errors, promotes self-awareness, and enhances grammatical accuracy and idea development. Furthermore, it allows teachers to monitor student progress and adapt instruction based on learners' needs. Corrective feedback also fosters a supportive learning environment that encourages reflection, motivation, and accountability in the writing process, leading to sustained improvement in students' writing competence.

Perceptions of the Participants on the Use of Corrective Feedback

A post-intervention focus group discussion was conducted to explore participants' perceptions of written corrective feedback. Thematic analysis of the transcripts yielded four major themes: (1) Appreciation of Corrective Feedback, (2) Preferences on Written Corrective Feedback, (3) Importance of Re-drafting, and (4) Overall Perception on Written Corrective Feedback.

Participants expressed strong appreciation for corrective feedback, viewing it as guidance rather than criticism. Participant 4 stated, "I viewed and appreciated the feedback that my teacher provided. It is helpful and important (feedback) because it helped me correct my mistakes and it provided me a new lesson that I could bring with me for a long time as a student." Participant 2 added, "I see the feedback from my teacher as important. It helps me know what I did well and where I need to improve... It helps me understand what's wrong and right." These responses indicate that students regarded feedback as a valuable tool for personal and academic growth.

Preferences for feedback type were mixed. Some favored direct correction for its clarity, as Participant 8 noted: "I prefer when our teacher directly corrects our errors because it provides us clear guidance on what needs improvement... Having mistaken corrected allows me to see exactly where I went wrong." Others preferred indirect feedback, with Participant 2 explaining: "I prefer the one in which my errors were underlined because I think it is also a way to improve my analyzation skills... as I have to analyze the corrections given by the teacher." These findings align with Ellis (2009), Lalande (1982), and Ferris and Roberts (2001), confirming that direct feedback offers immediate clarity while indirect feedback promotes deeper cognitive engagement.

All participants emphasized the importance of re-drafting. Participant 4 remarked, "To review my compositions is very helpful. As I rewrite my piece, I get to be enlightened about my errors and remember them so the next time I write essays, I can avoid those." Participant 6 similarly observed that re-drafting "helps me identify and correct any mistakes or areas where I could improve my writing" and allows clarification of unclear ideas. These views support Goldstein (2004) and Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) on the role of revision in developing self-regulation.

Overall, participants perceived written corrective feedback as beneficial and valuable for growth, even when initial embarrassment arose from visible error marks. Participant 9 stated, "Feedback given by my teacher is valuable for my growth and learning. It offers insight of my weaknesses in my writing style," while Participant 10 acknowledged that red marks, though initially embarrassing, "actually demonstrate my willingness to learn

more.” This perception echoes Amrhein and Nassaji (2010) and Balanga et al. (2016), who found that positive attitudes toward feedback increase uptake and engagement.

In summary, participants regarded corrective feedback as a constructive, motivating, and indispensable tool that enhances writing competence, encourages self-reflection, and supports long-term development. These qualitative perceptions strongly corroborate the quantitative gains observed, underscoring that when learners view feedback as supportive, it significantly amplifies improvement in writing performance.

Enhancement Writing Program in English Language Teaching

Based on the posttest results, which revealed persistent weaknesses in Language Use ($M = 12.71$) and Vocabulary ($M = 13.19$), the researcher developed a two-month (8–9-week) Written Enhancement Program for Grade 11 Senior High School students. The program integrates systematic written corrective feedback (WCF) throughout the writing process to improve accuracy in grammar, vocabulary, organization, and overall coherence.

The program consists of the following sequential components: (1) diagnostic assessment to pinpoint individual strengths and weaknesses; (2) error-focused activities including Error Identification, Sentence Rewriting, and Error Analysis; (3) targeted Error Correction Exercises emphasizing clarity, conciseness, and grammatical accuracy; (4) Peer Feedback and Teacher Feedback sessions to promote collaborative and reflective practices; and (5) continuous Progress Monitoring culminating in a Final Assessment.

Grounded in the study’s findings that sustained corrective feedback significantly enhances writing performance and fosters self-editing skills, the enhancement program provides a practical, replicable framework for English language teachers to embed written corrective feedback into regular classroom writing instruction.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that written corrective feedback significantly enhanced the writing performance of Grade 11 HUMSS students. The pretest mean score was 55.98 (satisfactory), which increased to 66.78 (good) in the posttest, yielding a significant mean gain of 10.80 ($t = 4.651$, $p < 0.001$), leading to rejection of the overall null hypothesis.

Revision analysis showed that indirect corrective feedback produced statistically significant improvement between original and revised drafts in both the first and second essays (null hypotheses rejected). In contrast, direct corrective feedback yielded non-significant differences ($p = 0.107$ and $p = 0.166$, respectively), resulting in acceptance of the null hypothesis for the direct feedback condition.

Findings further indicated that the effectiveness of written corrective feedback depends on its type: direct feedback was more effective for immediate overall language accuracy and was preferred by most participants for its clarity and ease of application, whereas indirect feedback better promoted long-term accuracy in new writing tasks by encouraging critical thinking and self-correction.

Overall, participants highly valued and appreciated teacher-provided corrective feedback, confirming that systematic written corrective feedback, regardless of type, is an effective strategy for improving ESL learners’ writing performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

Future studies are encouraged to address several limitations of the present research. First, the sample size of 30 participants, drawn from a single school in Marawi City, restricts the external validity and generalizability of the findings to the broader Philippine ESL population. Future research should employ larger samples - ideally a minimum of 60 to 100 participants- and include students from multiple schools across diverse regions and educational contexts to enhance the representativeness and transferability of results. Second, the two-month intervention period may not have been sufficient to capture the full long-term effects of both direct and indirect

corrective feedback, particularly given the cumulative nature of writing development. Future studies should consider extending the intervention to a full academic semester or longer to better assess sustained gains. Third, comparative studies involving control groups that receive no corrective feedback, or that contrast WCF with oral feedback, would further strengthen causal inferences. Finally, future researchers may explore the moderating roles of learner proficiency level, motivation, and metacognitive awareness in shaping the differential effectiveness of feedback types, contributing to a more nuanced understanding of WCF in varied ESL contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Almasi, E., & Tabrizi, A. (2016). The effects of direct vs. indirect corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(1), 74–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.2014022>
2. Beuningen, C. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/ijes.10.2.119171>
3. Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. *Applied Linguistics* 31(2), 193–214. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp016>
4. Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 17(2), 102–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004>
5. Bitchener, J. & Ferris, D. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.04.010>
6. Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 191–205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001>
7. Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2019.73014>
8. Chen, J., Lin, J., & Jiang, L. (2016). Corrective feedback in SLA: Theoretical relevance and empirical research. *English Language Teaching*, 9(11), 85-94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n11p85>
9. Dabboub, A. (2019). The effectiveness of comprehensive corrective feedback-direct and indirect- on EFL learners' language accuracy, structural complexity and lexical diversity. PhD, Nottingham Trent University. <https://irep.ntu.ac.uk/id/eprint/38102>
10. Dekeyser, R. M. (1993). The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. *Modern Language Journal*, 77(4), 501–514. <https://doi.org/10.2307/329675>
11. Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(02), 339–368. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060141>
12. Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher Development. *L2 Journal* 1 (1): 3-17. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054>
13. Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 33-53. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587804>
14. Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error Feedback in the L2 Writing Classes: How Explicit Does It Need to Be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 161-184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X)
15. Ferris, D. (2006). "Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524742.007>
16. Gass, S. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. Doughty, & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition*, 224-255. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492.ch9>
17. Goldstein, N. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 591–621. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142015>
18. Harmer, J. (2002). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* 4th Edition. <https://coljour.wordpress.com/wp->

- content/uploads/2018/09/jeremy_harmer_the_practice_of_english_language_teaching_4th_edition_longman_handbooks_for_language_teachers.pdf
19. Hartshorn, K. & Evans, N. (2015). The Effects of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback: A 30-Week Study. *Journal of Response to Writing* (1) 2. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol1/iss2/2>
 20. Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback on second language students' writing* (39). New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
 21. Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
 22. Krashen, S. (1989). *Language Acquisition and Language Education: Extensions*. https://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/sl_acquisition_and_learning.pdf
 23. Kroll, B. (Ed.). (1990). *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*. Cambridge University Press. https://www.academia.edu/31670408/Barbara_Kroll_Second_Language_Writing_Research_Insights_for_or_the_Classroom_Cambridge_Applied_Linguistics
 24. Lalande, J. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 67(2), 140–149. <https://doi.org/10.2307/326382>
 25. Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 20, 37-66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
 26. Montgomery, J., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 82–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002>
 27. Nicol, D., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education* 31. 199-218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
 28. Sambodatu, F. (2022). *The Effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback in the English Written Compositions of RC- AKICFI Senior High School Students* [Unpublished bachelor's thesis]. English Department, Mindanao State University-Marawi.
 29. Sanguila, S. (2023). *Effects of Written Corrective Feedback Method on BAELS Students' Writing Performance* [Unpublished bachelor's thesis]. English Department, Mindanao State University-Marawi.
 30. Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11, 17-46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
 31. Sheen, Y. (2007). The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles. *TESOL Quarterly* 41, 255-283. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x>
 32. Sheen, Y., Wright, D. & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by ESL learners.
 33. Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning* 46(2), 327–369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
 34. Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. (2008). Error Correction, Revision, and Learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 292-305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.05.003>
 35. Wlodkowski, R. & Jaynes, J. H. (1990). *Eager to Learn: Helping Children Become Motivated and Love Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. <https://cmc.marmot.org/Record/b12240448>