

The Role of Technology-Mediated Written Corrective Feedback in Improving the Writing Skill: A Qualitative Inquiry

Abdullah Al Maqbali¹, Sheikha Ali Al-Buraiki², Samya AL-Shidi³, Salama Saif Al-Siyabi⁴

¹ Sohar University; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2476-8207>; Email: AMMaqbali@su.edu.om

² Sohar University; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8821-6299>; Email: saburaiki@su.edu.om

³ Gulf College; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-7149-2339>; Email: samya.alshidi@gulfcollege.edu.om

⁴ Ministry of Education; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6799-8608>; Email: 236179@students.su.edu.om

*Corresponding Author: saburaiki@su.edu.om

Citation: Al Maqbali, A., Al-Buraiki, S. A., AL-Shidi, S. & Al-Siyabi, S. S. (2026). The Role of Technology-Mediated Written Corrective Feedback in Improving the Writing Skill: A Qualitative Inquiry, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 11(1), 2475-2486. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v11i1.4395>

Published: January 30, 2026

ABSTRACT

The present research paper investigated the effectiveness of Technology-Mediated Written Corrective Feedback (TMWCF) in the overall development of undergraduate students' writing in the Sultanate of Oman. In order to examine students' perceptions and preferences, seventy students, who were enrolled in the general foundation program at Sohar University in the Sultanate of Oman, were interviewed via focus groups. The study also analyzed students' written work to understand and interpret the instructor's feedback practices and how students perceive that. The findings indicated that students valued the utilization of TMWCF and considered it to play a vital role in improving their writing particularly when provided with clarity and systematic structure. They viewed TMWCF as instrumental in enhancing both their writing proficiency and motivational engagement. Additionally, the students preferred indirect strategies represented in coded annotations, textual highlighting and summative comments. Grammar corrections were highly preferred by the students in comparison to other language aspects, reflecting their concerns about the linguistic accuracy of their writings. The findings of the study call for further technology-supported instruction particularly in English as a second language settings and recommends experimenting the role of emerging technologies in enhancing students' language.

INTRODUCTION

Higher education has witnessed significant shifts due to technological advancement. Foundation programs in higher education institutions accommodate large numbers of students annually. These programs offer students the essential basic skills in language, information technology and mathematics, enabling them to better understand and perform in their credit courses. Language support offered to the students aims to optimize students' learning in listening, speaking, reading and writing. Students' language development takes steady steps in all language skills except in writing, which calls for additional support from the teacher. As technology integration has proved its successful role in improving learning, incorporating technology in providing students with corrective feedback constitutes a potential approach to enhance writing skill.

Literature Review

Technology Integration in English Language Classrooms

The rapid development of technology has affected not only areas of business and economy, but also the field of education in general (Barreto, 2018; Rintaningrum, 2019) and English language teaching and learning in particular (Gunuç & Babacan, 2017). The term “technology integration” refers to the use of digital instruments such as computers, programs, the Internet, projectors and printers in both formal and informal learning contexts (Ali et al., 2023). Some other researchers like Gupta and Goel (2024) note that technology integration in education extends beyond teaching fundamental computer skills and software packages in a distinct computer course to the effective technology integration across the curriculum in ways proven in studies to promote and increase meaningful learning. Gupta and Goel also emphasize that technology integration should specifically support four essential learning components: active engagement, group participation, frequent contact and feedback, and access to real-world experts.

Brackett (2024) states that technology integration, along with ongoing technological progress and changes, is one of the most essential educational innovations. Much research exploring the effects of various technologies in education has found that they improve learning and achievement when combined with effective pedagogical methods. Similarly, technological integration in educational settings has become an effective way for key stakeholders, i.e. curriculum advisers, principals, instructors, students, and parents to support learning in line with international educational standards. Technology-based activities give students appropriate materials, and immediate feedback (Genclter, 2015; Tomlison, 2009). Similarly, technology-based language activities foster cooperative and collaborative learning in the classroom (Harmer, 2007). Some researchers, for example, Clements and Sarama (2003), stated that applying appropriate technological tools is highly beneficial for students because technology offers unlimited resources to language students (Bull & Ma, 2001), where the role of the teachers is to encourage students to find suitable activities by using computer technology to successfully improve the process of language learning (Genclter, 2015; Harmer, 2007). As a result, incorporating technology into the teaching and learning process can foster a conducive learning environment for students.

The Role of Technology in Enhancing English Writing Skills

The writing process has been revolutionized by new technology, as highlighted by Musoyeva and Shavkatova (2025), as it has changed learning and teaching methods. In writing education, various factors motivated the use of digital technology in academic writing. The primary focus is on students, their learning processes, delivery methods, and technological advancement. Furthermore, digital technology has the potential to improve students’ creative writing abilities. Using technology can improve students’ motivation and writing skills. Students can use technology to enhance their writing abilities by elevating their creativity, arranging their thoughts, and correcting grammatical and spelling errors. Technology programs, platforms, and websites have been shown to improve language, grammar, and writing skills significantly.

The impact of technology on academic writing is substantial. Many research studies provide evidence for the significant effect of the various technological tools, Apps and programs on diverse aspects of students writing. For instance, technologies have a substantial impact on academic writing by improving speed, clarity, and structure (Musoyeva & Shavkatova, 2025; Ramadhan et al., 2024) among many other studies. Writing instruction which is powered by technology also helps to advance the writing process, increase linguistic accuracy, and organize ideas. Moreover, integrating technology into academic writing has been shown to improve students’ writing skills across various educational levels. They assist students in producing more structured, and academically appropriate writing (Al Maqbali et al., 2026). These technologies not only help build writing skills but also increase educational accessibility, providing more opportunities for students from diverse backgrounds to improve their abilities.

Direct vs. Indirect Feedback

Direct feedback (DF) provides learners with sufficient information to remedy complex language errors after receiving the correct form (Guo, 2023). Written corrective direct feedback increases students’ grammatical awareness in a short term and produces higher quality writing (Mafulah & Basthomi, 2022). Additionally, DF equips learners with sufficient knowledge to rectify complicated language problems after getting the proper form (Guo, 2023). However, as noted by Hutchison (2020), although this type of feedback offers insights on students’ flawed written work, it does not encourage self-evaluation of their performance. In this kind of feedback, only the instructor is responsible for detection and correction.

Indirect feedback informs students that they have made errors, but the teacher does not provide the correct form directly. Teachers can accomplish this by emphasizing the error in other suitable ways (Guo, 2023). Written corrective direct feedback handles language issues without supplying the appropriate form, serves as practical, motivating and enlightening feedback and helps students improve their writing skills (Budiana & Mahmud, 2020). Moreover, Budiana and Mahmud (2020) state that indirect Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) is a sort of feedback that addresses language problems without providing the correct target form. Teachers in this sort of feedback serve as facilitators, providing hints to students as they work on their own texts.

Empirical Evidence of Technology Integration and Written Corrective Feedback

Sauro (2009) investigated the impact of two types of computer-mediated corrective feedback on the development of adult learners' L2: (1) corrective feedback that reformulates the error in the form of recasts and (2) corrective feedback that provides the learner with metalinguistic information about the nature of the error. Adult English learners at the high intermediate and advanced levels ($n=23$) from an unbroken class at a Swedish university were randomly allocated to one of three conditions (two feedback conditions and one control) and matched with English native speakers. The learners got focused correction feedback on the absence of zero articles with abstract noncount nouns during task-based engagement through text-chat (e.g., employment, global warming, culture). Learning outcomes were assessed using computer-delivered pre-tests, post-tests, and delayed post-tests of knowledge (acceptability judgements). Although the metalinguistic group exhibited considerable initial increases compared to the control condition, the results demonstrated no significant benefit for either feedback style in terms of immediate or sustained advances in target form knowledge.

Shahab and Saeed (2024) investigated lecturers' perspectives and experiences in providing direct and indirect written corrective feedback. To this end, seven Kurdish EFL lecturers participated in a semi-structured interview that were later analyzed thematically using the Braun and Clarke's (2006) model. The findings revealed that the lecturers encountered some challenges including "time constraints, students' lack of comprehension, different learning styles, paper space limitations, difficulty balancing quality and quantity, and ease of understanding" (p. 1).

Sharom and Kew (2021) designed a conceptual framework for a flipped classroom in teaching English writing to primary students, with the aim of improving students' writing performance and motivation, and to examine the correlation between these outcomes. This study employed a mixed-methods design with three instruments: a writing test, a questionnaire, and an interview. The population consisted of ESL primary students, and the sample included (64) students. The findings highlighted the contributing role of flipped classroom to improve students' writing performance and motivation.

Zhang et al. (2021), using both quantitative and qualitative methods, looked into learners' preferences for four forms of written corrective feedback (WCF) on grammatical, lexical, orthographic, and pragmatic mistakes, which are frequently addressed in the literature. It particularly looked into whether two learner factors, namely foreign language enjoyment (FLE) and skill level, affected such preferences. The advantages of selective vs. comprehensive WCF were also investigated. The survey included 117 university students studying English as a foreign language in Thailand. Regardless of their competence or FLE level, learners prefer more explicit forms of WCF (i.e., metalinguistic explanation and overt correction) for most mistake types, according to questionnaire data. Less explicit WCF such as underlining and error code were considered beneficial to some extent by high proficiency level learners, but not by low proficiency level learners. The two FLE groups yielded similar findings. Furthermore, the FLE level seems to play a significant role in determining the extent of WCF. The key elements leading to diversity in learners' preferences were linguistic aspects of learners' first language, existing knowledge of the target language, emotional sentiments, and the role of the instructor, according to the findings of follow-up interviews.

Al Maqbali and Mohin (2022) explored the beliefs of Sohar University General Foundation English teachers about EFL writing and Technology-Mediated Written Corrective Feedback TMWCF and examined how teachers practice TMWCF in the writing classroom. Seven writing teachers took part in this qualitative study. This study used semi-structured interviews with instructors to collect data. Moreover, the population consisted of teachers at Sohar University, and the sample included (7) teachers. The study found that teachers' attitudes and behaviors were both consistent and inconsistent. Teachers' thoughts on error detection and repair mirrored their actions. However, the teachers' attitudes toward redrafting, feedback explicitness, feedback volume, feedback source, and feedback focus were not consistent with their actions.

Li et al. (2025) examined the complex relationship between technology-integrated teaching, students' writing achievements, and their perspectives on such teaching and investigated how technology-integrated teaching methods affect students' writing achievement. Also, they explored the aspects of the technology-integrated teaching method that led students to form specific perspectives, and these perspectives, in turn, affect the further integration of technology in teaching. This study employed an experimental design, and data were collected through pre- and post-tests of writing achievement and a series of student surveys to assess their perspectives on technology integration. The population consisted of two classes of 12-year-old students with low academic achievement, and the sample included fifty students. The study reported the outperformance of the experimental group over the control group underscoring the effectiveness of the technology-integrated teaching method that positively affected students' writing achievement compared to traditional methods.

Rkiki et al. (2025) identified the role of technology-enhanced tools in providing written corrective feedback (WCF), particularly automatic writing evaluation systems (AWES) such as Grammarly, which aligns with the principles of direct and indirect WCF. These tools provide immediate, personalized feedback on grammar, vocabulary, style, and sentence structure. Additionally, they reduce teachers' workload by automating lower-level error detection, allowing instructors to focus on higher-order skills. Nevertheless, this should be done with caution

because of the chances of excessive dependence of the students on automated feedback, which could have adverse effects on independent editing skills and critical language awareness. Moreover, AWES feedback is usually less context-sensitive and personally involved than the traditional teacher-led methods.

In a recent study, Al Maqbali et al. (2026) examined the impact of using Copilot AI to provide corrective feedback on the quality of written work of learners of English as a foreign language. The study employed a quasi-experimental design involving 70 Omani intermediate English language learners. Half of the students, 35, were assigned to a control group that received corrective feedback from the teacher and the other half functioned as an experimental group that received corrective feedback using Copilot AI coupled with additional follow-up feedback from the teacher. In both groups, students' writing production were analyzed for task achievement, organization, grammar and lexicon. The findings indicated that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group in the overall development of the writing skill. These findings underscore the effective role of corrective feedback powered by technology over teachers-only feedback.

All in all, acquiring writing skills is essential for career and academic success. The proper use of corrective feedback in teaching English writing to students is believed to promote their use of a positive voice when addressing their writing errors. This is because when corrective feedback is effectively used in teaching English writing to students, it will encourage them to use positive voice in correcting their writing mistakes. However, some researchers, for example, Alsamadani (2010) believes that the learning and teaching of writing skill are considered a challenging, complex and difficult endeavor for English as a second language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. Providing feedback to English language learners can be considered an important practice in contributing to the development of writing skills in EFL learners. Even though the aspect of giving feedback to students may have received a great deal of attention in many educational systems, some recommendations of previous studies in the Omani context call for a deeper understanding of giving feedback in the writing classrooms in different Omani institutions (Al-Bakri, 2015). Therefore, empirical evidence would be a valued contribution to the body of research on EFL in Oman in particular and EFL in general. Hopefully, this study can be a base for those researchers who want to examine TMWCF in Oman in the future. Thus, the current research aims to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What are GFP students' perceptions of Technology-Mediated Written Corrective Feedback (TMWCF) in EFL writing classes?

RQ2: How do students interpret the purpose, clarity, and usefulness of TMWCF?

RQ3: What types of feedback do students prefer, and why?

RQ4: How do students perceive the role of TMWCF in improving their writing skills and motivation?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopts an exploratory qualitative approach to examine General Foundation Programme (GFP) students' perceptions of Technology-Mediated Written Corrective Feedback (TMWCF) in Sohar University in the Sultanate of Oman. Exploratory research "involves a search for clues to reveal what happened or is currently taking place" (Lösch et al., 2023, p. 53). The participating students are in their foundation year and they study English as a foreign language. The research data were collected from seventy students via focus groups and student text analysis, aiming to understand their perceived preferences, experiences, and interpretations of teachers' feedback practices.

Context of the Study

Sohar University is utilizing its E-learning system, and its students are learning to use a database management system called Sohar University Learning Management System (SULMS). SULMS is considered the platform of Sohar University. SULMS was not enough to cover all the teachers' and students' teaching and learning needs. Therefore, several programs have been applied to facilitate teaching and develop learners' performance throughout their studies such as *My English Lab* and *Showbie*.

My English Lab is an online tool that provides many activities based on students' textbooks. *My English Lab* gives extra support to the learners when there are not in the classroom. As students complete their assignments, they receive extra tips and hints to support and encourage their learning. *Showbie* is an App utilized by teachers to collect, assign, and review learners' work. *Showbie* keeps learners' work organized according to assignments and classes. At a glance, learners can see their upcoming assignments and due dates so they can prioritize their work. Since this study focuses on writing skills, *Showbie* is the tool that is often used in the writing classroom. Sohar University continues to encourage its staff and students to apply such tools in their classrooms

to develop learning and teaching at the university. Yet, many teachers at Sohar University are not aware of how to utilize these tools with their students.

Students enrolled in the GFP at Sohar University represent a varied group of recent high school graduates from all over the Sultanate of Oman. For admission to the GFP, candidates must hold an Omani secondary school diploma and successfully pass a placement test that assesses their proficiency in English across critical areas such as writing, reading, vocabulary, and grammar. The eligibility for entering the programme is based on placement scores and the student's overall results from secondary school. At the GFP, the writing syllabus aims to enhance students' academic writing skills and thus it is organized into three progressive levels: elementary, pre-intermediate, and intermediate. See table 1 that illustrates the nature of each level.

Table 1. The levels of the writing syllabus at the GFP

Level	Emphasis
Elementary	Constructing sentences
Pre-intermediate	Writing well-planned paragraphs about familiar topics
Intermediate	Writing paragraphs and essays

Assessment in the GFP includes regular quizzes and comprehensive final exams. Although traditional paper-based assessments were the norm, online evaluations were introduced in 2020. The programme coordinator oversees the final examinations, which may involve delegating test development to individual instructors or suggesting a standardized exam to be used across all sections. Typically, at the intermediate level, students must select one of two essay prompts and write a composition of around 250 words, demonstrating their capability to utilize the writing skills learned throughout the programme.

Data Collection

Students' Focus Group Discussions

Qualitative research is an investigation that typically involves interviews or discussions, which generate non-numeric results (Akyıldız & Ahmed, 2021). Two groups of students, five males and five females, participated in a focus group interview using Arabic, the students' native language, to enable the students to express their ideas easily. Focus groups are a type of interview that provide a more authentic environment where the participants tend to talk about an issue and thus might provoke some discussions (Akyıldız & Ahmed, 2021). Collecting research data via focus group discussions is preferred over individual interviews when there is a limited opportunity for data collection (Akyıldız & Ahmed, 2021). The entire conversations were filmed using a cell phone. The focus group discussions took place in the students' classes, after their regular lectures. The students' consent was obtained before the focus group discussion, and they were assured that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. Their names and the names of their teachers would likewise not be included. The focus group discussions included 17 questions, see Appendix 1.

Analyzing Students' Writing

To guarantee a representative and unbiased sample, writing portfolios from level three (intermediate) GFP students were collected from seven participating instructors, each one of them contributed ten portfolios, choosing students from three achievement levels: high achievers, average performers, and low-achievers. This stratified sampling method was designed to capture the variety of student writing skills within the program. Students' writing errors may vary across the three levels and thus feedback provided to them will vary accordingly. The data analysis process integrated both inductive and deductive approaches to examine issues related to Technology-Mediated Written Corrective Feedback (TMWCF). Deductive analysis entails the generation of analytical themes from the research problem and emerging key assumptions of what the data may involve (Bihu, 2024). Inductive analysis refers to approaches that primarily use detailed readings of raw data to derive concepts, themes, or a model through interpretations made from the raw data by a researcher (Thomas, 2006). Inductive coding was used to identify emerging themes, while deductive analysis helped verify existing codes using raw data. The researchers engaged in a nonlinear process of organizing, coding, and interpreting data, and began analysis in conjunction with data collection to deal with volume and improve objective focus.

Using the six-stage thematic analysis framework developed by Broun and Clark (2006), see Figure 1, the researchers systematically identified the data, created initial codes, searched for topics, reviewed and refined those topics, defined and named them, and finally produced a detailed report. This approach has enabled a comprehensive understanding of students' written responses' and the nature of teacher feedback, providing insights into how learners interact with TMWCF across different proficiency levels.

Six-stage data collection and analysis	Braun and Clarke (2006) Recursive phases
1. Collect the data	Refer to all the data collected as the data corpus.
2. Engage with the data	Become familiar with the data by reading and re-reading transcripts, listening to audio-recordings and noting any initial observations.
3. Code the extracts from the data	Generate initial codes and labels to represent important features of the data relevant to the research questions.
4. Generate the code categories from the codes	Identify ideas and concepts that inform the semantic content of the data.
5. Conceptualise the themes from the categorised coded extracts	Search for themes as coherent and meaningful patterns in the data and define the nature of each theme in relation to existing literature.
6. Contextualise and represent the findings	Weave together the analytic narrative and vivid data extracts to inform the findings.

Figure 1. Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase thematic analysis framework

Data Analysis of Students' Responses

The researchers used the thematic analysis approach to examine student interview data, following the six-stage recursive model of Broun and Clark (2006). Scripts were manually coded and reviewed frequently to identify patterns and meaningful themes. Initial interviews focused on students' motivations, expectations, attitudes, and strategies for responding to feedback, while follow-up interviews at the end of the semester explored changes in these areas. External factors such as grading policy and availability of TMWCF, and internal factors including learner attitudes, motivation, and feedback coping techniques were analysed. Symbols were organized into categories using visual tools, and themes were improved through iterative evaluation. This process enabled the researchers to construct coherent profiles (Seidman, 2006) that captured students' evolving perceptions and interactions with TMWCF throughout the semester.

Ensuring Trustworthiness

To enhance the trustworthiness of this qualitative study, the researchers employed multiple strategies aligned with Lincoln and Guba's (1985) four criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility was addressed through triangulation, using diverse data sources such as students' focus groups discussions, and analyzing students writing. Also, achieving credibility can be via "the longer the constructivist stays in the field, the more the pluralistic perspective will be heard from the participants" (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 128). In the present study, the research investigator spent an entire semester (15 weeks) in the GFP to gather the research data. Dependability in qualitative research "involves an examination of the context and the procedures employed to obtain the data" (Richards, 2020, p. 159). In the present study, dependability was supported by consistent data collection procedures and transparent documentation of analytical decisions. Transferability is the ability to use or apply study findings in different situations (Richards, 2020) and it was strengthened through purposive sampling and rich, contextual descriptions of the research setting and participants, enabling readers to assess applicability to other contexts. Confirmability, which "depends on making data available to the reader" (Richards, 2020, p. 160) was ensured by acknowledging the researcher's positionality and maintaining reflexivity throughout the study. One of the researchers' prior teaching experiences at Sohar University facilitated prolonged engagement and deeper insight into the institutional context, while care was taken to avoid bias and over-identification with participants. These combined techniques contributed to the overall accuracy and integrity of the research findings.

FINDINGS

This section presents the key findings derived from the thematic analysis of GFP students' perceived preferences towards the implementation of technology-mediated written corrective feedback (TMWCF) in EFL writing classes. The analysis was guided by four central research questions, each addressing a distinct dimension of student engagement with TMWCF: their overall perceptions, interpretations of its purpose and clarity, preferences regarding feedback types and formats, and its perceived impact on writing development and motivation.

Four central themes emerged from the data, reflecting students' (1) emphasis on error correction, (2) preference for grammar-focused feedback, (3) tendency towards indirect feedback formats, and (4) dependance on teacher expertise. These themes are discussed in alignment with the research questions to provide a coherent and systematic account of students' experiences and expectations regarding TMWCF. Samples of students' writings with TMWCF are represented in Figures 1 and 2.

The second reason is that tourists often lack respect for local traditions and culture. Obviously, some tourist refuse to follow local dress standards, and get drunk in public like what happens here in Muscat, I heard a story several years ago about foreign tourists who drink alcohol in public without respect the culture and religion of the country. Additionally, local people in the country can affect tourists believe and think, especially teenagers they may imitate tourists in there dressing, way of talking and bad habits like smoking or drinking alcohol or drug addict which not allow in Oman culture and religion. All that will affect badly in the progress of Oman, Oman will pay money to treat people if they became drug addicts and the production will decrease, subsequently, the income will decrease, so that makes me not agree with that statement.

Commented [aa25]: No need for this word
Commented [aa26]: Begin a new sentence
Commented [aa27]: Grammar mistake
Commented [aa28]: Grammar mistake

Commented [aa29]: too long sentence. Check what you mean by this sentence.
Commented [aa30]: You need a linking word here.
Commented [aa31]: Grammar mistake
Commented [aa32]: This sentence doesn't belong here. It belongs to Body 1

The topic sentence, the supporting sentences and the concluding sentence seem fine.
In general, body paragraph 2 seems ok despite the mistakes I have mentioned. It also seems too long. Could you make it shorter? Sentence before the last is irrelevant to this paragraph.

To sum up, tourism can't help in the progress of Oman. It cause environmental damage and affect badly in culture of Oman. finally, I want to say that tourism can be a source of problems especially if it is not managed well it can be a cause of regression for countries.

Commented [aa33]: punctuation
Commented [aa34]: Grammar mistake

Your introduction looks great

words count=479 words(Too many), you need to write 200 words)

Figure 1. Sample 1 of students' writing with TMWCF

development
 Today some people think that tourism can help in advance of Oman. A big reason for this thinking is tourism brings a lot of advantages to the country, for instance, it brings in money, it provides jobs and finally, it promotes international connections which can bring more business and cultural collaborations in the long term. personally, I don't agree with them and I think that tourism will lead to the regression of Oman for many reasons related to environment and culture.

To start with I don't agree that tourism can help in the progress of Oman because tourism can often cause environmental damage like pollution, forest fires, and the loss of natural habitats. To make it more clear, I will give you a real example. every year millions of tourist visit Salalah, and they did not respect the environment they throw the rubbish in the land which lead to the death of animals like camel and cattle. Furthermore, the view of the beautiful green mountain became hirable, the plastic bag everywhere on the branches of trees. you can't imagine how bad I fell when I saw this picture. Besides, some tourist are setting fire for barbecue and they dose not extinguishes the fire after they finish, and other smoke and throw the cigarette on the grass which lead to forest fires. Also, I can forget those tourists how crazily drive their car and damage the beautiful green land and kill the grass. So all that will make the government pay a lot of money to solve this environmental problem witch caused by the tourist and that may cause decrees in the income of Oman.

Commented [aa1]: Your introduction looks great
Commented [aa2]: No forest in Oman!
Commented [aa3]: Grammar mistake!
Commented [aa4]: punctuation
Commented [aa5]: Grammar mistake!
Commented [aa6]: Grammar mistake!
Commented [aa7]: Start a new sentence!
Commented [aa8]: Grammar mistake!
Commented [aa9]: Should be plural!
Commented [aa10]: Grammar mistake!
Commented [aa11]: spelling!
Commented [aa12]: start a new sentence
Commented [aa13]: punctuation
Commented [aa14]: Grammar
Commented [aa15]: Grammar
Commented [aa16]: Grammar
Commented [aa17]: Grammar
Commented [aa18]: Start a new sentence
Commented [aa19]: Grammar
Commented [aa20]: !!!!!!! What do you mean?
Commented [aa21]: spelling
Commented [aa22]: Grammar
Commented [aa23]: spelling

The topic sentence, the supporting sentences and the concluding sentence seem fine.
In general, body paragraph 1 seems ok despite the mistakes I have mentioned. It also seems too long. Could you make it shorter?

Commented [aa24]: In general, body paragraph 1 seems ok despite the mistakes I have mentioned. It also seems too long. Could make shorter?

Figure 2. Sample 2 of students' writing with TMWCF

RQ1: What are GFP students' perceptions of Technology-Mediated Written Corrective Feedback (TMWCF) in EFL writing classes?

It appears that the students of the General Foundation Program (GFP) at Sohar University demonstrated positive and consistent perceptions of Technology-Mediated Corrective Written Feedback (TMWCF), which they considered a pivotal component in developing their writing skills. All participants (100%) stressed the importance of receiving feedback to identify, understand and correct errors, with a special focus on grammatical accuracy. One participant noted that “technology-mediated feedback is particularly useful in correcting grammar and vocabulary”. Another student stressed a similar idea when he said, “the digital feedback I received from the teacher helped me improve my English language especially grammar and how to write correct sentences”. These statements reflect a general consensus among students about the essential role that digital feedback plays in improving linguistic form. In addition to that, some students expressed their satisfaction and comfort dealing with corrective feedback that the teacher gave them via technology-supported media. One of the students explained that she “liked the feedback received from the teacher with the support of technology because it is detailed and clear”.

RQ2: How do students interpret the purpose, clarity, and usefulness of TMWCF?

Students interpreted technology-mediated corrective written feedback as a meaningful practice with high pedagogical value, especially when presented in a clear, organized, and systematic manner. They emphasized that the effectiveness of feedback is closely related to how clearly it identifies weaknesses and guides them towards ways to improve. Their preferred formulas included indirect feedback strategies, such as the use of corrective symbols, highlighted and underlined texts, along with concluding comments at the end of writing assignments. One of the participants explained that the “highlights and codes helped me see my weak points” while another student emphasized his happiness with the strategy of using “meaningful codes” as they “draw the attention to what to be corrected exactly”.

All participants (100%) expressed their preference for indirect feedback compared to direct correction, justifying this by its ability to encourage critical thinking and effective engagement in the review process rather than simply receiving corrections passively. One student explained that his favorite formula is “comments using symbols, with shading and underlining, because of their role in enhancing deep interaction with the text during review”. 71% of the participants also indicated the need to comprehensively identify all errors, stressing that partial feedback may lead to the recurrence of errors that have not been addressed. In this regard, one of the participants indicated that he “wants the comments to be lengthy to help in improving my writing and review skills”. This trend highlights students’ need for clarity, comprehensiveness, and educational transparency in feedback practices.

RQ3: What types of feedback do students prefer, and why?

Students showed clear preferences regarding both the focus and format of feedback. At the concentration level, the vast majority preferred to correct grammatical errors, reflecting a common trend among EFL learners to prioritize linguistic accuracy as an indicator of writing quality. One of the participants mentioned “I like to see grammatical errors being highlighted”. Similarly, another student expressed her preference of the kind of corrective written feedback by saying “My teacher always gives me comments about my spelling and verb tenses. That’s good for my language”. Students showed great concerns in relation to the depth of the feedback received. One participant stated that he preferred “a simple explanation of the rules in the sentence”, while another participant explained her desire for “the teacher to explain the rules in a simplified way”. These responses indicate that students are not just looking for corrections, but for a clear and understandable explanation that will help them learn.

Although the focus on grammar dominated, a lower group showed interest in feedback related to vocabulary choice and organization of ideas, indicating a growing awareness of the higher aspects of writing. In terms of format, students clearly preferred indirect feedback mechanisms, such as corrective symbols, in-text comments, and concluding remarks. This preference was based on their belief that these methods promote independent learning, requiring them to actively participate in analyzing errors, searching for solutions, and applying feedback during the review process.

RQ4: How do students perceive the role of TMWCF in improving their writing skills and motivation?

Students viewed technology-mediated corrective written feedback as an effective tool in improving their writing proficiency and enhancing their motivation to learn. They described feedback as a “roadmap” that clarifies expectations, identifies areas for improvement, and reduces ambiguity associated with the writing process. One of the students mentioned that digital feedback “can be very motivating and interesting. When asked why, the student explained that she feels “encouraged to go through the comments, read them at her own convenient time and discuss them with the teacher later”. They also noted that digital feedback, in particular, seems easier and less threatening, which encourages them to interact with it more positively and consistently.

Although some students appreciated peer feedback, particularly regarding the exchange of ideas, the majority expressed concerns about its accuracy and reliability. As a result, most participants showed a clear preference for teacher feedback. When asked whether they prefer feedback from their colleagues or their teachers, one student explained that “teachers are more aware and have a beautiful way of conveying information”, while another student indicated that “teachers have more experience and can understand students better”. A third student stated that “I

prefer my teacher to give me feedback because she has more knowledge”. In doing so, teachers were seen as reliable and highly credible sources of feedback.

These findings reflect pedagogical and cultural patterns common in EFL teaching contexts, where the teacher is often viewed as the main focus of the learning process. The results indicate that students’ motivation and self-confidence are closely linked to the credibility of the feedback source, confirming the pivotal role of teacher-mediated feedback in enhancing interaction and developing writing skills.

DISCUSSION

This study explored students’ perceptions and experiences with teacher-mediated corrective written feedback (TMWCF) in the Foundation Program at Sohar University, with a particular focus on the role of technology, preferred sources and methods of feedback, and the extent of compatibility between student expectations and teachers’ practices. The results revealed a number of key themes that have important implications for educational practices, institutional policies, and future research.

First, students consistently emphasized the importance of technology-enabled feedback tools, particularly the *Showbie* platform, which they saw as providing instant, accurate, and accessible feedback on grammar, vocabulary, and writing style. This finding is consistent with the findings of Al-Saleh (2018), who noted the positive effects of using *Showbie* in improving multiple aspects of writing, including language use, vocabulary, and linguistic mechanics. Students pointed out that one of the most prominent advantages of digital feedback is that it can be referred to later for review and reflection. For instance, one of the student expressed his request for the feedback to “be lengthy to help in improving my writing and review skills”. This argument is supported by Ryan et al. (2019), who explained that online feedback enhances ease of access and continuity of interaction with feedback content. Students also appreciated the technology not only for its efficiency, but also for its ability to reduce the negative emotional impact of criticism, as it allows them to review notes at a time that suits them. This preference is consistent with the results of Pham (2022), which showed that students prefer computerized feedback over face-to-face feedback because it is considered less threatening. Similarly, Aydin (2018) noted that virtual environments are often viewed as more secure and supportive. In general, technology has been an effective tool in clarifying meaning, improving vocabulary selection, and enhancing linguistic accuracy.

Second, students expressed clear preferences regarding the methods and sources of feedback. While peer feedback was acknowledged as beneficial for fostering confidence and contextual relevance, the majority of students preferred teacher feedback, which they perceived as more reliable, constructive, and comprehensive. Al-Farsi and Slimi (2025) and Solovey (2024) found that students highly valued teachers’ feedback in comparison to peers’ feedback suggesting that students benefit more from the teachers’ feedback as it is more reliable and comprehensive. Similarly, in a large survey of EFL students, Feng (2025) found that despite the benefits of peer and automated feedback, students still prioritize teachers’ feedback particularly for complex tasks. This all leads to the conclusion that the role of teacher’s feedback is central in writing development. The participants in the present study valued comments that addressed both language and style, rather than feedback limited to positive reinforcement. Importantly, students desired feedback that was explicit, varied, and repeated across different tasks, enabling them to track progress and address recurring weaknesses. In support with this finding, Solovey (2024) underscored that students favored teachers’ and technology-generated feedback to peers commentary as they perceived the former as more actional, explicit and constructivist.

Third, the study underscored the importance of timing and clarity in feedback. Students noted that technology-supported feedback is provided in a timely manner and is closely linked to their written production, enhancing its educational effectiveness. Recent literature supports this trend, indicating that digital feedback is highly effective due to its speed and educational applicability. In this context, the Mahfoodh and Pandian study (2011) showed that students were more satisfied with electronic feedback because it was provided in a timely manner and was more motivating than traditional paper feedback. Students in this study also emphasized the importance of understanding the purpose of feedback, explaining that clearly explaining learning objectives and types of errors helps them identify weaknesses and engage in meaningful learning dialogue with teachers. Likewise, Lee and Yoon (2020) noted that students prefer explicit feedback that explains error types and learning objectives rather than just identifying error locations. The immediacy that characterizes electronic feedback has enhanced communication, allowing students to request clarification outside of class time, and has contributed to the sustainability of interaction, which has also been confirmed by Zhang et al. (2021).

Finally, the study contributes to knowledge by situating TMWCF within the Omani higher education context, offering insights into how cultural, institutional, and technological factors shape feedback practices. By integrating classroom observation, text analysis, and student focus groups, the research provides a nuanced understanding of both teacher beliefs and student experiences. It demonstrates that effective feedback requires not only pedagogical skill but also sensitivity to learner needs, technological integration, and reflective practice on the part of educators.

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The present study examined students' preferences and views towards the integration of technology-mediated written corrective feedback. The study data were collected via analyzing students' writing assignments, the feedback given to them by the teachers and interviewing the students via focus groups discussions. The findings uncovered students' educational gains from the TMWCF and their preferences for indirect feedback that emphasizes grammar accuracy. Research should examine the influence of TMWCF on students' writing when they are requested to re-write an essay and when they do not, so that differences between producing a second draft of an essay as opposed to only the first draft can be measured. As a result, the researcher can distinguish between student faults that need to be rectified and are produced due to a lack of understanding and a lack of attention, which are likely to disappear in the second draft of the paper.

REFERENCES

- Akyıldız, S. T., & Ahmed, K. H. (2021). An overview of qualitative research and focus group discussion. *International Journal of Academic Research in Education*, 7(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.17985/ijare.866762>
- Al-Bakri, S. (2015) Written corrective feedback: Teachers' beliefs, practices and challenges in an Omani context. *Arab Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 1, No. 1, September, 2015, 44-73.
- Al-Farsi, S., & Slimi, Z. (2025). Impact of Teacher and Peer Feedback on University Students' Spelling and Punctuation. *European Journal of English Language Studies*, 5(2), 113-128. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ejels.5.2.113>
- Ali, Z., Younis, S., Ahmad, N., Saba, F., & Ullah, N. (2023). Teachers' perspective of technology integration effects on students learning at university level. *Gradiva*, 62(5), 29-38. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5165713>
- Al Saleh, N. A. (2018). The impact of positive and corrective feedback via Showbie on Saudi students' English writing. *Arab World English Journal: Thesis Collection*, 1-121. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/th.215>
- Aydın, S. (2018). Technology and foreign language anxiety: Implications for practice and future research. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(2), 193-211.
- Al Maqbali, A. M. K., & Mohin, M. (2022). Technology-mediated written corrective feedback: EFL teachers' beliefs and their practices. *IJASOS-International E-journal of Advances in Social Sciences*, 8(22), 91-106.
- Al Maqbali, A., Al-Hanshi, S., Al Ghaithi, A., & Behforouz, B. (2026). Reimagining writing feedback: The effect of Copilot artificial intelligence (AI) on English foreign language (EFL) students' written performance. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 25(1), 94-110. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.25.1.5>
- Barreto, A. M. R. (2018). Motivating English language use by using the benefits of technology. *Education and Learning Research Journal*, 16(1), 117-140. <https://doi.org/10.26817/16925777.428>
- Bihu, R. (2024). Qualitative data analysis: Novelty in deductive and inductive coding. *Authorea Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.31124/advance.24143088.v2>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Budiana, H. & Mahmud, M. (2020). Indirect written corrective feedback (WCF) in teaching writing. *Academic Journal PERSPECTIVE: Language, Education and Literature*, 8(1), 60-71. <https://dx.doi.org/10.33603/perspective.v8i1.3398>
- Brackett, S. (2024). *Examining Barriers to Technology Integration Practices of K-12 Teachers* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Walden University.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into practice*, 39(3), 124-130. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2
- Feng, Y. (2025). Research on EFL Learners' Engagement with Feedback in English Writing. *Frontiers in Educational Research*, 8(4). <https://doi.org/10.25236/FER.2025.080419>
- Gunuç, S., & Babacan, N. (2017). Technology integration in English language, 5, 349-358. <https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP1702349G>
- Guo, T. (2023). The impact of written corrective feedback on enhancing second language writing skills: A comprehensive review. *International Journal of Education and Humanities (IJEH)*, 3(3), 280-287. [https://doi.org/10.58557/\(ijeh\).v3i3.132](https://doi.org/10.58557/(ijeh).v3i3.132)
- Gupta, K. & Goel, S. (2024). Integration of technology into education and its effects on student learning. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)*, 6(2), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i02.15586>

- Li, Y., Songsiangchai, S., & Ye, L. (2025). The effects of technology - integrated course to enhance writing achievement of grade 6 students in primary school at Guangdong. *World Journal of Education*, 15(2), 28-40. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v15n2p28>
- Lösch, S., Rambo, C. A., & de Lima Ferreira, J. (2023). *Exploratory research in the qualitative approach in education*. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação*, 18.
- Lee, J. W., & Yoon, K. O. (2020). Effects of Written Corrective Feedback on the Use of the English Indefinite Article in EFL Learners' Writing. *English Teaching*, 75(2), 21-40. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.75.2.202006.21>
- Lincoln, Y. S. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry* (Vol. 75). sage.
- Mahfoodh, O., & Pandian, A. (2011). A qualitative case study of EFL students' affective reactions to and perceptions of their teachers' written feedback. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p14>
- Musoyeva, A. & Shavkatova, M. (2025). The use of technology in enhancing students' writing skills. *International Scientific and Practical Conference "Smart Technologies and Innovative Approaches in Research: Building a Digital Future"*, 528-532. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14918519>
- Pham, H. T. P. (2022). Computer-mediated and face-to-face peer feedback: Student feedback and revision in EFL writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(9), 2112-2147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1868530>
- Ramadhan, A., Rahim, A., Darmanto, D., & Paris, A. (2024). Enhancing academic writing through digital tools: A systematic review. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 4(4), 758-770. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v4i4.2342>
- Rkiki, A., Nadif, B., Sakale, S., & Bidari, S. (2025). Integrating corrective feedback in EFL classrooms. *The Journal of Quality in Education (JoQIE)*, 15(25), 143-168. <https://doi.org/10.37870/joqie.v15i25.472>
- Rintaningrum, R. (2019). What can we learn from ICT users in English language teaching and learning. *Ineltal*, 187-193. <http://ineltal.um.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/27-Ratna-Rintaningrum-What-Can-We-Learn-from-ICT-Users-in-English-Language-Teaching-and-Learning-Lecturers%E2%80%99-Views.pdf>
- Richards, L. (2020). Handling qualitative data: A practical guide. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781036232429>
- Ryan, T., Henderson, M., & Phillips, M. (2019). Feedback modes matter: Comparing student perceptions of digital and non-digital feedback modes in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(3), 1507-1523. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12749>
- Sauro, S. (2009). Computer-mediated corrective feedback and the development of L2 grammar. *Language Learning & Technology*, 13(1), 96-120. <https://doi.org/10.64152/10125/44170>
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. Teachers College press.
- Shahab, M. L., & Saeed, K. M. (2024). Direct and indirect written corrective feedback: Lecturers' perspectives. *The Qualitative Report*, 29(10), 2582-2603. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2024.7147>
- Sharom, K. & Kew, S. (2021). A conceptual framework on technology integration in English writing flipped classroom. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/1051/1/012010>
- Solovey, Z.O. (2024). Comparing peer, ChatGPT, and teacher corrective feedback in EFL writing: Students' perceptions and preferences. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, 6(3), 1482-1482. <https://doi.org/10.29140/ttl.v6n3.1482>
- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American journal of evaluation*, 27(2), 237-246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748>
- Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., & Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL students' preferences for written corrective feedback: Do error types, language proficiency, and foreign language enjoyment matter? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 660564. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660564>

Appendix 1

Focus Group Questions

1. Do you like to receive feedback through technology on your writing from your teacher? Why? Why not?
2. Which elements in your writing do you prefer the teacher feedback to be focused on more (vocabulary, organization of ideas, organization of paragraphs, mechanics)?
3. What's your preferred way in which your teacher can respond to your errors in your writing (providing corrections, commenting, etc)?
4. Do you prefer your teacher to correct all your writing errors or specific types of errors?
5. Do you prefer your classmates' feedback to your teacher's feedback? Why? Why not?
6. Do you prefer to receive feedback using technology? Why? Why not?
7. Does your teacher explain to you the purpose of feedback on your writing? How?
8. Is the feedback received from your teacher on your writing timely?
9. Does your teacher use different types of feedback (direct, indirect, mixed, focused, or unfocused to comment on your writing? Please explain.
10. Does the teacher vary the focus of feedback on your writing (grammar, vocabulary, ideas, organization)? Please explain.
11. Does your teacher give you sufficient feedback on your writing?
12. Is the writing feedback given to you explicit and clear? Please explain.
13. Does your teacher use comments and error codes that are familiar to you? Explain.
14. Do you think the feedback that you received from the teacher is effective? Please explain.
15. Does your teacher ask you to redraft your writing? How often? How many drafts do you usually produce?
16. Do you consult your teacher for an explanation after receiving feedback? Please explain.
17. Have you ever faced any challenges in understanding the teacher's feedback (i.e., not enough clarity and complications)? What do you usually do to overcome them?