

Voices of Chinese private college EFL students: unveiling preferences in written corrective feedback

Mudan Cai^{1,2}, Joseph Ramanair¹

¹Faculty of Education, Language and Communication, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, Kota Samarahan, Malaysia

²English Language School, Anhui International Studies University, Hefei, China

Article Info

Article history:

Received Apr 23, 2025

Revised Jan 1, 2026

Accepted Jan 15, 2026

Keywords:

Chinese EFL students

Preference

Private college

WCF

Writing

ABSTRACT

Despite the growing body of research on the impact of written corrective feedback (WCF) on intermediate and upper-level students in Chinese public universities, limited attention has been paid to the preferences of lower- and intermediate-level English as a foreign language (EFL) students in Chinese private colleges regarding various types of WCF. To address this gap, the current study examined students' experiences with and preferences for WCF. A quantitative survey design was adopted, with data collected from 30 EFL students at a private college in Mainland China using an online self-administered questionnaire. The results showed: i) students' preferences for WCF types were consistent with their feedback experiences; ii) students most commonly received direct feedback focused on content, while spelling gained the least feedback; and iii) students most preferred direct feedback on content and grammar, while indirect feedback on organization and spelling was least favored. The findings suggest that WCF remains valuable for EFL learners and their English as a second language (ESL) counterparts. It is recommended that EFL writing teachers in similar contexts tailor their feedback practices by prioritizing students' preferences, particularly by emphasizing direct feedback on content and grammar, to boost engagement and learning outcomes.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Joseph Ramanair

Faculty of Education, Language and Communication, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak

94300 Kota Samarahan, Sarawak, Malaysia

Email: rjoseph@unimas.my

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing serves a crucial function in improving, broadening, and deepening students' learning experiences by offering opportunities for intellectual and imaginative growth, promoting critical thinking skills, and enriching their overall educational journey [1]. Engaging in intentional practice and receiving constructive feedback can assist students in cultivating executive control and attaining higher levels of writing proficiency, so enhancing their academic performance [2], [3]. The value of written corrective feedback (WCF) in improving students' writing accuracy has been a subject of longstanding academic debate. Currently, WCF has been widely proved in its effectiveness in improving students' overall writing quality both in English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a second language (ESL) contexts [4]–[7]. Empirical studies have shown that goal-oriented feedback can significantly contribute to language development, particularly when it is in alignment with students' needs and contexts [8].

In ESL research, there is often an emphasis on the role of WCF in immersive language environments, whereas EFL research tends to focus on the lack of English exposure outside the classroom. In EFL contexts, an overwhelming part of existing studies has examined various aspects of WCF practices in

public universities. Studies indicate that most students prioritize grammatical errors in feedback [9], [10]. However, it was suggested that students prefer feedback to focus on content rather than other aspects such as language, organization, and content [11], [12]. Similarly, some scholars have analyzed students' preferences for types of feedback. It was found that students prefer direct feedback above other types of feedback [9]–[13], yet other studies reflected indirect feedback was the most preferred type by students [14], [15]. Despite these insights, private college students have been largely overlooked, leaving a significant research gap in the literature.

Recent research has begun to narrow this gap by focusing on private educational settings and investigating the variables that determine the effectiveness of WCF. Shintani [16] conducted a case study at a private college in Japan to examine the effect of computer-assisted feedback on students' writing quality. In addition, research has been undertaken to investigate the relationship between students' language proficiency and their engagement in feedback practices [17], [18]. The findings indicate that proficiency levels greatly affect how students process and use WCF. Such studies mark a paradigm shift toward understanding how individual and contextual differences shape the effectiveness of feedback in private institutions.

Additionally, learner preferences represent a significant factor in the delivery of WCF, as they can affect students' engagement with and receptiveness to feedback [19], [20]. Feedback that is congruent with learners' preferences is more likely to be regarded as beneficial and motivating, which in turn can enhance writing performance [21], [22]. This relationship has been investigated in the context of public universities within EFL settings when feedback is administered [23]–[25].

However, the preferences of private college students for various types of feedback and their experiences with WCF are still underexplored. Existing studies have predominantly concentrated on intermediate or advanced EFL learners, frequently in the context of public universities. This focus has resulted in a notable deficiency in knowledge of the experiences and preferences of lower-proficiency students enrolled in private institutions to various types of WCF. Considering the fact that private colleges serve a diverse student population with different educational backgrounds and learning needs, it is essential to examine how these learners interact with feedback and identify which types of WCF facilitate their writing development. Therefore, based on the typology of feedback proposed by Ellis [26], this study aims to address this gap by answering the following two questions, thereby improving the understanding of the value of WCF in a variety of educational contexts.

- RQ1: What WCF types and focus do Chinese private college EFL students receive regarding their past experiences?
- RQ2: What are Chinese private college EFL students' preferences for WCF types and focus?

2. METHOD

This study adopted a quantitative survey design, a method commonly used to gather data on participants' opinions, attitudes, and behaviors through structured, closed-ended items [27]. Questionnaire surveys are the most cost-effective method for collecting data in educational research [28]. Their effectiveness depends on careful design, appropriate use, and thorough validation, making the process of designing and validating research questionnaires crucial for getting reliable data [29]. Therefore, the design of this questionnaire was based on Taherdoost seven-step method [30]: defining information needs, selecting a survey type, determining question types, writing questions, organizing the layout, pre-testing, and finalizing the instrument. To ensure that the questionnaire is consistent with the research objectives of this study, it is essential to gather information regarding students' previous experiences with WCF, as well as their preferences for WCF types, through the formulation of relevant questions.

Next, in light of its benefits related to cost-effectiveness, anonymity, and confidentiality [31], this study chose a web-based self-administered questionnaire. "Wenjuanxing", a popular online survey platform in China, was used for distributing questionnaires. Then, a 5-point Likert scale was used to determine questions types in this study, which ranged from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". The formulation of questions was adapted from previous studies [10]–[12], [32]–[34], ensuring both content relevance and construct validity. In the fifth stage of organization, questions were semantically structured in a logical sequence to facilitate respondents' cognitive processing (from comprehension to retrieval) thus reducing cognitive load and enhancing memory access [35]. Finally, to ensure the reliability and clarity of the instrument, a pilot study was first conducted, serving as a preliminary investigation that informed the larger research project undertaken in the first author's Ph.D. study. The feedback from the pilot study was used to refine the items and structure of the questionnaire before its final administration.

2.1. Participants

The study was conducted with 30 first-year non-English major students (N=30) from Anhui International Studies University, a private college in Mainland China. Typically, a sample size of 15 to 30 respondents is regarded as sufficient for representing the target population [30], and participants in this study were selected through snowball sampling. These students were enrolled in the compulsory English Reading and Writing course, which is part of the college's curriculum for non-English majors. The sample comprised 5 male students (16.67%) and 25 female students (83.33%), with ages ranging from 17 to 21 years. The participants were from various fields, including accounting, finance, and asset appraisal.

All participants had received prior training in writing during their earlier education, given the significant emphasis placed on writing skills in China's state-level selection exams, particularly the National College Entrance Examination (NCEE). The group was characterized by low to intermediate English proficiency, with an average NCEE English score of 92.60 out of 150. The scores ranged from 70 to 131. Table 1 illustrates the demographic and academic characteristics of the 30 participants involved in this study.

Table 1. Demographic and academic characteristics of participants

Demographic variable	Interpretation	N	%
Gender	Male	5	16.67
	Female	25	83.33
	Total	30	100
Years of English learning	4-6 years	6	20
	7-10 years	18	60
	More than 10 years	6	20
	Total	30	100
Feedback experience	Yes	30	100
	No	0	0
	Total	30	100
Age	The oldest	The youngest	Mean
	21	17	19.17
NCEE English score	The highest	The lowest	Mean
	131	70	92.60

2.2. Instrument

A questionnaire using a 5-point Likert scale was employed to gather data from the student population. The questionnaire was made up of 40 items, which were categorized into three parts. Part A collected demographic information from participants, consisting of 10 items. Part B included 26 items designed to explore participants' experiences and preferences regarding WCF types. Part C asked about participants' additional comments on the questionnaire through 4 open-ended questions. In accordance with Albogami [36] and Kerman *et al.* [37], the terms "agreement" and "disagreement" were combined in order to provide a more concise and effective presentation of the findings. Table 2 shows the range employed in describing the Likert scale questionnaire.

Table 2. Scoring range of Likert scale of the survey

Range	Agreement	Level of agreement
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree	Disagreement
1.81-2.60	Disagree	
2.61-3.40	Neither disagree nor agree	Neutral
3.41-4.20	Agree	Agreement
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree	

2.3. Data collection and analysis

The online questionnaire was developed using the "Wenjuanxing" platform and subsequently distributed through a QR code shared within WeChat and QQ groups. Participants were directed to respond to each item based on their personal experiences of WCF, and to complete all questions in one sitting. Before conducting the analysis, the raw responses were evaluated for completeness and examined for response patterns. Demographic variables were coded numerically in Microsoft Excel.

Quantitative data were analyzed in two stages. First, descriptive statistics, including mean, standard deviation, and percentage, were calculated for each item to provide a summary of central tendency and variability. Second, the items were categorized into two overarching groups: feedback experiences and feedback preferences, each covering the subcategories of feedback focus and feedback types. The average scores for the items within the four subcategories were then ranked in descending order to identify the most

and least preferred types of feedback. To ensure internal consistency of the questionnaire, Cronbach's alpha was calculated. The overall Cronbach's alpha for the questionnaire was 0.889, indicating strong internal consistency. The items measuring students' experiences with receiving WCF and their preferences for the focuses and types of teacher WCF had Cronbach's alpha values of 0.815 and 0.864, respectively (feedback focus $\alpha=0.865$ and feedback type $\alpha=0.828$ in feedback experiences; feedback focus $\alpha=0.900$; and feedback type $\alpha=0.798$ in feedback preferences), as shown in Table 3. These values confirm that the questionnaire met the required level of internal consistency, suggesting a high degree of correlation between the items [38].

All quantitative analyses were performed in SPSSAU (Beijing QingSi Technology Co., Ltd.); rank-order tables were exported to Microsoft Excel for presentation. Finally, results were interpreted in light of the study's two research objectives: i) to examine Chinese private college EFL students' experiences of receiving WCF and ii) to identify their preferences for different feedback focus and types.

Table 3. The correlation coefficient of the items of the scale of feedback experiences and preferences using the Cronbach's alpha

Category	Scale	Items	Cronbach's alpha	Total score
Experiences	Feedback focus	5	0.865	0.815
	Feedback type	8	0.828	
Preferences	Feedback focus	5	0.900	0.864
	Feedback type	8	0.798	
Total score				0.889

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Results

3.1.1. The results relate to the first question

To answer the question "what WCF focus and types do Chinese private college EFL students receive regarding their past experiences?", the means and standard deviations were calculated to determine the types including the focuses of WCF among 30 EFL students at a private college in Mainland China. According to Table 4, students evaluated the focus of teacher feedback on different aspects of their writing. Content feedback received the highest mean score ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.82$), followed by grammar ($M=3.80$, $SD=0.85$) and vocabulary ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.79$). Organization and spelling received lower ratings, with mean scores of 3.50 ($SD=0.94$) and 3.37 ($SD=1.00$), respectively. The overall mean score across all categories was 3.65, suggesting a generally positive experience.

Table 4. Experience: feedback focus

Feedback focus	Mean	SD	Rank	Agreement	Neutral	Disagreement	Level of agreement
Feedback focuses on content	3.87	0.82	1	22 (73.33%)	6 (20%)	2 (6.67%)	Agreement
Feedback focuses on grammar	3.80	0.85	2	22 (73.33%)	5 (16.67%)	3 (10%)	Agreement
Feedback focuses on vocabulary	3.70	0.79	3	19 (63.33%)	9 (30%)	2 (6.67%)	Agreement
Feedback focuses on organization	3.50	0.94	4	16 (53.33%)	9 (30%)	5 (16.67%)	Agreement
Feedback focuses on spelling	3.37	1.00	5	15 (50%)	9 (30%)	6 (20%)	Agreement
Total	3.65	0.21					Agreement

Based on the five feedback types (direct, indirect, metalinguistic, focus, and reformulation) as outlined by Ellis [26], Table 5 shows students' reported experiences with the types of teacher feedback. Among the eight types presented, direct feedback received the highest mean score ($M=4.37$, $SD=0.61$), closely followed by reformulation ($M=4.27$, $SD=0.64$). Both types had exceptionally high agreement rates, with 93.33% and 90% of participants affirming their use, respectively, and no reported disagreement. Unfocused and metalinguistic feedback with explanation followed, with mean scores of 3.80 and 3.70, and over 63% of students agreeing with their use. In contrast, focused feedback, indirect feedback with coded correction, and metalinguistic feedback without explanation received moderate to low mean scores, ranging from 3.33 to 2.80. The lowest rating was for indirect feedback without coding, with a mean of 2.57 ($SD=1.17$) and the highest disagreement rate at 60%. This type also had the lowest agreement rate, at 20%.

3.1.2. The results relate to the second question

Table 6 presents data that addresses the second question "what are Chinese private college EFL students' preferences for WCF focus and types?". Students generally preferred feedback on content and grammar, which received the highest mean scores ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.75$) and agreement rates of 70%. Vocabulary ($M=3.77$) and organization and spelling ($M=3.70$ each) followed closely. Although the mean

differences are slight, they indicate a preference for feedback that focuses on meaning-making and language accuracy rather than surface-level elements like spelling. All five categories received high levels of agreement and low levels of disagreement, with overall mean ratings showing a consistent preference ($M=3.77$) across various feedback areas. This indicates a generally positive attitude towards receiving detailed feedback on both global and local aspects of writing.

Table 5. Experience: feedback type

Feedback type	Mean	SD	Rank	Agreement	Neutral	Disagreement	Level of agreement
Direct	4.37	0.61	1	28 (93.33%)	2 (6.67%)	0 (0%)	Agreement
Reformulation	4.27	0.64	2	27 (90%)	3 (10%)	0 (0%)	Agreement
Unfocused	3.80	0.85	3	20 (66.67%)	8 (26.67%)	2 (6.67%)	Agreement
Metalinguistic (with explanation)	3.70	0.92	4	19 (63.33%)	9 (30%)	2 (6.67%)	Agreement
Focused	3.33	0.99	5	13 (43.33%)	10 (33.33%)	7 (23.33%)	Neutral
Indirect (with coded correction)	2.97	1.07	6	9 (30%)	9 (30%)	12 (40%)	Neutral
Metalinguistic	2.80	1.24	7	9 (30%)	8 (26.67%)	13 (43.33%)	Neutral
Indirect	2.57	1.17	8	6 (20%)	6 (20%)	18 (60%)	Disagreement
Total	3.89	0.43					Agreement

Table 6. Preference for feedback focus

Feedback focus	Mean	SD	Rank	Agreement	Neutral	Disagreement	Level of agreement
Feedback focuses on content	3.83	0.75	1	21 (70%)	8 (26.67%)	1 (3.33%)	Agreement
Feedback focuses on grammar	3.83	0.75	1	21 (70%)	8 (26.67%)	1 (3.33%)	Agreement
Feedback focuses on vocabulary	3.77	0.77	2	19 (63.34%)	10 (33.33%)	1 (3.33%)	Agreement
Feedback focuses on organization	3.70	0.79	3	19 (63.34%)	9 (30%)	2 (6.67%)	Agreement
Feedback focuses on spelling	3.70	0.79	3	17 (56.67%)	12 (40%)	1 (3.33%)	Agreement
Total	3.77	0.07					Agreement

Table 7 illustrates the types of feedback students' preference. Rated highest was reformulation ($M=4.33$, $SD=0.61$); next came direct feedback ($M=4.27$) and focused feedback ($M=4.20$). With more than 86% agreement and minimal disagreement, all three were well preferred. Though they had slightly more neutral replies, unfocused and metalinguistic feedback with explanation also got favorable scores ($M=4.07$ and 3.90 , respectively). On the other hand, metalinguistic feedback without explanation, indirect feedback with coded correction, and particularly indirect feedback ($M=2.67$) were the least favored options. These types received significant disagreement, especially regarding indirect feedback, with 60% of students expressing disagreement.

Table 7. Preference for feedback type

Feedback type	Mean	SD	Rank	Agreement	Neutral	Disagreement	Level of agreement
Reformulation	4.33	0.61	1	28 (93.33%)	2 (6.67%)	0 (0%)	Agreement
Direct	4.27	0.78	2	26 (86.66%)	3 (10%)	1 (3.33%)	Agreement
Focused	4.20	0.66	3	26 (86.66%)	4 (13.33%)	0 (0%)	Agreement
Unfocused	4.07	0.74	4	23 (76.67%)	7 (23.33%)	0 (0%)	Agreement
Metalinguistic (with explanation)	3.90	0.80	5	21 (70%)	8 (26.67%)	1 (3.33%)	Agreement
Metalinguistic	3.27	1.11	6	15 (50%)	7 (23.33%)	8 (26.67%)	Neutral
Indirect (with coded correction)	2.73	1.17	7	8 (26.67%)	6 (20%)	16 (53.33%)	Neutral
Indirect	2.67	1.18	8	8 (26.67%)	4 (13.33%)	18 (60%)	Neutral
Total	4.15	0.17					Agreement

3.2. Discussion

This study explored the experiences of WCF that EFL students were exposed to at a private college in Mainland China, and their personal preferences for WCF, which had considerable influence on writing teaching. Findings of this study revealed two sharp contrasts: i) content and grammar became the equally important parts of feedback focus and ii) reformulation ranked first among the eight feedback types while indirect feedback was commonly neglected by both teachers and students. These trends present a new challenge to the traditional feedback approach by emphasizing linguistic accuracy over structural development, highlighting differing student perceptions of feedback effectiveness.

3.2.1. Focus and types of WCF students received on their writing

The findings of this study regarding students' unanimous agreement of WCF focus and implementation show that feedback was frequently provided by their teachers, which is the same in the

finding of Saragih *et al.* [39]. In both EFL context and ESL context, research has shown that feedback has played a positive role in improving writing [40]–[43]. Students generally reported on the five primary focus areas—content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling ($M=3.65$, $SD=0.21$)—that teachers targeted when providing WCF in EFL writing classrooms. This aligns with prior research emphasizing the value of these elements in feedback practices [10], [12], [44]. At the same time, it also reflects that due to their low English proficiency, students are eager that all their errors can be corrected, so as to improve their writing level. Such findings are similar to those of Chen *et al.* [14] and Rasool *et al.* [20]. Taken together, the findings also indicate that teachers frequently stress global concerns such as content and language in their feedback, consistent with a pedagogical focus on meaning-making and accuracy. In contrast, superficial issues, particularly spelling, sometimes get inconsistent attention. This imbalance in feedback delivery may influence the comprehensiveness of students' revision activities and their overall language development.

In terms of feedback types, direct feedback ($M=4.37$, $SD=0.61$) provided by teachers—emerged as the commonest method, a trend supported by previous studies [11], [13], [45]. The fact that direct feedback ranks highest indicates that students urgently need their writing errors to be explicitly corrected. This inclination could be explained by the clarity and urgency of direct feedback. In their explanation of “corrections through WCF provided by teachers are encouraging,” Rasool *et al.* [46] emphasize the significant value students place on practical guidance for enhancing their writing skills. Similarly, reformulation ($M=4.27$, $SD=0.64$) was rated highly, which further suggests that students appreciate direct correction as well as the explanatory feedback built on direct feedback. On the contrary, the lower acceptance of indirect and metalinguistic feedback, especially when lacking explanation, might indicate learners' limited strategies or cognitive readiness to handle such input independently. This highlights the importance of teachers supporting students in engaging with less explicit feedback types, particularly in environments where learner autonomy is still being developed.

3.2.2. Students' preferences for WCF on their writing

In terms of feedback focus, content ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.75$) and grammar ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.75$) rank the first as students' most preferred foci. Students preferred teachers' comments focus on content, which is in line with earlier studies [11], [12], [44]. Also, they express that grammatical errors should also receive the highest attention for correction. This can be supported by a number of studies [9], [10], [44], [46]–[49]. The equal weight students gave to content and grammar suggest that these two dimensions are seen as the basis for the complementary reinforcement of writing quality. Such a balance illustrates the interdependence of meaning construction and language correctness during the revision process. Besides, another likely explanation is that EFL students' priority to writing accuracy and quality as a result of pressure from language certificates and academic advancement. Feedback on content and grammar can contribute to the overall improvement for students at varying language levels. Organization ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.79$) and spelling ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.79$) are the least favored feedback foci, probably due to students' ability to self-correct their organization and spelling through imitation and repetition guided by a template-oriented teaching strategy.

Reformulation, a type of feedback that provides learners with corrected versions of their original text while leaving the responsibility for final revisions to the students themselves [5], became the most preferred feedback type in this study, gaining support from 93.33% of participants. This surpasses direct feedback (86.66%), focused feedback (86.66%), and unfocused feedback (76.67%). Such strong preference is in accordance with its dual ability to improve writing accuracy [50] and promote deeper cognitive engagement. As Coyle *et al.* [51] note, reformulation requires students to make comparisons between their own work and the revised version, encouraging them to engage in a more thorough analysis of the feedback, actively pursuing solutions for incorrect language use or concentrating on more effective alternatives. Recent studies also highlight that reformulation may require teacher mediation to be effective. It is found that learners often needed teacher explanation and guidance to fully benefit from reformulated texts, which suggests a possibility of dependency on teacher support [52]. On the contrary, reformulation appears to promote learner independence by providing a clear, revised model of writing that reduces the cognitive load of self-editing, particularly for inexperienced writers facing complex tasks [53]. As Kibler *et al.* [53] explain, this approach enables learners to focus on higher-order revisions by simplifying lower-level editing demands. Thus, reformulation may serve as a pedagogical bridge, equipping students with the tools to refine their work while stressing their agency in the learning process.

Indirect feedback, emerged as the least preferred feedback type, receiving agreement from only 8 of the surveyed 30 participants. This finding is consistent with the conclusions from the previous studies [9], [11], [12], [14], while it differs from what Jahbel *et al.* [15] found in their study. The rejection of indirect feedback could be attributed to students' needs that not only their errors were identified, but also would rather be corrected by teachers so that they can be more accurate in future writing. It suggests that explicit identification and correction can be essential for students, particularly for students who are with low or

intermediate English level. The participants involved in this study are precisely the students of this level, and the majority of them belong to the passive learning type and habitually rely on teachers' clear instructions to acquire knowledge, including English. Besides, the sharp contrast between this aversion to indirect feedback and the popularity of reformulation highlights students' preference for specific knowledge over abstract meta-cognitive prompts. These findings illustrate the critical importance of personalizing feedback strategies according to learners' skill levels and knowledge frameworks, especially in contexts when students do not possess the language independence to efficiently employ implicit corrective approaches.

4. CONCLUSION

The study focused on eight types of WCF (direct, indirect, indirect with coded correction, metalinguistic, metalinguistic with explanation, unfocused, focused, and reformulation), and explored Chinese EFL students' experiences and preferences of WCF focus and types at a private college. Survey results affirm that students' preferences for WCF are closely aligned with their experiences of receiving it. Students most prefer reformulation that focuses on the content and grammar of their writing. This study offers significant insights and contributions to the research on non-English majors' preferences regarding the focus and types of WCF, which helps English teachers of writing course understand students' preferences and optimize their teaching practices. However, participants in this study are non-English majors with lower and intermediate English proficiency at a private college in Mainland China, so the results may not show the generalizability to English majors or students from public universities. Additionally, the limited sample size (N=30) was a consequence of employing snowball sampling, a method essential for identifying participants who fulfilled the specific criteria established for this study. Although this approach may restrict broader applicability, it facilitated focused data collection and comprehensive analysis within a feasible framework.

Based on the results of this study, several recommendations are proposed. First, it is observed that students' preferences for WCF types largely correspond with their actual experiences. Consequently, teachers are suggested to align their feedback strategies with the expressed needs of learners, particularly by offering more direct feedback that emphasizes content and grammatical accuracy. Although content received the majority of feedback, spelling was the least addressed aspect, despite students indicating a lower preference and exposure to it. Thus, more balanced feedback coverage is needed, including components often overlooked. Furthermore, given that students showed the least preference for indirect feedback on organization and spelling, it is advisable for teachers to adopt more explicit approaches when addressing these aspects. Finally, future research should examine the impact of aligning WCF types with learner preferences on long-term writing development, motivation, and self-regulation. It should also investigate how digital or AI-assisted feedback can be customized to meet these learner-centered needs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to extend the gratitude to Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS) for providing an excellent research environment and to all the participants involved in this study and we are also obliged to all the reviewers for their valuable comments on this paper.

FUNDING INFORMATION

Authors state no funding involved.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT

This journal uses the Contributor Roles Taxonomy (CRediT) to recognize individual author contributions, reduce authorship disputes, and facilitate collaboration.

Name of Author	C	M	So	Va	Fo	I	R	D	O	E	Vi	Su	P	Fu
Mudan Cai	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Joseph Ramanair		✓		✓	✓					✓		✓	✓	

C : Conceptualization

M : Methodology

So : Software

Va : Validation

Fo : Formal analysis

I : Investigation

R : Resources

D : Data Curation

O : Writing - Original Draft

E : Writing - Review & Editing

Vi : Visualization

Su : Supervision

P : Project administration

Fu : Funding acquisition

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

Authors state no conflict of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, [JR], upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. DiYanni and A. Borst, "Writing and learning," in *The Craft of College Teaching: A Practical Guide*, R. DiYanni and A. Borst, Eds., Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020, pp. 160–178, doi: 10.2307/j.ctvp2n3jt.23.
- [2] N. Karakaya, "Evaluation and teaching writing in Turkish language classes as a second language," *Vestnik Bishkek State University of K. Karashev*, vol. 2, no. 61, pp. 20–23, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.35254/bhu/2022.61.20.
- [3] M. E. Martinez and V. Gomez, "Effect of feedback and strategy training on undergraduate students' writing ability," *Acta Pedagogica Asiana*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 26–33, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.53623/apga.v2i1.169.
- [4] R. A. Febrian and I. A. Nurcholis, "The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving English foreign language university students' writing," *Jurnal Review Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 2931–2939, Feb. 2025, doi: 10.31004/jrpp.v8i1.43109.
- [5] H. M. Nguyen and T. A. Chu, "Written corrective feedback in second language writing: a review of research," *rEFLections*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 858–870, Aug. 2024, doi: 10.61508/refl.v31i2.275269.
- [6] R. Cai, "Attitudes and perceptions of teachers and Chinese students towards corrective feedback in L2 writing," *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 1328–1338, May 2024, doi: 10.17507/tpls.1405.05.
- [7] S. Scherer, S. Graham, and V. Busse, "How effective is feedback for L1, L2, and FL learners' writing? A meta-analysis," *Learning and Instruction*, vol. 93, p. 101961, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101961.
- [8] P. Muthukrishnan, L. F. Lan, H. Anandhan, and P. S. D., "The role of growth mindset on the relationships between students' perceptions of English language teachers' feedback and their ESL learning performance," *Education Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 10, p. 1073, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.3390/educsci14101073.
- [9] D. A. Black and A. Nanni, "Written corrective feedback: preferences and justifications of teachers and students in a Thai context," *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 99–114, Oct. 2016, doi: 10.17576/gema-2016-1603-07.
- [10] A. Hamouda, "A study of students and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Saudi EFL context," *English Language Teaching*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 128–141, Aug. 2011, doi: 10.5539/elt.v4n3p128.
- [11] O. Jamoom, "Teachers' beliefs and practices of feedback and preferences of students for feedback in university level EFL writing classrooms." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southampton, Southampton, England, United Kingdom, 2016.
- [12] Z. Xiaohai, *Survey study on college students' writing and teachers' written feedback preferences based on individual factors*. Beijing: Tongfang Knowledge Network (Beijing) Technology Co., Ltd. 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://link.oversea.cnki.net/doi/10.27159/d.cnki.ghzsu.2019.002331>
- [13] A. Aridah, H. Atmowardoyo, and K. Salija, "Teacher practices and students' preferences for written corrective feedback and their implications on writing instruction," *International Journal of English Linguistics*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 112–125, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.5539/ijel.v7n1p112.
- [14] S. Chen, H. Nassaji, and Q. Liu, "EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: a case study of university students from Mainland China," *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 5, Dec. 2016, doi: 10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y.
- [15] K. Jahbel, M. A. Latief, B. Y. Cahyono, and S. N. Abdalla, "Exploring university students' preferences towards written corrective feedback in EFL context in Libya," *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 8, no. 12A, pp. 7775–7782, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.13189/ujer.2020.082565.
- [16] N. Shintani, "The effects of computer-mediated synchronous and asynchronous direct corrective feedback on writing: a case study," *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 517–538, Apr. 2016, doi: 10.1080/09588221.2014.993400.
- [17] N. Moquit and T. Baten, "Enhancing L2 writing skills in tertiary EFL learners: an investigation into teacher-provided written corrective feedback in Bangladesh private university," *Boletín de Literatura Oral*, vol. 10, pp. 2538–2551, 2023.
- [18] J. Pan, H. Chen, and S. Yuan, "A comparative study of the engagement with written corrective feedback of Chinese private college students," *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 18, 2023, doi: 10.1186/s40862-023-00191-8.
- [19] I. Fitriyah, A. S. B. Ningrum, and I. Gozali, "An investigation of written corrective feedback in EFL writing assessment: how teachers' feedback practices meet students' expectations," *International Journal of Language Testing*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 166–184, 2023, doi: 10.22034/IJLT.2023.411616.1275.
- [20] U. Rasool, J. Qian, and M. Z. Aslam, "Understanding the significance of EFL students' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback," *SAGE Open*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 1–11, 2024, doi: 10.1177/21582440241256562.
- [21] Z. Mao, I. Lee, and S. Li, "Written corrective feedback in second language writing: a synthesis of naturalistic classroom studies," *Language Teaching*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 449–477, 2024, doi: 10.1017/S0261444823000393.
- [22] S. Yu, F. Geng, C. Liu, and Y. Zheng, "What works may hurt: the negative side of feedback in second language writing," *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 54, p. 100850, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100850.
- [23] M. Almania, "Less is not more for learners: EFL learners' preferences and perceptions of teachers' written corrective feedback," *Acta Psychologica*, vol. 255, p. 104926, May 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.104926.
- [24] M. Almohawes, "Undergraduate EFL learners' preferences for three different types of written corrective feedback," *Frontiers in Education*, vol. 10, p. 1532729, Feb. 2025, doi: 10.3389/feduc.2025.1532729.
- [25] A. Mamad and T. Vigh, "Student perspectives on preferences and reported instructor practices of written feedback in the Moroccan EFL university context," *Heliyon*, vol. 10, no. 11, p. e31694, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e31694.
- [26] R. Ellis, "A typology of written corrective feedback types," *ELT Journal*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 97–107, May 2008, doi: 10.1093/elt/ccn023.

- [27] J. Rana, P. L. Gutierrez, and J. C. Oldroyd, "Quantitative methods," in *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, A. Farazmand, Ed., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021, pp. 1–6, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_460-1.
- [28] R. Bihu, "Questionnaire survey methodology in educational and social science studies," *International Journal of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 40–60, 2021, doi: 10.37745/ijqrrm.13
- [29] P. Ranganathan and C. Caduff, "Designing and validating a research questionnaire - part 1," *Perspectives in Clinical Research*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 152–155, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.4103/picr.picr_140_23.
- [30] H. Taherdoost, "Designing a questionnaire for a research paper: a comprehensive guide to design and develop an effective questionnaire," *Asian Journal of Managerial Science*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 8–16, Apr. 2022, doi: 10.51983/ajms-2022.11.1.3087.
- [31] B. T. West, S. Zhang, J. Wagner, R. Gatward, H. W. Saw, and W. G. Axinn, "Methods for improving participation rates in national self-administered web/mail surveys: evidence from the United States," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 18, no. 8, p. e0289695, Aug. 2023, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0289695.
- [32] H. R. Amrhein and H. Nassaji, "Written corrective feedback: what do students and teachers think is right and why?" *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 95–127, 2010.
- [33] N. L. T. Nguyen, B. T. T. Nguyen, and G. T. L. Hoang, "Students' perceptions of teachers' written feedback on EFL writing in a Vietnamese tertiary context," *Language Related Research*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 405–431, 2021, doi: 10.29252/LRR.12.5.15.
- [34] A. Samuel and M. Akther, "Students' perceptions and preferences about teachers' written corrective feedback at secondary level," *Bulletin of Education and Research*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 45–58, 2021.
- [35] K. Brosnan, B. Grün, and S. Dolnicar, "Cognitive load reduction strategies in questionnaire design," *International Journal of Market Research*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 125–133, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1177/1470785320986797.
- [36] M. Albogami, "An inquiry into effective written feedback from EFL teachers' and students' perspectives at a Saudi university," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Exeter, Exeter, England, United Kingdom, 2020.
- [37] N. T. Kerman, S. K. Banihashem, O. Noroozi, and H. J. A. Biemans, "The effects of students' perceived usefulness and trustworthiness of peer feedback on learning satisfaction in online learning environments," in *8th International Conference on Higher Education Advances (HEAd'22)*, Jun. 2022, pp. 263–271, doi: 10.4995/HEAd22.2022.14445.
- [38] J. U. Navarrete, "Validation of a satisfaction survey using Cronbach's alpha and Aiken's V: improving data quality," *PriMera Scientific Engineering*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 40–52, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.56831/PSEN-03-062.
- [39] N. A. Saragih, A. Madya, S. A. Siregar, and R. A. Saragih, "Written corrective feedback: students' perception and preferences," *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 676–690, 2021.
- [40] M. H. Ghane and M. H. Razmi, "The impact of written corrective feedback on students' writing performance, self-efficacy, and anxiety," *Journal of Writing Research*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 271–321, 2024, doi: 10.17239/jowr-2024.16.02.04.
- [41] H. Sun and W. Qi, "Effects of written corrective feedback on college EFL students' writing accuracy and linguistic knowledge acquisition," *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 445–461, 2022, doi: 10.1515/CJAL-2022-0310.
- [42] A. Mamad, "The role of written corrective feedback in EFL writing," *Opus et Educatio*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 148–154, May 2020, doi: 10.3311/ope.376.
- [43] K. Karim and H. Nassaji, "The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing," *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 519–539, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1362168818802469.
- [44] L. Hajian, A. A. K. Farahani, and M. A. Shirazi, "A study of students' and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Iranian EFL context," *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 287–297, 2014, doi: 10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.5p.287.
- [45] J. A. Elwood and J. Bode, "Student preferences vis-à-vis teacher feedback in university EFL writing classes in Japan," *System*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 333–343, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2013.12.023.
- [46] U. Rasool, R. Mahmood, M. Z. Aslam, S. H. H. Barzani, and J. Qian, "Perceptions and preferences of senior high school students about written corrective feedback in Pakistan," *SAGE Open*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1–14, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.1177/21582440231187612.
- [47] R. F. Zohra and H. Fatiha, "Exploring learners' and teachers' preferences regarding written corrective feedback types in improving learners' writing skill," *Arab World English Journal*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 117–128, 2022, doi: 10.24093/awej/vol13no1.8.
- [48] S. S. Halimi, "Indonesian teachers' and students' preferences for error correction," *Wacana, Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 50–71, Apr. 2008, doi: 10.17510/wjhi.v10i1.178.
- [49] P. Wang, "Dealing with English majors' written errors in Chinese universities," *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 194–205, May 2010, doi: 10.4304/jltr.1.3.194-205.
- [50] L. Farsi, "Looking at reformulation task types in writing classrooms: theoretical and empirical perspective," *JIEB*, vol. 4, pp. 54–60, 2016.
- [51] Y. Coyle, P. A. F. Mora, and J. S. Becerra, "Improving reference cohesion in young EFL learners' collaboratively written narratives: is there a role for reformulation?" *System*, vol. 94, p. 102333, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2020.102333.
- [52] M. Davari, "Online reformulation and collaborative feedback: its effect on EFL learners' writing performance during the COVID-19 pandemic," *International Journal of Research in English Education*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 101–118, 2022, doi: 10.52547/ijree.7.2.101.
- [53] A. K. Kibler, A. S. Salerno, and E. Andrei, "Teacher inquiry in ESOL teacher education," in *Expertise in Second Language Writing Instruction: Conceptual and Empirical Understandings*, A. Hirvela and D. D. Belcher, Eds., New York: Routledge, 2024, pp. 52–70, doi: 10.4324/9781032626864-4.

BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS

Mudan Cai    is a full-time doctoral candidate at Faculty of Education, Language and Communication, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS) in Malaysia, and also a lecturer at English Language School, Anhui International Studies University, China. A native of China, she obtained her Master's Degree from Anhui University in 2012 and her Bachelor's Degree from Anqing Normal University in 2008. She has been instructing College English (Reading and Writing) course for more than 10 years and conducting provincial-level and school-level research on English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching and learning. She can be contacted at email: 303035444@qq.com.



Joseph Ramanair    is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education, Language and Communication, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS), Malaysia. He conducts research in areas related to education, eLearning, English language pedagogy, and teacher development. He can be contacted at email: rjoseph@unimas.my.