THE IMPACT OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK ON ENGLISH ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE STUDENTS' WRITINGS" FROM STUDENTS' PERCEPTION

Nora Nour Sheikh
The American University in the Emirates (AUE).

ABSTRACT: *This case study provides an analysis of EAL students' written work feedback. Qualitative research methods were used to collect data through document analysis of EAL students' recount writings and semi-structured interviews. The case study was conducted on both school and university EAL students for three months in Dubai. Two small groups of 175 students each were involved from an international school and a university in Dubai. The case study points out related theories, previous related studies, methodology, challenges, and limitations. As per students' perspective, effective written feedback should be detailed and constructive, and it should advise students how they can enhance their writing. Then proposed a series of strategies for making the function of feedback positive and beneficial. The case study concludes by offering suggestions for research and practice that actively engage students in the written feedback process and creating a unified framework for teachers to follow.*

KEYWORDS: English Additional Language; corrective written feedback

INTRODUCTION

Considerable time and effort go into generating written feedback, but the minimal effort is made to inspect its impact and effectiveness on English Additional Language Students (EALs). Written feedback can cause frustrations for teachers and students. Also, it inhibits the learning potential of the given feedback (Carless & Winstone, 2020). However, the feedback procedure is considered inadequate because, regardless of proof of students' desire for feedback (Hyland 2000; O'Donovan, Price & Rust, 2001), students do not necessarily read their written feedback (Hounsell, 1987), and if they do so, they might not comprehend it (Gibbs & Simpson, 2004; Lea & Street, 1998; McCune, 2004). Many schools and universities are currently reviewing the negative impact on students due to certain feedback practices. Furthermore, how COVID-19 has affected the process of written feedback at educational institutes.

This case study reveals findings from a three-month plan during COVID-19 pointing out students' engagement with written feedback to indicate that the measurement of written feedback impact is not an easy process. This case study argues the complexity of giving feedback to EAL students, mainly how students handle it and its impact on their learning process in school and higher education.

1

The researcher investigates and reports the impact of written feedback on students' learning process and the progress of their work online (Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris, 2002; Hyland & Hyland, 2010; Ma et al., 2021). Over the years, written feedback has developed exclusively effective written feedback, which is more explicit, focused, and encouraging (Lindemann, 2001). Feedback is considered essential in the learning process as it is the leading cause of students' enthusiasm and motivation. Besides, since the new norm "online learning" took place, online feedback is considered the core of the modern teaching process, especially in English classes or lectures (Ma et al., 2021).

The effect of corrective comments on language improvement has been essential, particularly in second language acquisition (SLA) since the 1990s, which also affected language writing ability. The idea of feedback derives from several theories. These theories have classified corrective feedback as either direct (explicit) or indirect (implicit). Direct feedback can establish the correct linguistic cognition by the tutor to the learner to overcome the linguistic error (Ferris, 2002). Having said that, corrective feedback is theorized to help in language learning, and it also offers chances for EAL students to acquire, connect, and interact with significant language input. Likewise, making the information more understandable for the student as set by the generally acknowledged Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996).

Adding to that, the importance of written feedback is associated with Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (1990, 1995, 2001), which embraces that "SLA is to a great extent driven by what students focus on, and what they see in target dialect input" (Schmidt, 2001, p. 34). Scientists of second language Qi and Lapkin (2001) have also stated that written feedback gives EAL students chances to concentrate on information from given feedback and notice the gap between their written language and the targeted language by the teacher. However, due to COVID-19, the educational process has been affected (Bozkurt & Sharma, 2020), teachers and lecturers have been giving feedback online.

Swain's (1985, 1995) Output Hypothesis has also advocated the significance of constructive feedback in language improvement, which states that encouraging learners to deliver information increases a student's attention to etymological inputs and gaps. Corrective feedback is theorized to urge understudies to develop language beyond their aptitudes, encouraging the EAL students to work harder towards the target language. This case study is structured with two data sources used by the researcher. The EAL students' written recounts with teachers' written feedback and semi-structured interviews with the students. These two data sources are primary in this research, as they reveal detailed evidence on the usefulness of written feedback; whether it was direct on books or indirect online; it is still fundamental in the learning process (Winstone & Carless, 2020).

Statement of the Problem

School teachers and university lecturers at the selected educational institutes in Dubai, UAE, do not have the skills to write positive yet straightforward feedback to the EAL students. Moreover, most teachers and lecturers still practice the teacher-centered method in the designated classes. Students' perception and understanding of the corrective feedback is limited to just reading the feedback with no reaction. Also, as seen from the collected evidence, some EAL students do not understand the purpose of the feedback given to them, as it is hard for them to understand since they lack the basics of the English language (Yu & Liu, 2021). Another aspect is the online feedback, where students have to read it by themselves, in most cases they cannot comprehend it.

Having said that, teachers and lecturers in Dubai do not allocate enough time to teach students vocabulary that may aid the EAL students to understand their instructions and, as a result, understand their feedback. The role of written corrective feedback is to be used as a tool to assist SLA remains obscure. Specifically, most educational institutes do not assign enough teaching time for grammar and punctuation. Grammar explanation helps EAL students produce better writings at any age or level. With remote teaching, it has become harder for teachers to focus on grammar and punctuation as most students use "word document". Additionally, it has been stated that developed countries are the only ones benefiting from online teaching (Saavedra, 2020).

Purpose of the Study

Teachers often give oral or written feedback to their students. In this case study, the researcher concentrated on the written corrective feedback at different age groups, whether it was given on books or online. The researcher is driven by the difference in our understanding of written feedback in general and its effectiveness on EAL students writing. Moreover, how students in schools and higher education are involved and engaged in the feedback process. Previous studies of written feedback did not enhance the researcher's understanding of the reason behind it. As a result, the researcher investigated the impact of written feedback on EAL students and how students perceive it in-depth (Carless & Boud, 2018). Moreover, to understand how different types of comments, whether negative or positive, can affect the EAL students' learning process (Ferris, 2010) and how specific comments have influenced more than others from the EAL students' written work and skills (Foin & Lange, 2007; Han & Xu, 2019a). Furthermore, how EAL students reflect and respond to these comments (Hyland, 2010; Carless & Boud, 2018).

Measuring the effectiveness of written feedback needs the explicit purpose of its use by teachers. Without a precise aim of giving feedback on students' written recounts, attainment and progress cannot be measured. In this case study, methods of written feedback measurement and students' responses are valuable. Providing written feedback could be seen as an utterly applicable focus to all school teachers and higher education tutors. Nevertheless, emphasizing the value of written

3

feedback, extending beyond the ordinary 'fulfillment of a ritual' (Carless, 2006). According to Ferris and Roberts (2001), teachers should know their students' attitudes towards feedback. Therefore, this study focuses not on writing itself but rather on EAL students' attitudes.

To sum the purpose of this study is to have a close look at both the types of written corrective feedback to EAL students at different ages and how they might respond (if they do) to that feedback in their recount writings.

Research Questions
To comprehend the aim of the study, the researcher pursued that through straightforward and related questions, which assisted in guiding the research. The case study addressed the following research questions:

Q1. What is the EAL students' perception in terms of experiences with written corrective feedback?
Q2. What applied strategies of written feedback influence EAL students' written ability?

Research Hypotheses
The researcher decided to formulate the following hypotheses:
Hypotheses 1: Written corrective feedback significantly affects the improvement of recount writing ability among EAL students.
Hypotheses 2: Teachers are not entirely aware of the significance of corrective and constructive feedback and how to use them positively to enhance EAL students' writing ability specifically online.

The Rationale for the Study
Reconsidering the means to work with diverse students and how future educators will influence the students' outcomes and overall performance. Reflection is another way to define feedback, arisen from cognitive science, where the main task of feedback is to 'put things right' by doing a corrective action. A supporting part was advocated by behaviorists such as Skinner (1968), who viewed feedback as a valuable external stimulus whether it provides a positive or negative influence on behavior. Since the researcher is an EAL teacher in an international school in Dubai and a lecturer at a university in Dubai, this case study will assist her in knowing the impact of written feedback on her EAL students' future writing and behavior at different age groups.

LITERATURE REVIEW

To support this case study's context, the researcher reviews the most important related concepts and theories from previous and current research on the effectiveness of written corrective feedback on

EAL recount written work. The researcher will show evidence of how literature looks at feedback and its connection to Second Language Acquisition (SLA).

Conceptual Analysis
Conceptual analysis is one of the fundamental custom methods of philosophy, possibly dating back to Plato's era. According to Henderson and Horgan (2011), the conceptual analysis provides definitions and further analysis of specific concepts and beliefs about the nature of the literature design and the foundations of the theory.

Feedback
Collected work studies and research about the students' written feedback indicate that delayed feedback was insufficient, as stated by Iron (2008, as cited in Lumthong 2010; Carless & Winstone, 2020), and was equivalent to no comments at all. Some cases' outcomes defined the link between students' ability level and their behavior with the teacher's written feedback. Written feedback amazingly influenced students with various ability levels and especially EAL students. Students also appear to have inadequate feedback from peers when working in groups (Han & Xu, 2019a). Therefore, teachers must provide feedback according to the students' level and focus on positive comments.

Teachers tend to provide written feedback as comments of different lengths; from one word to multiple sentences; and it is written on various locations such as the side of the page, the margin, or at the end of the written work, using a variety of speech acts like questions, guidelines, and suggestions as well as specialized markings or codes (Baker & Bricker, 2010).

The attention of previous studies on written feedback was mainly on the reacts of direct or indirect feedback related to grammatical accuracy (Chandler, 2003; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lalande, 1982; Robb et al., 1986) and on the outcomes of written feedback on the material (Ashwell, 2000; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Fazio, 2001; Semke, 1984), exploring various forms of written feedback the direct and the indirect. Ellis et al. (2009) mentioned that direct written feedback could be given to the student as oral corrective feedback on the spot while the student is doing the work or as a symbol or code of indication of where needs amendment. On the other hand, Storch and Wigglesworth (2010) and Gue Nette (2007) debated that codes stand for indirect feedback rather than direct. While indirect feedback as mentioned by Ellis, "involves indicating that the student has made an error without actually correcting it," this includes placing a sign or underlining and highlighting the errors in the text (2009, p. 100). Moreover, Chong (2020) stated that students misunderstanding the meaning may constrain the students' reaction towards the feedback.

Additionally, some studies on written feedback in second language writing improvement have discovered the merit between explicit and implicit feedback. Ellis et al. (2009) and Sheen (2007) debated that implicit-explicit measurements do not relate to written feedback but to oral feedback only. At the same time, both agreed that written feedback could only be explicit. On the other hand, Li (2010) clarified that implicit-explicit dimensions are related to written feedback.

Lindemann (2001) believes that providing valuable, effective, and positive written feedback may improve students' communication skills. Similarly, according to Arnold and Thomlinson (2005), corrective written feedback improves second language students writing skills by reading and comprehending the problem than developing their weak areas. Moreover, it is advised that teachers should compose complete sentences to show that they are serious when giving written feedback to students (Straub, 2000). On the other hand, Carless (2020) suggested that having a framework for feedback can help teachers and students improve their written work.

Nevertheless, written feedback is a commonly researched area for EAL students; understanding teachers' feedback is still in its initial stages. Many types of research have concentrated on the types of feedback, but not enough research on its impact on EAL students and if students were involved in the feedback process, and whether they comprehended the feedback or not. To help students during tasks and draw their attention to achieve the aim, there are two ways of correcting explicit and implicit feedback:

Implicit Feedback
Implicit is derived from the Latin word *implicitus,* which means implied. Implicit feedback could be any type of clarification given to students without drawing their attention indirectly. Implicit feedback includes many types of corrective feedback, but the most basic form is the recasts technique in which teachers tend to improve the students' incorrect accuracy and fluency (Ellis et al., 2009) (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012).

According to many researchers, recasts are the most practiced type of feedback in and out of the classroom (Oliver, 1995; Lyster & Rants, 1997; Braidi, 2002; Sheen, 2004). Loewen and Philp (2006) also referred to recast as the most common form of corrective feedback since it saves time and students' confidence is not being intimidated. According to the researcher, in this case study, this type of feedback can confuse the EAL students as they don't have enough vocabulary to understand any indirect words, codes, or symbols. Furthermore, EAL students lack fluency in the English language, so implicit feedback is not a good choice.

Explicit Feedback

Explicit is derived from the Latin word *explicitus,* which means clear and direct. Some studies agree with explicit types of feedback (Spada, 1997; Seedhouse, 1997), especially metalinguistic feedback, as described by Lyster and Ranta (1997) as "comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the learner's utterance.". Metalinguistic feedback is direct feedback that can help students self-repair, while recasts can direct learners only to the repetition of the suitable forms (Lyster, 2007). The benefit of explicit corrective feedback is that students easily and directly understand the feedback intention, unlike recasts. However, Lyster stated a caveat that using metalinguistic feedback can be disruptive to the flow of teaching and learning (2000, p. 405). The researcher considers this type of feedback more appropriate to the EAL students as it is straightforward, even though, as mentioned earlier, it disturbs the lesson's flow. The explicit feedback can be very accommodating for the EAL students if given based on a one-to-one.

Theoretical Framework

There is a combination of three frameworks related to this case study, which are the Speech Acts Theory by Searle and Austin (1969), the Learning and Language Theories by Richard and Rogers (2001), and Socio-Cultural Theory (SCT) by L.S. Vygotsky (1976). These frameworks provide a more explicit justification for classifying feedback as a communication technique amongst the teacher and the student. Holmes stated that providing feedback is a heavy information load on students, so how about the EAL students! Researchers believe that providing students with oral or written feedback will grant more opportunities for improvement and communication between the provider and the receiver of the feedback. However, during remote teaching encountered by the COVID-19 pandemic, the classroom resources were not available. Therefore, the feedback for some students was online. Teachers had to adapt to the new situation and create new rubrics and strategies for written feedback (Chong, 2020).

Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers Theories

Theory of Learning

The Task-Based Approach depends on the positive effects of the given task itself in the learning process. Task-Based Approach involves an input-output process by the student. Additionally, the teacher and the students can negotiate this learning process to establish a fruitful, independent, critical thinking, and positive learning environment. Having said that, the EAL students get encouraged to achieve tasks independently; as a result, the learning process is successful (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Theory of Language

According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), Task-Based Instruction is established on the standard where meaning and vocabulary are important. Leading to an important point that teachers need to focus on is teaching vocabulary and using different ways to implement it, not the traditional way. It's well-known that EAL students need ample vocabulary when they start learning English as a new language.

Searle's and Austin's Speech Act Theory

Since 1970 speech act theory has become a significant section of the contemporary theory of language, recognition goes mainly to the inspiration of Searle (1969, 1979) and Grice (1975) whose philosophies have inspired studies in philosophy and cognitive sciences. Searle's interpretation of speech act theory is based on fundamental conditions, in which the minimal intention of the provider is taken by the receiver. Speech Acts are very important to be taught to EAL students, unfortunately nowadays in the teaching system, they are taken for granted, as most teachers think that EAL students will learn it spontaneously. The researcher believes that this is one of the reasons behind EAL students being unable to read, understand and reflect on teachers' feedback. Searle classified the performing speech acts into five categories whether it is spoken or written:

Table 1

Representative or assertive	In this situation, the speaker is dedicated to the truth of the content whether spoken or written. Also, the speaker is assertive and firm.
Directive	In this condition, the speaker is giving direct instructions to the listener. Mostly such commands are seen in the classroom given by the teacher.
Commissive	In this situation, the speaker becomes devoted to acting in the way embodied by the propositional content, which in most cases, is promising of doing the act. Also in most positions, the speaker tends to be the student.
Expressive	The speaker basically, expresses the honest condition of the speech act. Therefore, in this case, expressions and feelings are used to complete the meaning.
Declarative	In this situation, the speaker carries out an action representing itself by being accomplished and completed.

As mentioned before, speech acts are an efficient component of communication. As stated by Cohen and Austin's theory of speech acts (1964, 1962), speech has three kinds of significance:

Table 2

8

Propositional or Locutionary Force	This gives the exact literal meaning for the utterance. It is always direct meaning.
Illocutionary Force	This has a social function for both oral and written speech. In this utterance, the meaning is implied indirectly. It could be expressed emphatically, a repeated request, or as a complaint.
Perlocutionary Force	In this case, if the utterance has no force, which means if the action is asked for is already done, then the context is ignored.

Vygotsky's Socio-Cultural Theory

Sociocultural theory (SCT), established by L.S. Vygotsky in the 1970s, this theory has numerous implications for Second Language Acquisition (SLA) investigations. Vygotsky (1986) recommended that students learn better in a sociocultural environment, from a natural perspective, where students can communicate and collaborate easily, which is the case with EAL students. Two primary concepts are central to understand the SCT – the mediated mind and the zone of proximal development (ZPD).

Lantolf cited that Vygotsky suggested, that the mediated mind concept is the most important, "to mediate and regulate our relationships with others and with ourselves and thus change the nature of these relationships" (2000, p.1). In other words, our social relationship with others or with ourselves depends mainly on language. Even the simplest way to help the EAL students to socialize with others is through group work, which can boost their confidence and language.

Related Previous Studies

The researcher has reviewed similar studies to enrich the current case study:

Ma et al. (2021), in their article, explored the effects of online learning feedback literacy and individual differences from an ecological perspective. The paper proposed a model for online assessment and developing students' literacy feedback. While Watson and Carless 2020, in their recent book on effective feedback in higher education, claimed feedback has a powerful influence on students' achievement. Yet, it is hard to implement it productively. The book focuses on the challenges of creating effective feedback in higher education, merging theory and practice to supply and enable educators. The book places less highlight on what educators do while providing the feedback, and more emphasis on how students understood the feedback.

The following study by Leng in 2014, examined the written feedback on written assignments of 15 ESL students. This study sought to clarify the efficacy of written feedback on undergraduate Malay,

Chinese and Indian students. The data showed that when the ESL students had positive written feedback from the tutor, they were capable to rewrite and amend the drafts, their confidence enhanced, and they enjoyed writing. Therefore, written feedback has a socio-emotional part on ESL students during the writing process (Kumar & Stracke, 2007, 2010).

While Dunworth and Sanchez stated in their article in 2016, stated that both teachers and students in higher education incorporate emotional and interpersonal written feedback, each has a different view of the given feedback. Another insight from the researcher in this study is that direct and explicit feedback had a positive influence on the ESL students, this boosted their self-esteem. The researcher stated that there were three implications of written feedback: ESL students were able to rewrite more because of the detailed feedback, ESL students were able to comprehend the instructed feedback and tutors provided positive written feedback. In contrast, random written feedback failed all the time to enable the ESL students to understand the feedback and the purpose behind it. The corrective feedback from teachers in all cases was found to be effective and helped the learners to improve their writing ability.

According to Hyland and Hyland (2006), they stated that ccorrective feedback can now and then go wrong if not practiced in the right way and if there was no subjectivity from both the teacher and the students, which is needed to build a zone of proximal development (ZPD). Hyland (2000) acknowledged that corrective feedback in an academic writing program is very important, the researcher analyzed some examples of corrective feedback practices and the learner's replies. According to the collected data, Hyland highlights, the mismatch between the teachers' and the students' objectives. Hyland sensed a control of the feedback process from the teachers, in which they failed to take into account the students' goals. Therefore, feedback was considered as having a strong potential with the expectation for "a revision of cognition itself that stems from response" (Freedman: 1985: xi).

Another study investigated written feedback by Wang and Jiang in 2014, they claimed that in agreement with the theoretical framework of written corrective feedback in the EAL setting, much empirical research has provided constructive evidence on the effectiveness of written feedback. According to Wang and Jiang written feedback studies are restricted specifically on the available forms of feedback. Many present studies only focused on some types of written feedback; therefore, it is difficult to generalize the conclusions and link them to SLA. By doing so, the expectancy of feedback in the EAL context can be investigated from the students' perspectives.

From another point of view, a recent study was conducted by Chutaphon et al. in 2018. The study had a huge population of 35,708 12th grade students in the 2017 academic year, from 119 schools in Bangkok, Thailand. The outcome of this case study presented information that written corrective feedback affected students and assisted in progressing their comprehensive writing skills.

Nevertheless, providing feedback to students was a mutual benefit; the teacher to know the students' level, while helped the students to improve their weaknesses and build on their strengths.

Theoretical Consolidation
In this case study, the term feedback is affiliated with communication during class time between the teacher and the learner. During the class period, they both exchange thoughts and feedback through the mediation of language, and from this cooperation of meaning and vocabulary, their relationship and the students' perception of feedback will be shaped. In this process, the teacher and the student convey their acquaintance of writing through the given written feedback.

Due to distance learning, the interaction between the teachers and the students has become different, through various channels. This has become challenging for educators to keep learners engaged in the learning process (Moore, 1989; Riggs, 2020). In this sense, online teaching is considered a temporary answer to an immediate crisis (COVID-19 (Golden, 2020).

Vygotsky (1987) indicated that students' ability to do tasks can reach higher standards with collaboration, positive feedback, and assistance. In an EAL context, this is applicable only if the EAL students have the right vocabulary to assist them. Furthermore, Storch (2002) piloted a study exploring various patterns of interactions. In her study, 10 adult ESL students took part and completed written tasks. The analyzed data shows the equality and mutuality of these patterns of interactions. Equality refers to the equal control of the task, and mutuality defines levels of engaging interactions between students in terms of given feedback and concepts. This is related to the current case study the researcher is conducting, as the researcher wants to shed the light on strategies teachers use to influence positively EAL students.

These theoretical outcomes are an opportunity for this research to investigate how written feedback on students' work in educational institutes around the UAE affects EAL students; to what extent are educational institutes involved in these programs and how do they facilitate and implement it, and if the COVID-19 has affected the written feedback. It is anticipated that this study would address the current practices with the COVID-19, considering the main theories of Searle and Vygotsky across the world.

In summary, the research piloted so far on teachers' written corrective feedback is abroad. Although most scholars believe that teachers' oral feedback is more applicable, less time-consuming, and direct more than written, more consideration has been concentrated on written feedback but without any focus on a type of writing, for example, recounts. Furthermore, with online teaching, the written feedback has changed, and the codes used are different.

METHODOLOGY

The study is an analytical, cohort study that analyzes the written recounts of a group of second language students of English language. The researcher made her best not to manipulate the variables while collecting the data. Further evidence was collected through interviews with students to get their point of view on given corrective feedback. The methodology section below provides further information about the design, approach, setting, population, materials, tools, and procedures that took place during this case study. The chapter will also elaborate on the method and instruments used in the study. Then the researcher will state further information on how the qualitative data will be analysed.

Research Approach

This research approach gave the researcher the chance to investigate in depth the strength, effectiveness, and weakness of the written corrective feedback. Yin 1993 stressed, that choosing qualitative approach for its strength as a way of investigating, justifying, and identifying. This approach would provide the researcher the possibility to notice the way students can reflect on their learning (Stake, 1995).

Consequently, the researcher considers the qualitative research approach competent since it can evaluate and enhance the written feedback and providing an opportunity for in-depth investigation (Merriam, 2009). The researcher will utilize the collected qualitative data from the interviews and the students' written work to add breadth to the research.

Data Collection

In this case study, data was gathered from two sources as mentioned before: from the written assignment (100-150 words) recount writings and interviews over 12 weeks. Both data sources assisted the researcher to collect evidence from the EAL students' deep reaction towards the written corrective feedback from their teachers. This case study is structured, as the researcher used semi-structured interviews. The researcher assembled the oral and the written data to aid her in answering the research questions through students' written recounts and interviewing them using interview form and structured questions to guide them (Diab, 2015; Ferris et al., 2013). The data wasn't easy to obtain as the researcher had expected. Both methods provided enough evidence to the research and supported the data even though they were time-consuming.

Method

In this investigation, the researcher is using a case study method. Case studies are in-depth inquiries of a thing, person, phenomena, event, or community. Typically, the data is collected from different

12

sources using several methods. Nowadays, case studies are widely used in different fields, but the best-known studies were the ones carried out by Freud (1909) in physiology.

Research Design and Context
This study is a qualitative and semi-structured case, in which the investigation was conducted in Dubai, UAE. The study duration lasted for 12 weeks in two educational institutes, intact classes were involved, but the focus was on EAL students only. It would have added more value if more schools and universities were involved, which was hindered by the researchers' job and being unable to conduct this elsewhere but her workplace due to the COVID-19 rules and regulations. The case study focused on written corrective feedback and the perspective of EAL students, in which the data was collected by semi-controlled interviews. The classes were between 60-90 minutes long, in some lessons the students wrote recount assignments, while in other lessons students were interviewed.

Participants
The number of participants who took part in this case study was adequate, although the research would have been more fruitful if the sample size had been more prominent than only 175 EAL students ages 14 and above. The students were of mixed nationalities, including Spanish, Italian, Belgium, Russian, Chinese, Lebanese, and Emiratis. English is their second language. The researcher employed a convenient sampling group from different classes (Ary et al., 1996). Table 3 below shows more details regarding the participants.

Participants	N	Age	Teaching Language	Gender	Nationality
School students	98	14-16	English	Mix	Mostly European
University students	77	18-29	English	Mix	Mostly Emiratis

Instrument
The researcher will use two qualitative research methods to collect the data and evidence:

Written Recounts
The researcher collected some recount samples written by the EAL students. Some samples were written on paper, while others were on a word document. The samples had teachers' written feedback on them. The given feedback was given in two ways, either a small direct positive comment or detailed feedback with the educational institutes' feedback approach. The international school had initiated its feedback format, in which the teacher starts with a positive comment (Holmes, 2001; Searle, 1969), then writes a question for the students to reflect on and react to the comment. In some

cases, the question in the feedback could be answered orally by the student, the teacher pointed this down in the feedback comment. While in higher education, there was no unified uniform used for giving feedback to the students, it was the lecturer's effort (Winstone & Carless, 2020).

The school students wrote recounts every four weeks. The writing process included two drafts before the final submission of the recount writing. The students read their first draft and did self-edit, then peer assessment took place on the second draft, and finally, students received their teacher's feedback on the final written recount. All drafts and submissions were written in their English language notebooks. Students were given success criteria to self-assess. Students used coloured pencils to correct errors during self-editing and peer assessment. If students were doing remote learning, then only self-edit took place before handing it to the teacher.

While in higher education, depending on the module taught students were given assignments. The lecturer would provide the students with success criteria to follow and links to research. In most cases, the students were given one draft submission to check for plagiarism before the final work submission. In higher education, the learning mode was remote learning. Therefore, the students' work was given through the university's portal. Furthermore, it was noted that in higher education in Dubai peer assessment is hindered due to remote learning. The researcher only collected the final recount writing as it was the only one with the written feedback from teachers.

Semi-structured Interviews
Semi-structured interviews are a major qualitative method (see Appendix 1) that were used to collect data about teachers' perceptions of written corrective feedback. The researcher used an interview form sheet to help the teachers stay focused and on point when answering questions and not drift away (Merriam, 2001). According to Cohen et al. (2008) using interviews is recommended to gather evidence in-depth and test the hypotheses and provide reinforcement for other research instruments in this case study. To prompt spontaneous responses from the interviewees, the researcher created open-ended questions (Kvale, 2008).

The interviews took place in week 4 of the research journey, each interview lasted between 20 to 50 minutes, during which Microsoft Teams was used to record, and notes were interpreted. Later the researcher used the notes and the recorded interviews in the data analysis and the discussion of this study.

Delimitations and Limitations of the Case Study
To avoid limitations with participants the researcher only interviewed teachers who had qualifications and backgrounds about EAL students. Hence, teachers with less than two years of experience were excluded as they would not have been familiar with the written feedback approach

14

in-depth. However, the researcher couldn't interview any lecturers teaching higher education, and the reason was time-constraint and due to COVID-19.

The researcher conducted this study in one international school and one private university in Dubai, UAE, over 3 months. Therefore, the sample size and time were not sufficient due to the constraint of COVID-19. Furthermore, the researcher's focus was only on written feedback and neglected the oral feedback. Another limitation the researcher faced was that there was no comparison made between the students' first written recount draft and the final draft with given comments. Therefore, the researcher couldn't provide the students' progress or even show the effectiveness of written feedback on students' writing ability.

Ethical Consideration
The researcher included several ethical considerations in this case study. These considerations included the confidentiality of the participants, the institutes, and staff members. The researcher aimed to protect them from any misrepresentation using a consent form sent home through email to parents to get approval through clarifying the research study and its purpose, or a google form shared with higher education students to consent for participation (Maxwell, 1996). Furthermore, the researcher asked for permission from the school to conduct this study. Bearing in mind that the participants both the students and the teachers were given a clear understanding of their contribution to this research. Nevertheless, in higher education, the students were given the choice to participate in this study by providing their consent form.

Reliability, Validity, and Feasibility of the Data
The feasibility and validity of any qualitative research are known as the degree to which the data is correctly measured (Gay et al., 2011, p. 391). According to Maxwell (1992), researchers can accomplish trustworthiness and understanding of their investigation by achieving reliability, theoretical feasibility, and evaluative validity (Gay et al., 2011, p. 392). The researcher respects all aspects of the research, the participants, the educational institutes, and the documents. Since the researcher is an employee at the International School and the Private University, she will try her best not to affect the study's data accuracy.

Accessibility
Since the researcher is employed with the designated International School and Private University in Dubai. Certainly, gaining access to the institutes' documents, interviewing teachers, and obtaining students' work was easy. For the very same reason, the researcher took advantage of easy access to save time and effort while conducting the study.

RESULTS, FINDINGS, AND DATA ANALYSIS

The researcher applied qualitative methods to investigate the data. The findings in this section were built upon the key data sources of document analysis and interviews. Throughout the case study journey, the researcher collected written recount writings from EAL students. The researcher only focused on the final piece of writing and ignored the drafts as there was no given feedback from the teacher. The participants were asked to write a recount on different topics on an average of 150 words every 4 weeks or any given assignment, so the researcher collected only the final samples.

The researcher decided to use the narrative construction approach to analyze the students' work (Cresswell, 2006; Gerring, 2007). This approach provided insight into each feedback given to the selected students' work. Then compared the outcomes across the students' work with the given corrective feedback, (as seen in the below tables).

The researcher also compared schools' written feedback given to students with the written feedback used in higher education on EAL students. The researcher also compared the perspective of the EAL students in both institutes and whether they understood it or not. The analysis was based on the students' perspective of what they could understand from the feedback given to them by their teachers.

The researcher analysed the final samples for all the students in-depth, looking at the most corrective feedback given by the teachers at schools (Table 4). The bold codes represent the most frequent mistakes students made in their writing, according to the following sections: knowledge, correct responses, and the reason behind the writing. The researcher searched for the highest 4 codes in each sample. While (Table 5), showed the codes lecturers used when providing comments on the students' written recounts in university. Towards the end, the teachers wrote a comment as mentioned before, see (Appendix 1 and 2) that shows an example of students' work in both school and university for EAL students.

Error Type Code	Brief Description
ℓ	Delete
^	Insert word
#	Insert a space
-	Omit word
\	Change
C	Capital letters

//	New paragraph
SS [	Use single space line
(SP)	Spelling mistake
WO	Word order
V	Wrong verb form
?	I don't understand what you are trying to say
P	Wrong punctuation
⌃	Insert comma
⊙	Insert full stop/ period
⌄	Insert apostrophe

*Table 4: Error codes used in marking and providing written feedback in school

Error Type Color Code	**Brief Description**
Delete	Delete
Missing words	Insert word or missing words
Spelling and punctuation	Spelling mistake, wrong punctuation
I don't understand	I don't understand what you are trying to say
?	Incomplete thought or idea

*Table 5: Error codes used in marking and providing written feedback in university

It can be seen from the above tables that there was a big difference in the codes and the way the written feedback was given at school and the university for the EAL students. Even though both provided the students with the success criteria. The researcher couldn't conduct semi-structured interviews with all the 175 EAL students. As it was time-consuming and not all the students had the ability to answer the prepared questions, yet COVID-19 rules and regulations prevented the researcher to meet with some students. Therefore, the researcher chose 3 high-ability students to interview (see appendix 3). The interviews were 30-50 minutes long and took place in the EAL classroom for school students or through Microsoft Teams for university students. The researcher used an audio recorder and at the same took notes. Since international schools went back fully to function on the premises abiding fully to COVID-19 rules and regulations, this helped the researcher to interview the students face-to-face. While at higher education, university institutes were still closed

with full online teaching methods used for learning. In this case, the researcher was able to interview the university students only through Microsoft Teams. The researcher found that the interview with school students went smoothly and easily. On the contrary with the university students, were very shy, mostly did not want the interview to be recorded, or refused to put the camera on.

The interviews were designed to investigate the concerns elevated in the research questions: (1) To know what students thought of the given written feedback. (2) To know how they felt about the feedback and their recount writing. (3) To know what strategies have helped them during the writing process. (4) To know if the students understood the provided and given written feedback.

In all interviews, the researcher included the marked recount writing, asked the students about their thoughts of the feedback process, how they responded to the written feedback and what changes and next steps have they took? (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005, p. 285). The purpose of individual interviews was to know how each student perceived the written feedback.

The research questions were answered through the collected data. However, the findings presented clear evidence that the students had a supportive reaction towards their written feedback. Approximately, all the EAL students debated time limitations as the main issue in their capability to apply what they have acquired through language classes to their writing tasks. The researcher found out that the most common direct errors in feedback as shown in the provided samples were capitalization, spelling mistakes, and verb format. Therefore, following up strategies by teachers will make a big difference in EAL students' work. Furthermore, it was clear that the draft sample helped the students in improving their final sample, fewer mistakes were evident in the final sample compared to the first draft. The researcher concluded from the students' interviews that the feedback provided at school was hard as the students had to go back to a table for a reference of the code to understand the teacher's feedback. While at higher education the students commented that it was easy to understand the mistakes and work better with the final draft since the lecturers provided the meaning of the codes used in the feedback. Therefore, it was easy to follow and maintain good writing style.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The globe is ever-changing, and the reasons for disruptions in education are not limited, pandemics are one of those types of natural disasters. Therefore, the world must adjust and fast by creating a modern agenda to follow. From the previous discussion, the following conclusions can be considered as part of the agenda: Teaching EAL students' punctuation and grammar enabled them to perform writing recount tasks efficiently with fewer mistakes. The code-correction errors helped the EAL students understand the comments easily, yet schools need to simplify the codes for the EAL students. The corrective written comments helped the EAL students write better when comparing the

18

draft sample and the final sample for each student. Using codes in the written feedback, motivated students. It also helped them to be more independent and aware of the errors (Stracke & Kumar, 2010). As predicted in the hypothesis, not all teachers are aware of the benefits of providing detailed, simplified, and positive feedback. Therefore, the school should implement professional development for teachers focusing on EAL students' feedback with simple codes (Karami et al., 2020). While in higher education if they use a unified structure for providing feedback it will be easier for the lecturer and the students to understand the feedback.

To sum up, the researcher found three implications that could benefit the EAL students and the teachers in the future: Teachers should provide simplified feedback for EAL students (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Moreover, teachers should provide positive feedback in comments. Additionally, teachers ought to provide a self-checklist to help the students be more independent and responsible. The researcher believes that we should focus on the Why perspective (why corrective feedback has inadequate benefits on EAL students' writing?) More than the currently focused upon "How" perspective. There is a hope that this would influence researchers, direct teachers, and guide EAL students.

References

Alicia Martínez Flor and Esther Usó-Juan, 2010, "Pragmatics and Speech Act Performance." *Speech Act Performance: Theoretical, Empirical and Methodological Issues.*

Anne Barron, 2003. Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics: Learning How to Do Things with Words in a Study Abroad Context. John Benjamins.

Austin, J.L. 1962. How to do Things with Words. *Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.*

Bardovi-Harlig K. & C. Félix-Brasdefer (eds.) 2016. The design and construction of websites to promote L2 pragmatics. *In Pragmatics and language learning (pp. 341-356),* Volume 14.

Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R. C. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to CoronaVirus pandemic. *Asian Journal of Distance Education, 15*(1), i–vi.

Brown E & Glover C (2006) Evaluating written feedback on students' assignments. In Innovative Assessment in Higher Education, Eds Bryan C. and Clegg K., pp.81 - 91. *Routledge Taylor & Francis Group plc. Oxford shire.*

Brown E & Glover C (2005) Refocusing Written Feedback. Paper presented to The 13th Improving Student Learning Symposium, *Imperial College, London, UK.*

Brown E., Glover C. J., Freake S. and Stevens V.A.M (2004). Evaluating the effectiveness of written feedback as an element of formative assessment in science. Proceedings of the Improving Student Learning: *Diversity and Inclusivity Symposium, Birmingham, UK.*

Brown E, Gibbs G., and Glover C. (2003). 'Evaluating tools for investigating the impact of assessment regimes on student learning', *Bioscience Education E-journal, 2-5.*

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43(8),* 1315–1325.

Carless, D. and Winstone, N., 2020. Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education,* pp.1-14.

Carless, D. 2006. Differing perceptions in the feedback process. Studies in Higher Education 31, no. 2: 219–33

Carless, D. 2006. Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education 31, no. 2:* 219–33.

Carson, J. (2001). Second Language Writing and Second Language Acquisition. In T. Silva & P. Matsuda (eds.), On Second Language Writing. *Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 191–200.*

Cohen, D.A. 1996. Speech Act in S.L. Mckay & N.H. Hornberg (Eds.), Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

Cohen, A D. & Sykes, J. M. 2013, Strategy-based learning of pragmatics for intercultural education. In F. Dervin & A. J. Liddicoat (eds.), *Linguistics for intercultural education.*

Chong, S. W. (2020). Reconsidering student feedback literacy from an ecological perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 46*, 92.

Daniel Vanderkeven and Susumu Kubo, 2002, "Introduction." Essays in Speech Act Theory.

Diane Larsen-Freeman. 2000. Techniques and principles in language teaching AND Jack Richards and Theodore Rogers. *2001. 2nd edition. Approaches and methods in language teaching.*

Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63(2),* 97-107.

Ferris, D. (2004). The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime…?) *Journal of Second Language Writing 13.1,* 49─62.

Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. *In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (eds.).*

Golden, C. (2020). Remote teaching: The glass half-full. *EDUCAUSE Review*.

Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2019a). The development of student feedback literacy: The influences of teacher feedback on peer feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 45*(5), 680–696.

Hinkel E. (Ed.), 2017, Teaching and learning second language pragmatics. In Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning (pp. 428-452), *Vol. 3. NY: Routledge.*

Holmes, Janet. 2001. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. *London: Longman Education Limited.*

Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and Feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research, 4*, 33-54.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

Hyland P. (2000) Learning from feedback on assessment. In: The practice of university history teaching Eds Hyland P. & Booth A. Manchester, UK: *Manchester University Press.*

Katie Dunworth & Hugo Santiago Sanchez (2016) Perceptions of quality in staff-student written feedback in higher education: a case study, *Teaching in Higher Education, 21:5,* 576-589.

Kang E. & Han Z. (2015). "The Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in Improving L2 Written Accuracy: A Meta-Analysis". *The Modern Language Journal 99* 1-18.

Karami A, Masoudi Nadooshan E, Samiei Zafar Ghandi M. (2020) Provide a Model for Designing Teachers' Professional Development in education. *Iranian Journal of Educational Sociology. 3 (2)* :29-37

Kong, A., & Teng, F. (2020). The operating mechanisms of self-efficacy and peer feedback: An exploration of L2 young writers. *Applied Linguistics Review*.

Lantolf, J. P. (1999). Second culture acquisition: cognitive considerations. in E. Hinkel (Ed.), Culture in second language teaching and learning (pp. 28-46). *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

Leng, K. 2014. An Analysis of Written Feedback on ESL Students' Writing. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 123*, pp.389-397.

Liu, Q., & Chao, C. C. (2018). CALL from an ecological perspective: How a teacher perceives affordance and fosters learner agency in a technology-mediated language classroom. *ReCALL, 30*(1), 68–87.

Ma, M., & Teng, M. F. (2021). Metacognitive knowledge development of low proficiency Hong Kong English as a Foreign Language university students in a process-oriented writing course: An action research study. In B. L. Reynolds & M. F. Teng (Eds.), Innovative Approaches in Teaching English Writing to Chinese Speakers (pp. 117–144). *De Gruyter Mouton.*

Ma, M., Wang, C. & Teng, M.F. (2021) Using Learning-Oriented Online Assessment to Foster Students' Feedback Literacy in L2 Writing During COVID-19 Pandemic: A Case of Misalignment Between Micro- and Macro- Contexts. *Asia-Pacific Edu Res*.

Merriam, S.B. (2009). Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation. *San Francisco:Jossey-Bass.*

Moore, M. G. (1989). Editorial: Three types of interaction. *American Journal of Distance Education, 3(2)*, 1–7.

Mutch A. (2003). Exploring the practice of feedback to students. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 4(1),* 24-38.

Riggs, S. (2020). Student-centered remote teaching: Lessons learned from online education. *EDUCAUSE Review*.

Saavedra, J. (2020). Educational challenges and opportunities of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. *World Bank Blog.*

Searle, John. (1969). Speech Act: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes. *Cambridge. MA: Harvard University Press.*

Wang, T. and Jiang, L. (2014). Studies on Written Corrective Feedback: Theoretical Perspectives, Empirical Evidence, and Future Directions. *English Language Teaching, 8(1).*

Winstone, N., & Carless, D. (2020). *Designing effective feedback processes in higher education: A learning-focused approach.* Routledge.

Yu, S., & Liu, C. (2021). Improving student feedback literacy in academic writing: An evidence-based framework. *Assessing Writing, 48*, 100525.