

## The Use of Whole-class Feedback as an Alternative in Improving Education Students' Writing Skills: Students' Perspectives

### Proponents:

Abot, Norman Azil T.

Salientes, Ana Jane E.

Valdez, Wesley M.

Syting, Christian Jay O.

christianjay\_syting@umindanao.edu.ph

DOI: [10.56201/ijee.v10.no1.2024.pg144.191](https://doi.org/10.56201/ijee.v10.no1.2024.pg144.191)

---

### Abstract

*This qualitative descriptive study aimed to unravel students' perspectives on the use of whole-class feedback and its implementation as an alternative to improve education students' writing skills. Using an in-depth interview, twenty-two students from a non-sectarian institution were interviewed. The results revealed that the perspectives involved responsiveness to students' needs, self-regulative tool features, motivational benefits, reinforcement programs, elaborated approaches, absence of task levelness, and insufficiencies to students' concerns. The implementation of whole-class feedback involved explicit feedback, positive motivational belief and self-esteem, quality information to students about their learning, development of self-assessment in learning, peer and teacher collaboration, and computer-assisted delivery. Further, the results imply that explicit feedback with an emphasis on criteria and the use of informative tutoring is paramount to maximizing the effectiveness of the feedback itself. This study will significantly help teachers and students as it helps teachers' workload and is responsive to students' needs, enabling students to self-regulate and peer-coaching.*

---

**Keywords:** education, whole-class feedback, writing skills, descriptive qualitative, students, Philippines

---

### INTRODUCTION

Feedback is one of the essential practices that teachers need to do to improve student's learning in the classroom. In addition, feedback involves procedures by which learners utilize inputs to improve their work or learning practices. However, while feedback significantly contributes to students' learning, its implementation affects the degree of learning that students get in the teaching and learning process. A large body of evidence in higher Education indicates that undergraduates are generally dissatisfied with how feedback systems are conducted (Buckley, 2020). This dissatisfaction with feedback processes is bolstered by findings that students do not view their teachers' input as easily understandable, valuable, or actionable (Winstone et al., 2017). Boud and Molloy (2013) also noticed that feedback systems in higher Education are typically challenging to execute and do not significantly impact student learning as intended. Also, some researchers question the extent to which this is true in higher Education due to institutional constraints and staff workloads (Higgins et al., 2002).

Researchers support the above mentioned problem by stating that students do not act upon the feedback provided, thereby making no progress in the learning process (John & Essery, 2018; & Percival, 2017). Sadler (2010) asserts that feedback appears to have little or no effect on most students, despite the enormous time and effort invested in its provision. This indicates a discrepancy between teachers' and students' comprehension of feedback, particularly if students perceive it as having little utility or worth (Lunt & Curran, 2010). In most individualized feedback, generic to vaguely written comments are just some ways, to name a few in feedback processes (Christodoulou, 2019; Foster, 2017). Written feedback on students' work had become overvalued, and the quantity of written feedback had gotten conflated and confused with the quality (Independent Teacher Workload Review Group, 2016). Perhaps one of the downsides of written feedback is how time-consuming it is and how much it adds to teachers' workload (Cawley, 2020). It is supported by (Deeley et al. 2019), asserting that teachers' time is also consumed by feedback, such as when extensive periods are spent delivering written comments on students' assignments. Also, in related studies, teachers frequently find grading and marking to be time-consuming and relatively unproductive since feedback must serve multiple purposes, including grade justification, commentary, and quality assurance requirements (Winstone & Carless, 2021).

Furthermore, aside from the mechanism for implementing feedback, the timing to which the input should take place also plays a role in increased learning (Kherer et al., 2013). Numerous research has demonstrated that the timeliness of feedback contributes to its usefulness because its relevance can be lost if it is provided too late, such as after a course has been completed (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Jonsson, 2012; O'Donovan, Russ, & Price, 2015). Kherer et al. (2013) assert that delaying input may increase the desirable difficulty and decrease student performance. Also, the efficiency of immediate feedback was determined to be a significant factor in improving students' performance (Aglah et al., 2014). Furthermore, immediate teacher feedback is more advantageous to students' writing skills than delayed or no feedback, which makes the time limitations more rigorous for teachers. Ultimately, feedback timing is crucial to learners' learning and teaching progress (Kheradmand and Sayadiyan, 2016).

Although written feedback may have a positive impact, the cost of teacher workload may render it inefficient or detrimental, as it diverts a teacher's time away from more impactful practice. Accordingly, (McDonald, 2021) places high regard on whole-class feedback as a substitute for written feedback. Contextually, whole-class feedback needs a mental shift away from the constraints of the traditional approach to grading, namely, written feedback. Once liberated, teachers rapidly recognize the value of collectively resolving misconceptions (Riches, 2021). Riches (2021) suggested that teachers may utilize verbal whole-class feedback, especially if there is a common misconception across the whole class. He further suggested that for teachers to be more responsive to learners, they should be more informed and attentive. Moreover, (Lad, 2020) asserts that whole-class feedback is more beneficial than written remarks alone since it allows students to incorporate input into their learning instead of simply receiving it. Given the possible influence on English teachers' workload, (UCL, 2019) emphasizes the need to include professional development to ensure that whole-class feedback is appropriately implemented.

Unfortunately, the researchers found no studies that examined whole-class feedback to enhance education students' writing skills at the tertiary level. However, quantitative studies

discuss whole-class feedback as an alternative to the time-consuming chore of writing comments on each student's piece of work (Sherrington, 2017). Additionally, it has also been noted that for whole-class feedback to improve students' learning successfully, it should be explicit and firmly centered on deepening learning towards a recognized goal and students' learning intents (Burns, 2021). On a related topic of delivery manner and emphasis, it has also been claimed that efficient whole-class feedback relies largely on consistency and conformity, suggesting that how whole-class feedback is conducted is crucial (Riches, 2021). Nonetheless, no emphasis has been placed on tertiary students, notably Education students majoring in English, regarding their writing abilities or on how whole-class feedback improves their writing quality and ability.

On that account, this study aims to contribute to the subject of whole-class feedback's perceptions and utilization by collecting data from tertiary students. Specifically, education students majoring in English since the context of this study mainly focuses on how whole-class feedback significantly affects majoring in English students' writing skills. Also, how teachers should conduct the feedback alongside their preferential educational philosophies. Additionally, it covers the students' thoughts and sentiments regarding this feedback form using two (2) separate research questions: (1) How does whole class feedback help improve students' writing skills? (2) How should whole class feedback be implemented by teachers?

The findings of the study, as well, will benefit English teachers, educational administrators, and aspiring English teachers in improving their teaching and learning experiences firsthand by incorporating the information gathered from the sentiments, perceptions, and ideals of the respective participants of the study. This study will also impart prudent techniques to any learning environment that deals with feedback information and assist the most that aspire to add their knowledge and background about whole-class feedback.

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Participants

The respondents consist of twenty-two (22) students, with fifteen (15) participants in one-on-one interviews and a focus group discussion; seven (7) students, in which all are Education students enrolled at the University of Mindanao. It was previously stated that qualitative studies need a minimum sample size of at least 12 to reach data saturation (Clark & Brawn, 2013; Fugard & Potts, 2014; Bunce & Johnson, 2006, as cited in Vasileiou et al., 2018). In This research, a sample size of twenty-two (22) or more would prove sufficient for the analysis and qualitative study. Furthermore, the purposive sampling technique will be used in selecting the interviewees. This is to ensure that the information is from selected individuals that are knowledgeable about or have experienced the use of Whole-class Feedback (Cresswell & Plano Clark, 2011, cited in Palinkas, 2015). Inclusion, exclusion, and withdrawal criteria were also carefully deliberated by the researchers, and unbiasedly chose participants of age, gender, race, & ethnicity. Should medical and physical conditions occur that may force the respondent to be ineligible for participating in the study, the researchers already thought of that before picking their subjects. Withdrawal from the research was also transparentized in this study if the subject decided to withdraw from the research for various reasons, as refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss for the subject.

## Research Instruments

This study used open-ended questions for the interviews, at the same time using an interview guide for maximum efficiency and clarity of the interview process. The interview guide and the questions asked to the respondents that the researchers created will be validated by accredited professionals. The Interviewees consist of twenty-two (22) students, with fifteen (15) participants in one-on-one interviews and a focus group discussion of seven (7) students. All interviews will be recorded and will take place virtually using Google Meet. Lastly, the researchers might ask ad lib questions related to the topic for better overall understanding.

## Research Design and Procedure

A descriptive qualitative design was used for this study, as the descriptive-qualitative research best describes natural or man-made educational phenomena (Borg and Gall, 1989, as cited in The Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 2001). In this study, the feedback delivery itself is a phenomenon that is in the best interest of both students and educators, serving as an essential aspect not for their individual growth as part of the learning process but more for the development of their engagements inside the classroom. Moreover, qualitative descriptive research is the best method to draw insights from informants regarding a less commonly understood phenomenon (Neergard et al., 2009; Sullican Bolyai et al., 2005, as cited in Hyejin, K. et al., 2016).

The data gathering procedure commenced when the prospective interviewees were selected and consented to their voluntary participation, which mainly was requested via the Messenger app for an easier way to confirm their acknowledgments to be part of the study. The University of Mindanao Major in English students from the College of Teachers Education were the chosen participants since they serve as the exact partakers to inquire about feedback practices given that their course is in line with the researchers' analyses. Education students were the best prospects to conduct more informative and instructive data for this research study. The online interviews timeline started from the 7th of February 2022 until the 16th of May 2022 since the researchers also considered each respondent's convenience and leisure time. Importantly, should a participant have internet connection difficulties, the interview will be, instead, changed into an online written interview. With the current pandemic situation in mind, the researchers interviewed in digital space through Google Meet, as mandated. The in-depth individual online interviews were primarily finished in under thirty (30) minutes, especially the one-on-ones, while the chosen seven (7) students who were accommodated through a focused group discussion (FGD) lasted for about an hour, including the opening, and closing remarks of the interview. After which, the data provided by the respondents will be transcribed. The vernacular language received from their responses will be contextualized and translated to English using Microsoft Word as a platform for typing.

After the data transcription, the gathered insights were placed and arranged by theme in tables. However, the researchers gathered an incorrect format of themes and tables before arranging the final table. Using a coding system defined by the keywords, phrases, subjects, and concepts assigned by researchers to classify a subset of data by topic to which they carefully revised and redact for better adherence to the prescriptions of qualitative data analysis. Consequently, the data's central themes, generalizations, and other similarities were organized during the final analysis. They were put through analysis below the tables supported

with straightforward yet comprehensive discourses with cited references and verbatim answers from the participants that propounded the themes mentioned above.

### **Trustworthiness of the Study**

Ensuring the study's trustworthiness is one of the most critical steps in all research fields. Lincoln and Guba (1985), cited in Shenton (2004), proposed criteria for ensuring the trustworthiness of research results. Thus, the study's credibility, dependability, conformability, and transferability were highlighted. The credibility of our study laid great emphasis on collecting research data to ensure credible research findings. To establish the credibility of our research, we also confirmed that our participants were willing to attend our online interviews on purpose.

The dependability of this study also rested on the descriptions we provided in our methodology and the interview questions we formulated, which will significantly assist future researchers with similar interests in whole-class feedback while improving the authenticity and efficacy of the research study needed to establish data examination. In Addition, to further demonstrate the conformability of this research, one of the study's objectives was to observe congruence between two or more independent individuals regarding the relevance and accuracy of participants' responses (Polit and Beck, 2012). The researchers took responsibility for the delivery of assistance among participants' experiences and reactions regarding the topic, with the aid of comparative literature studies required to make the study substantially more authentic.

Lastly, to further promote good research progress about Whole class feedback, part of this study's goal was to establish objective evidence that could strengthen this study's findings to be more applicable to other contexts, situations, and future studies. According to (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), "it is not the naturalist's responsibility to provide an index of transferability; instead, it is his or her responsibility to provide the database that enables transferability judgments on potential applicants. As a result, it is the responsibility of the researchers to collect and evaluate solid evidence to ensure the transferability of the study.

### **Role of the Researchers**

According to Zubin and Sutton (2015), the researchers are to attempt to grasp the input and sentiments of the participants. As it is not a simple task to perform, having people talk and share their experiences and unbiased insights that they may deem personal or controversial. This is naturally due to the nature of qualitative studies collecting data from interviews and coding related, and significant topics, and concepts into themes.

There were several reasons why the researchers had taken up whole-class feedback as a research topic. As English majors, they were naturally curious about what feedback approach is most effective for teaching writing skills. With the present and prominent teacher problems in mind, specifically time limitations, the researchers also considered what type of feedback would lessen the time constraints. Thus, whole-class feedback presented itself as the means of delivery to accommodate the entire class of learners collectively, to lessen teacher workload, and the limited time teachers have to provide feedback.

Furthermore, with bias being the leading cause of error and inaccuracies in qualitative research, the researchers catered to being "non-existent," only to provide standard objective data and remove all subjectivity, as propounded by Simon (2011). However, with the interview and probing questions being substantially sufficient, the researchers were still open to related spontaneous questions that still contributed to the overall data of the research subject.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter discusses the results of the thematic analysis of the perceptions, implementations, and recommendations of the twenty-two (22) participants on the use of Whole-class feedback as an alternative in improving education students' writing skills. The order of presentation is based on the research questions stated in chapter one.

### Perspectives on the Use of Whole-class feedback

The thematic analysis has revealed prominent themes among the responses, as shown in Table 1 below. In this study, the respondents mentioned traits and detailed descriptions of whole-class feedback in its form and current implementation. It included the responsiveness to students' needs, Self-regulative utilities, motivational benefits, reinforcement programs, elaborated feedback, absence of task level feedback, and insufficiency of feedback toward students' concerns.

**Table 1**  
 Perspectives in the Use of Whole-class feedback

Basic Theme	Organizing Themes	Global Themes
One-Sitting implementation convenience (ST 1, ST 2, ST 4, ST 8)		
Addresses common mistakes or errors of the majority (ST 5, ST 7)	<b>Efficiency in conducting feedback</b>	
Provides uniformed feedback that caters all or most students (ST 1, ST 3, ST 8)		<b>Responsiveness to Students' needs</b>
Enables the teacher to provide feedback even with very limited time (ST 4, ST 7)	<b>Adaptability of Whole-class feedback</b>	

---

Prominent use in both face-to-face and online classes (ST 1, ST 16)

---

Reminds students of the errors of others (ST 5, ST 7)

---

Encourages well-performing students to coach underperforming students (ST 16, ST 20)

---

**Invocation of Peer-coaching**

Helps underperforming students compare outputs and share strategies to improve (ST 3 & ST 7)

---

Compels students to self-study (ST 18, & ST 9)

---

**Self-Regulative Tool**

Obliges students to evaluate their work independently (ST 3, ST 5)

---

**Metacognitive Tool**

Prompts critical thinking as to what input applies to them (ST 1 & ST 16)

---

Motivates students to reevaluate their outputs collectively (ST 5, ST 6)

---

Positively pressures students to meet an expectation. (ST 1, ST 4)

---

**Intrinsic Motivation**

**Motivational benefits of Whole-class feedback**

Motivates students collectively and personally (ST 6, ST 20)

Gives learners a sense of comradery (ST 7, ST 10)	<b>Extrinsic Motivation</b>	
Does not demoralize addressees (ST 3, ST 4)		
Direct Verbal Cues as Reward (ST 1, ST 10, ST 9)	<b>Intangible Rewards</b>	
Indirect Non-verbal Reinforcement (ST 5, ST13)		
Candy for lower years (ST 1, ST 22)	<b>Tangible Rewards</b>	<b>Reinforcement Strategies</b>
Small Tokens as appreciation (ST 5, ST 15)		
Informs learners of their weaknesses (ST 16, ST 20)	<b>Bugs/Misconceptions</b>	
Explains the mistakes of the majority (ST 7, ST 17)		
Provides tips and Strategies to improve (ST 4, ST 6)	<b>Informative Tutoring</b>	<b>Elaborated Feedback</b>
Feedback is carefully organized and articulated (ST 7, ST 20)		
Unable to account the components of writing skills (ST 2, ST 5)	<b>No specific Feedback on their work to progress</b>	<b>Absence of Task level Feedback</b>
Should be reinforced with individualized feedback (ST 4, & ST 7)		



---

Students acknowledge individualized feedbacks rather than whole class (ST 5, ST 10)

---

**Absence of Close-level feedback**

---

Does not cater to the different needs of learners (ST 4, ST 7, ST 8)

---

---

Indirectly causes learners to become complacent (ST 4, ST 5, & ST 8)

---

---

Students don't know whether the feedback is applicable to them (ST 5, ST 22)

---

**Ambiguity of feedback**

---

Vagueness of specific writing areas to improve (ST 4, ST 7 ST 13)

---

**Insufficiency of feedback towards students' concerns**

---

Incapable of addressing different individual concerns of students (ST 8, & ST 13)

---

**Lack of Dependability**

---

Heavily based on the teacher's proficiency (ST 2, ST 3, ST 4, & ST 7)

---

**Responsiveness to Students' needs.** Responsiveness in education means adapting teaching methods to the needs of different students that may provide additional support for all children's primary education (OECD, 2015). This refers to a myriad of traits that contribute to its effectiveness, such as the one-time feedback delivery that addresses the majority's errors, its equal bearing to all students, and its usability in different classroom settings. With efficiency and adaptability differing in emphasis, the theme was divided into two parts: *Efficiency in conducting feedback and Adaptability of Whole-class feedback*.

**Efficiency in conducting feedback.** Good feedback can provide helpful information to students to improve their learning and provide adequate information to teachers, thereby improving students' learning experiences (Yorke, 2003). The efficiency of the feedback is reflected in the responses below:

My perspective on whole-class feedback is first and foremost, it is time-saving because you are able to cater to all students, and it is very practical for the teacher, especially English teachers who want to address the common issues to the class.... It is convenient because it is generic.

[ST 4]

The most advantage... of the whole-class feedback I guess is the time efficiency, and also catering most of your students in one sitting.

[ST 7]

Teachers use this kind of assessment method for it lessens their workload... it also saves time, and less hassle.

[ST 8]

Students 4, 7, and 8 show that whole-class feedback saves time, mainly by reducing the teacher's workload. A one-sitting implementation is an advantage of this type of feedback, as it reduces inconvenience and accounts for common mistakes and classroom issues.

After examining relevant papers, we asserted that there were inadequately written publications on this subject. Several studies have failed to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of whole-class feedback in the classroom setting. We selected several other studies to support our claim and investigated their relevance to our topic; yet, like its lines, whole-class feedback remains a research gray area. Nonetheless, our findings contribute to the body of knowledge by demonstrating that whole-class feedback helps reinforce various feedback mechanisms while considering varied types of learners.

**Adaptability of Whole-class feedback.** The shift to online feedback, which is not limited by time or place, makes it easier for teachers and students to talk to each other and learn from each other, as well as for more feedback to be given and received (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). This is seen in the responses below:

Oh yes, especially during face to face even now in online class, the feedback is given as a whole...Usually, in a written or presented output, there isn't enough ample time, and whole-class feedback addresses the common problems to not only one, but to all of the learners, enabling teachers to provide feedback.

[ST 4]

Whole-class feedback as I understand it, more on if you lack time to cater to all of your students, so you will implement whole-class feedback to lessen the time. If they have the same concern, might as well have a uniformed feedback to everyone.

[ST 7]

I think it is quite effective, but it is only effective in face-to-face classes because there are limitations in this online setup. It also has time constraints and limitations of discussions – it is done twice a week, so there is no time for whole class feedback. So it is effective in face-to-face classes.

[ST 16]

With the usual situation being considered, student 4 stated how Whole-class feedback is widely used during face-to-face and online classes. Nevertheless, student 16 offers a different perspective by stating that whole-class feedback is highly effective during face-to-face classes. Hence, the researchers agree with student 7 in bringing together the gist of student 4 and student 16's sentiments about whole-class feedback, wherein it provides more time for teachers to give feedback.

There appeared to be no prominent studies examining the use of whole-class feedback in higher education. However, several studies indicate that whole-class feedback is adaptable in providing remarks and lowering teachers' workload, enabling response to students' needs, as mentioned (Burns, 2021). To emphasize the Adaptability of whole-class feedback, Riches (2019) suggested that when implemented correctly, it has the potential to turn tradition on its head by finding common inaccuracies in students' output in correlation to the fewer time teachers spend managing the class.

Across different institutions, educational sectors sought a variety of terminology to define the most effective pedagogies for ensuring that students' needs are prioritized throughout their learning experiences. These terms imply their prescriptive approaches, and most resources reflect a concept that teachers should provide, account for, and inquire about their learners' developing knowledge (Smith, Lee, & Newmann, 2001). According to Kavanagh and Rainey (2018), this perspective emphasizes the need for responsiveness in teaching students. This necessitates a collaborative process in which students interact with their teachers while having the opportunity to emerge and expand their ideas. Teachers' engagement with pupils through transmitting knowledge is built-in contextual sociocultural research that verifies their social participation in situated activities and practices. Thus, providing meaningful learning experiences for students implies that they become active participants in the lesson rather than passive recipients (Gee, 1989; Moje, 2015).

**Self-Regulative Tool.** This refers to the self-regulation, and peer-coaching, invoked by whole-class feedback. This also includes underperforming learners comparing outputs, assessing one's output in the metacognition process, adapting writing strategies, and being reminded and made aware of others' mistakes and errors (Lee et al. 2019; Panadero 2017; Winne 2011; Zimmerman 1990, 2001, 2002; Zimmerman and Schunk 1989). The central theme is generated from the following organizing themes below with different emphases.

**Invocation of Peer-Coaching.** According to Topping (2017), it is an avenue for learners to conduct peer evaluation by comparing individual outputs and enabling them to be mindful of their mistakes and adapt to their peers' recommendations. This is manifested in the responses below:

It's a good avenue for peer coaching and even peer review because the upper group or the bright people can teach those who are underperformers or the lower group.

[ST 3]

I can say that it has positive feedback because, with whole-class feedback, we are able to discuss with our classmates and our seatmates. When the teacher gives feedback then we share our strategies, so there is cooperation there... So I think that improves our writing skills, or they are able to relate to others, that you adopt their styles, how did they do this, how did they do that.

[ST 7]

And then, later on, we realized that it is good as we are to hear the concerns of other students even if it is not totally applicable to us, but the fact that errors from other students were mentioned, so why not check if we have the same mistakes.

[ST 5]

Whole-class feedback indeed improves students' performance, specifically students' writing skills, through peer-coaching and peer-review, with the higher-performing students coaching the low-performing students or peer-coaching amongst students themselves, as mentioned by students 3 and 7. Similarly, student 5 described whole-class feedback as instructive because it reveals the errors of others and enables other students to seek guidance from the feedback.

According to Schünemann et al. (2017), peer coaching may have a beneficial effect on learning in a variety of circumstances. It is commonly known that involving students in the evaluation process is essential for good self-regulation because it allows students to notice errors and develop solutions to rectify them (Zamora et al., 2018). However, the development of peer-coaching abilities is complex; learners must engage in constant and repeated practice to become competent peer evaluators (Andrade, 2016). Peer-coaching assumes that students can motivate themselves in appropriately crafted projects or activities given by the teacher (Race, 2019). Therefore, participation in peer coaching is intended to have a good effect on students' cognitive growth and learning motivation (Adachi et al., 2018).

**Metacognitive Tool.** This refers to whole-class feedback as an avenue for students to evaluate themselves metacognitively and become accountable for assessing their learnings. In Addition, while the end of whole-class feedback is generic, students generate a deep analysis of inputs they received and believe are essential and applicable to them (McMillan and Hearn, 2008). Listed in the responses below serving feedback as a metacognitive tool:

So, if ever whole-class feedback is what my teacher would do in assessing or in feedbacking my output. Since I couldn't really pinpoint what went wrong or whatsoever, but it would encourage me to study; it would encourage me to assess what are the things

that need my output lacking or etc., so I think in the part that it encourages self-learning, it would be helpful.

[ST 9]

I guess students' and teachers' bond is not that strong unlike in face-to-face classes, because as I have observed, teachers during this blended learning respond only to one student. With whole-class feedback in mind, since it is generalized, students who were not able to attend the class feel like they can't ask the same question with regards to their output, since the feedback was already given by the professor and was done whole-class. So, what the students did is to evaluate their own work.

[ST 5]

The idea is that they are given almost general feedback for the whole class, and the students will then deduce these ideas in terms of what they think that applies to them.

[ST 1]

Whole-class feedback provided a method for Student 9 to self-learn and assessed areas of weakness, as this method of providing feedback did not specify where the errors occurred. In Addition, student 5 mentioned the responsibility of students to evaluate their work, even becoming hesitant in interacting with their teachers and connecting are not as close and intimate as an individual one. Conclusively, it will demonstrate good critical thinking skills in determining what inputs might apply to them, as structured by Student 1.

Using a variety of research and articles, we asserted that there are few notable pioneers of whole-class feedback in conjunction with students' self-evaluation. However, according to an article by TeacherToolKit (2020), whole-class feedback reduces teachers' burden and promotes self-evaluation among students. As a result, it is critical to undertake a more thorough analysis of our study to provide a greater diversity of information and leverage whole-class feedback as a means of self-evaluation.

As Butler and Winnie (2009) point out, feedback's role in learning is mediated by learners' beliefs and knowledge. Nichol and Dick (2006) support that in higher education, there should be a decent degree of resemblance between student-set goals and teacher-set goals; this is critical given that students' goals act as self-regulation criteria. Thus, according to Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) self-regulated learning model, feedback promotes self-regulation through the contributions of classmates, teachers, and even some invisible culture inside a school context. Additionally, Hawk and Shah (2008) noted that feedback should include clarifying what constitutes acceptable performance, facilitating the learner's self-assessment, encouraging teacher and peer conversation, and encouraging positive motivation and self-esteem.

**Motivational benefits of Whole-class feedback.** It is effective if the process of providing feedback must be positive or at least motivating for the student (Wenglingksy, 2000). This is

divided into two parts: Intrinsic motivation, where the motivation directly comes from the passion and enthusiasm to learn and improve, and the latter Extrinsic motivation, where the motivation comes from other sources and factors outside the intended learning outcomes, such as cluster themes are discussed below the central theme.

**Intrinsic Motivation from Whole-class feedback.** This refers to the motivation generated and cultivated due to the intent to learn, improve, and grow academically due to whole-class feedback (Victoria, 2019). Many of the respondents below stated that this aspect stems from positive peer pressure, appreciation for their efforts as a group, and various other factors.

I am the kind of student, when the teacher expects me to improve in terms of writing , that would burst my attention in doing that thing, because I don't want to lose the expectation and I account myself that if you give me and expected me to do this and that, then you know me in the first place I could handle or achieve that. So yes, the Pygmalion effect is effective for me.

[ST 1]

Even if the scores that are given aren't as nice, we still are motivated because the feedback always comes with it, so we as a class would be even more motivated to check other literatures so we could assess where and what we were missing, as well as the other techniques we could use to better ourselves and meet the standards of the teachers

[ST 5]

If my work is appreciated and used as an example in front of the whole-class, for me, it would make me or anyone feel motivated the way the effort is recognized and appreciated, like I would be more motivated to write and improve.

[ST 10]

The combined sentiments of students 10 and 5 remarked that whole-class feedback is of great help in motivating them to excel in class, especially when their work is valued and appreciated by the teachers. Also, student 1 emphasizes the Pygmalion effect as it regards whole-class means to motivate its addressees. Placing expectations in the students, as a collective whole, to reach a certain level or goal drives them to strive and improve their writing skills.

Only a few studies have examined the dynamic relationship between teachers' feedback methods and students' feedback experiences and how this interaction affects the intended learning objectives in various educational settings. The only adjacent work that can reinforce our inquiry is Brown & Cocking (2000), who emphasized the critical nature of feedback, particularly during online instruction. According to Brown and Cocking (2000), positive feedback is vital to ensuring successful student learning. The fundamental goal of feedback is to assist students in adjusting their thinking, motivating their emotions in response to

conditional evaluations, and resulting in improved learning outcomes (Shute, 2008). Decades of feedback studies have substantiated this notion, with feedback widely regarded as one of the most effective techniques for increasing student achievement. Therefore, our investigation into whole-class feedback as a motivational discipline will add to this existing body of information, aiding in the future examination of feedback practices.

**Extrinsic motivation from Whole-class feedback.** According to Hoffman (2009), motivation is independent of the learning objectives and process. It could be due to various factors, such as the sense of community that results from being told things in a group or negative feedback that is less harsh when given to the entire class. This is seen in the responses below.

I guess there is motivation there. When it is whole-class, there is bound to be more interpersonal relationships, instead of just you receiving the feedback, it becomes directed to all and you all belong in that group. So I guess there is an extrinsic motivation factor there.

[ST 7]

I think it is an advantage for the teacher, if he wants to criticize someone's work, he will not directly address the concern to that specific student, and have it addressed to the whole-class generally, and will not affect the morale of the students, unlike individual feedback.

[ST 10]

Student 10 made a convincing case when he stated that whole-class feedback administers extrinsic motivation as it notably accounts for accentuating learners' morale, as it highly regards how criticism and correction are not directed to specific students. Student 7 elaborates on the comradeship that whole-class feedback sets forth in the class, as it brings belongingness and invokes the development of interpersonal relationships amongst learners. While extrinsic motivation is the least predictable of all the other themes, it still plays a vital role in the student's learning process from whole-class feedback.

From our examination of varied analyses and written publications about feedback practices, only a few have provided considerable information to suffice our inquiry on whole-class feedback prompting extrinsic motivation. More studies are tangent to our concept of motivation, which is acceptable as our analysis of whole-class feedback is relatively new. Most materials lack coherence, if not context, about feedback practices to allow extrinsic motivation within students and augment their means of acquiring knowledge. More so, we sought to substantiate our study more and account for a range of information about whole-class feedback linear with extrinsic motivation.

According to Moula (2010), motivation is one aspect that contributes to academic performance. Conforming to Ryan and Deci's (2000) Self-determination Theory, there are two

types of motivation, extrinsic and intrinsic. In his study, Harter (2011) stated that intrinsically driven students learn voluntarily and always choose complex challenges. Harter (2011) also emphasized that intrinsically driven students can successfully acquire new concepts and gain a deeper understanding of the subject matter. On the other hand, extrinsic motivation includes parental expectations, expectations of other trustworthy role models, and satisfactory grades, according to Benabou and Tirole (2003). Extrinsic motivation is frequently more effective and requires less work than intrinsic motivation, as Ryan & Deci (2000) stated. Bain (2004) claimed that pupils are extrinsically motivated to acquire higher marks and rewards. However, students' drive wanes once the incentive is eliminated, as Delong and Winter (2002) commented.

**Reinforcement Strategies.** This refers to any stimulus that encourages a particular behavior to be maintained or increase in occurrence. In a classroom setting, this can be defined as giving good grades, affirmation, small treats, and the like (Fatmala, 2020). There are different ways reinforcement programs are implemented, which will be discussed in the themes below.

**Intangible Rewards.** Rewards come in myriad forms, while intangible rewards in academics mainly refer to indirect non-verbal reinforcement and direct verbal cues. The direct verbal cues consist of compliments and words of encouragement towards a group of learners or even a specific learner. At the same time, indirect non-verbal reinforcement may be as simple as initiating a round of applause or compliments of the efforts (Kharel, 2012). This theme is manifested in the following responses below:

It adds motivation if the work is appreciated, especially if the teacher makes a few examples during the feedback as I have experienced. With efforts recognized, the students are more motivated to improve and further advance their effort  
[ST 10]

These rewards coming with the feedback are empowering, because it serves as motivation for students to do their best when they make their outputs. They like to be recognized, and commended even if it is indirectly said, like no names were mentioned.  
[ST 5]

As manifested in the responses of student 10 and student 5, they both agree that whole-class feedback is highly effective in motivating students, especially when their works are publicly appreciated. According to student 10 and student 5, it is somehow empowering when teachers compliment and recognize their work even anonymously.

Hoffmann et al. (2009) proposed that teachers must employ intangible rewards like praise, classroom currency, and even homework passes to foster academic achievement and acceptable classroom behavior in students. Nelson et al. (2010) asserted that delivering praise is a different practical approach for rewarding learner performance and positive behaviors and boosting learner self-esteem. According to Self-Brown and Mathews, cited in Drexler (2010), the usage of praise had a favorable effect. They report that students who receive positive verbal feedback establish more learning goals than students who do not receive verbal feedback.



**Tangible Rewards.** Rewards that are tangible in the classroom or activity are a reward that a teacher gives directly to a student in the form of a symbol or token. It is a reward for doing something correctly or effectively. These rewards are a way to motivate people and are contingent on their achieving the goal (Hoffman, 2009). This is evident from the following responses:

Learners appreciate even the small things, like candy or other simple materials in the lower years, and maybe 10 pesos or whatever, but of course, it is a big deal to at least acknowledge their efforts, and let them pursue greater heights. So I can say it is effective but it also has pros and cons.

[ST 1]

Actually I was given a certificate, it motivated me to do my best. I experienced this in college. It was a certificate that was meant to recognize excellence. It was also the advice of the professor to give rewards aside from candy and material things.

[ST 15]

As manifested in the responses of student 1 and student 15, they both acknowledge the giving of tangible rewards as motivation to bring about the best of students' ability in the teaching and learning process. According to student 1, learners appreciate their teacher when given even the most minor thing or amount as a reward for their hard work. Aside from financial or material things, student 15 emphasizes receiving a certificate as a reward for recognizing his excellence. It is true, based on these responses, that receiving tangible rewards augments students' motivation in the teaching and learning process.

According to Brophy, as reported by Uyen (2016), if a student is not intrinsically motivated to do well, extrinsic motivators like rewards may be employed to encourage them to act. Rewarding students throughout the teaching and learning process is critical for stimulating student interest and motivating them to study. It makes classroom activities more exciting and fosters a sense of student rivalry (Kharel, 2012). Teachers, for example, use tangible prizes such as toys, candy, books, and accessories to inspire student participation and academic progress in the study by Hoffmann et al. (2010).

In the learning environment, it is vital to reinforce good behavior or punish bad behavior. In the context of whole-class feedback, this is when the facilitator gives rewards to learners when some outputs have been exemplary or have gone beyond expectation. This program encourages the learners to maintain the behavior and inspire those who do not currently possess it. According to Santrock (2010), reinforcement is a repercussion that improves the probability of a behavior occurring. Guendouze (2012) argues that a teacher's use of rewards is critical for accelerating students' motivation in the learning process and enhancing its efficacy and efficiency. In her research, Silvina (2014) discovered that rewarding students strengthen their motivation to learn.

**Elaborated Feedback.** This general term for feedback explains why a specific output is correct, incorrect, or incomplete. It enables the learner to have sufficient knowledge in understanding, learning and improving significantly (Corbet & Anderson, 2001). Two of the

six types of elaborated feedback that generated the central theme are presented below as cluster themes.

**Bugs/Misconceptions.** According to Sleeman (1989), this type of elaborated feedback requires error analysis and diagnosis. It is done by discussing the learners' most common errors or misconceptions, explicitly dealing with the "What went wrong" and "Whys." This is evident from the following responses below:

Students are able to know what they should do, as well as the areas that need improvement. The key to it is empowering the students on where to improve, and their strengths and weaknesses.

[ST 16]

It is the most appropriate way of feedbacking. Addressing common mistakes of the learners, and a perk would be that it is time-saving.

[ST 17]

Students 16 and 17 both mentioned and agreed on the consistency of whole-class feedback in providing information on learners' common errors and weaknesses while academically empowering them in doing so. ST 16 even regarded the Bugs/Misconception type of elaborated feedback as the key to empowering students in their learning process.

In recent years, second language learning researchers' attitudes toward learner errors have undergone a substantial and positive shift. George (1972) encapsulated this shift in perspective, who stated, "...at the beginning of the 1960s, the word 'error' was associated with correction, and by the end, with learning." Researchers in second language learning have grown increasingly interested in investigating and analyzing students' errors in this context (Corder, 1967; Duřkova, 1969; Richards, 1971; George, 1972; Taylor, 1975; Sharma, 1981). Lee's findings (2003, 2004, 2007, and 2009) also highlighted the tension associated with error feedback. Despite teachers' diverse feedback practices, she concluded that traditional approaches were evident, such as focusing on students' mistakes and using summative assessments. Conclusively, students' mistakes should be expected and accepted as a natural part of the learning process.

**Informative Tutoring.** This refers to the most elaborated feedback (Narciss & Huth, 2004). It presents verification feedback and strategic hints on improving one's skills when the answer is not provided or fixed. This is seen in the following responses below:

All outputs are checked before delivery, and criteria are explained before the output assignment, and then it also provides ways or tips on how to improve where the learners lack, this is all in a generalized sense.

[ST 4]

Whole-class feedback helped me where to focus, and gave me the drills on which area to improve and how to improve it. It

helps them achieve what they lack with the same feedback that tells them where they lack.

[ST 6]

Feedback is specified and specialized according to the learners' improvement and patterns.

[ST 22]

It is manifested in the responses of students 4 and 6 that whole-class feedback includes suggestions and methods for improvement and focuses on the areas where students need improvement. However, student 22 made a different point, but in the same context, that feedback is carefully crafted based on learner improvements and patterns, making it more learner-friendly and elaborated.

Since information aids in error correction, researchers have begun investigating the informative function of feedback. Even though these explanations are being abandoned, little has been done to explain how feedback assists learners in learning beyond stating that it corrects mistakes. However, feedback is effective if it "feeds forward" (Moss & Brookhart, 2009). It can lead to learning if students are given opportunities to use it in improving performance while suggesting ways to make them build adequate and positive information for their improvement (Wiliam, 2011). Moreover, another group of researchers has linked variations in the effects of feedback manipulations on selective attention to enhanced student concentration (Cardelle & Corno, 1981; Kulhavy et al., 1979). According to Kulhavy and colleagues (Kulhavy et al. 1976 and 1979), these effects can be explained by a model that encourages students to continue scanning a text following specific errors.

This refers to the feedback generally labeled as related to the provision of explanations and discussion about whether a specific output is correct or not. Elaborated feedback may also permit learners to refer to the primary instructional material. In the context of whole-class feedback, the definition only is specific to delivering the feedback to the class as a collective whole and in one sitting. In Addition, when learners are given feedback that indicates whether or not an answer is correct, the opportunities to create meaning from input during the evaluation phase are not limited (Hattie & Timperley, 2007) and, as a result, the effect of feedback on performance will foster (Van der Kleij et al., 2011). Van der Kleij, Feskens, and Eggen (2015) postulate that providing elaborated feedback will stimulate learners' higher-order learning outcomes. They propose that elaborated feedback is especially crucial when teaching complex skills.

**Absence of Task Level Feedback.** Task level feedback is a type of feedback that emphasizes what needs to be done or what makes an output correct (Airasian, 1997). On the other hand, close-level feedback pertains mainly to whole-class feedback, which lacks personal, direct advice from teachers for students' learning. This is divided into two cluster themes listed below:

**No Specific Feedback on their work to progress.** Students may perceive feedback that lacks specificity as useless, frustrating, or both (Williams, 1997). It can also confuse how to respond to the feedback (Fedor, 1991). Though, some may require thorough individualized feedback for a better understanding of their learning situations, as such themes are generated from the responses below:

So in general, whole-class feedback is okay for classroom management, but it shouldn't be used to disregard individual feedback. There should be the use of both.

[ST 4]

I feel like whole-class feedback does not directly state details of what needs improvement in terms of their output. I feel like individual feedback is more suitable because it is explicit on which item and on which output what needs improvement.

[ST 5]

We learners have different needs and difficulties. Generalized feedback cannot answer each and every one of those needs and difficulties that require further consultation and guidance, but as I said, there are still times whole-class feedback is effective.

[ST 7]

In essence, whole-class feedback does not indicate which areas require improvement. It lacks a clear sense of which item, detail, or topic is due to help students overcome their difficulties. As Students 5 and 7 stated, generalized feedback cannot accommodate students' numerous and diverse needs and difficulties. Furthermore, Student 4 suggested that whole-class feedback is an effective classroom management technique, but that individualized feedback should be incorporated and utilized.

The applicability of whole-class feedback across institutions has been called into the discussion when researchers discovered its transient nature and the potential of collapsing academic improvements among pupils. According to Black and Williams (1998), whole-class feedback has been deemed an alternative because it may still be useless for other activities, notably formative evaluations requiring direct teacher guidance. It is insufficient to encompass all dimensions of learning. Thus, other forms of feedback, such as written notes, proved to have a more significant impact on student's development through their learning processes and experiences (Lad, 2020). Although whole-class feedback proved helpful across all age groups, particularly in managing cognitive load for improvement, its proper application is still required (UCL, 2019).

**Absence of Close-Level Feedback.** This refers to feedback interpreted as critical and frequently impedes efforts to improve performance (Fedor, Davis, Maslyn, & Mathieson, 2001). It tends to impede learning, indicates the student's standing concerning peers, and has low specificity on tasks (Butler, 1987; Kluger & DeNisi, 1998; McColskey & Leary, 1985; Wiliam, 2007; Williams, 1997). This is evident in the following responses below:

I really prefer individualized feedback because it gives emphasis on the areas I need to focus, and for me to know where I lack especially on my writing skill.

[ST 10]

For me, one on one consultation or individualized feedback is more efficient, rather than whole-class feedback. Although

whole-class feedback can sometimes address what I need to hear, it is not enough and effective for me. Individualized feedback works better for me, since I am a type of person who dislikes hearing segways input.

[ST 7]

As mentioned by student 10, whole-class feedback did not emphasize the areas that need improvement. It lacks supervision and guidance for students who want straightforward instruction, as stated by student 7. Also, student 7 asserted that individualized feedback states his desired input and is way better than whole-class feedback.

Feedback has been defined as a mechanism for assisting adolescents in changing their behavior or course of action (Berschling & Homman, 1966). According to a study by Riches (2021), whole-class feedback should not always be used in the classroom from an educational standpoint. If we are not cautious in our implementation, this strategy may jeopardize the students' comfort and learning potential. One of its drawbacks is that it does not provide students the personalized feedback they require to improve their work. However, misconceptions are addressed in whole-class feedback practices; what is frequently missing is direct instruction. Riches (2021) proposed that feedback be combined with methods capable of meeting and balancing the changing natures of their activities.

This refers to the lack of close-level emphasis on learning objectives and specific requirements of tasks. The deficiency of clarifying criteria or outcomes becomes almost non-existent at the beginning or during the learning cycle for students to meet and exceed the lesson's purpose. According to Hattie and Timperley (2007), feedback about expectations and standards that arrives at the end of the learning cycle is terminal and of limited value, primarily because the learner is not given additional opportunities to implement the feedback (William, 2011). According to Hattie and Timperley (2007), when task intent and success criteria are aligned with challenging learning objectives, feedback has the potential to be more effective. As a result, Hounsell et al. (2008) cautioned that teachers should be clear and specific when guiding expectations. They found that students can interpret their instructors' learning intent differently.

**Insufficiency of Feedback towards students' concerns.** This specifically refers to the unstable reliability of whole-class feedback to become responsive as it should be. According to William (2020), the instability is caused by how dependent it is on the facilitator's proficiency in delivering the feedback and the ambiguity in addressing individual concerns from the students. This is divided into two themes listed below:

**Ambiguity of Feedback.** This refers to the generalized feedback becoming too generalized and thus ambiguous for learners to assess and evaluate for themselves (William, 2020). This is not only directly caused by the overgeneralization of feedback but also by the tendencies that learners may develop with it.

However, there may be times that the students become lax because they think everyone's performance was fairly satisfactory with the generalized feedback, and will not improve due to this cycle of complacent mentality.

[ST 4]

I feel like whole-class feedback does not directly say specifically what aspect to improve in students' individual output. I feel like it's better even with the individualized feedback where the facilitator places circles on what needs to be improved, as well as comments about it.

[ST 5]

If the feedback is given too generally, as a student, I am unable to directly pinpoint what I need to personally improve in my writing and writing output.

[ST 13]

Student 4 brought up the tendency for students to become sluggish and complacent in their learning when provided with generalized feedback, as they believe that all written outputs are satisfactory and do not require personal and direct consultations and corrections. Additionally, Students 5 and 13 shared that general feedback inhibits their ability to improve, whereas individualized feedback enables them to excel. Therefore, learners cannot directly identify which specific writing skill or strategy requires improvement when given too generalized feedback.

As Burns (2021) claimed, the term whole-class feedback is ambiguous because it implies that everyone gets the same feedback. Also, one disadvantage of whole-class feedback, as prompted by Riches (2019), is that students do not receive the same input they require to progress with their work which leads to misunderstandings. Thus, whole-class feedback has to do with general misconceptions supported by Tes Magazine (2021), stating that critics believe this strategy eliminates individualized input and may impede the advancement of the highest achievers if whole-class feedback is ineffectively executed.

**Lack of Dependability.** According to Riches (2021), this specifically refers to the dangerous tendencies of whole-class feedback to become efficient. The instability is caused by how dependent it is on the facilitator's proficiency in delivering the feedback, as well as the inability to address the students' individual concerns. This is manifested in the following responses below:

Yes, but it always goes back to how the teacher delivers the feedback or how the teacher tells his students what the feedback is.

[ST 3]

We learners have different needs and difficulties. Generalized feedback cannot answer each and every one of those needs and difficulties...It's more on the implementation of the teacher rather than the approach itself. It is already established that there is a general feedback with the expected outcomes, and it varies from there what the teacher emphasizes and accounts for errors and provides recommendations. So it depends if it is effectively, and adequately implemented by the teacher.

[ST 7]

The response of Student 3 demonstrates his reliance on the facilitator's expertise. The feedback may become ineffective when the facilitator lacks the necessary skills, sensitivity, and consistency. Furthermore, student 7 emphasized that different learners have different needs, concerns, and difficulties that a generalized form of feedback cannot fully address. Student 7 also mentioned the adequacy and effectiveness of whole-class feedback, which highly depends on the teacher's implementation.

Riches (2021) noted that whole-class feedback leaves students who need individualized feedback unaddressed and stagnant in their progress. This is due to the inevitable individuality of the learner, along with their learning styles. Furthermore, Gamble (2021) emphasized whole-class feedback's inability to help weaker students. Facilitators should be mindful of the circumstances when conducting whole-class feedback (Riches 2021).

It is challenging to consider the time and effort spent on feedback if it has no positive impact on the areas where students need to improve. This suggests that the primary criterion for evaluating teachers' inputs is their impact on what students' concerns could produce, improve, and advance, rather than their content, style, or timing. Learning advancement has no effect because students do not absorb or even read the information provided by teachers. After all, it does not meet their needs. In other cases, such as when students receive overly critical feedback on their work, it can be harmful to their learning (Kluger and DeNisi, 1996; Hattie and Timperley, 2007).

### Implementation of Whole-class feedback

The implementation of whole-class feedback is common among students of all ages. As it is conducted at least occasionally in each class. The thematic analysis on table 2 has generated themes that discuss various implementations that are suggested by the respondents, namely: *Explicit feedbacking, Positive Motivation Belief and Self-Esteem, Quality information to students about their learning, Development of self-assessment in learning, Feedback Collaboration, and Computer-Assisted Learning and Feedback.*

The table 2 below has revealed emerging themes from the responses of the students in our one-on-one interviews and focus group discussion. The respondents had provided various suggestions for how teachers should implement whole-class feedback to maximize its potential, lessen the severities and tendencies of its cons, and to their preference. The context of implementation varies and are set on face-to-face and online class setup separately, or collectively.

**Table 2**  
Implementation of Whole-class feedback

Basic Theme	Organizing Theme	Global Themes
Pinpointing errors (ST 14, & ST 18)	Explicit Correction	Explicit Feedbacking

Using Specific Outputs as  
Examples in giving corrections  
(ST 2, & ST 5)

---

Specify what needs improvement  
(ST 17, ST 4)

---

Should have a checklist or guide  
on the feedbacking (ST 7, ST 10)

---

**Explicit Criteria**

Making Students aware of a  
rubric (ST 4, ST 14, ST 17)

---

Should not sound biased (ST 2,  
ST 12, ST 16)

---

**Avoidance of Using  
Negative Comments**

Avoiding insulting/ downgrading  
words (ST 3, ST 6, ST 15,)

---

Delivering Concise and Honest  
feedback (ST 5, ST 10, ST 19)

---

**Positive Motivational  
Belief and Self-Esteem**

Recognizing excellence (ST 9,  
ST 16, ST 18)

---

**Constructive  
Feedbacking**

Providing recommendations after  
corrections (ST 3, ST 4, ST 7)

---

Giving clear expectations  
(ST 1, ST 8)

---

**Words of Praise and  
Encouragement**



---

Giving Positive Words (ST 2, ST 3, ST 10)

---

Checking of outputs at the same time (ST 4, ST 17)

---

Giving feedback only upon return of the output (ST 1, ST 3, & ST 18)

---

**Output Return Before Feedback**

**Quality Information to Students about their Learning**

Emphasizing clarity and conciseness (ST 7, ST 16)

---

**Identifying own Action Points Based on Received Feedback**

Enabling Students to track progress (ST 3, ST 18)

---

Learners' initiative to self-reinforce

(ST 6, ST 16, ST 20)

---

**Self-Enhancement of individual skills**

Offers time to contemplate areas of improvement (ST 2, ST 11)

---

Inducing inaccuracies through teachers' clear instruction and correction (ST 18, ST 16,)

---

**Development of Self-Assessment in Learning**

Prompting self-assessment and study from teachers' generalized feedback (ST 9, ST 20)

**Learners' Teacher-prompted Self-Assessment**

Allowing Students to share of  
writing strategies (ST 15, ST 20)

---

**Regulating Peer  
Interaction**

Allowing Students to share their  
outputs and sources (ST 5, ST 2,  
ST 3)

---

**Feedback  
Collaboration**

Students' Compliance to Teacher  
Expectations (ST 1, ST 18)

---

**Student-Teacher  
Partnership**

Students' Adherence to  
Attainable and Explicit Feedback  
(ST 7, ST 17, ST 20)

---

Moderating the use Assistive  
Checking tools to Learners (ST 5,  
ST 22)

---

**Assistive Checking Tools  
for Writing**

Encouraging the use of Assistive  
Checking tools for Learning (ST  
10, ST 4, ST 20)

---

**Computer-Assisted  
Learning and  
Feedback**

Non-Real-Time Feedback Using  
Recorded videos, and Online  
Forums (ST 1, ST 15)

---

**Digital Media on  
Feedback Delivery**

Real-Time Feedback Using  
Video And/or Audio Conferences  
(ST 5, ST 2)

---

**Explicit Feedbacking.** This refers to the feedback indicating the corrections and the criteria it is based on (Ellis, R. et al. 2006.). This includes giving examples of the errors, informing the learners of the criteria before the output making, checklists, preparing feedback guides, and more. The central theme is divided into two, explicit correction and explicit criteria, discussed below in the following table.

**Explicit Correction.** This refers to how the given feedback highlights the learners' awareness of mistakes or errors in an attempt to understand better what makes the output wrong or correct (Lyster and Ranta. 1997 as cited in Ellis, R., et al. 2006). This provides an avenue for academic growth and personal growth, as students become aware of and learn from the errors they have made in their own outputs, increasing resilience when receiving explicit correction.

Prior to implementation, maybe, the teacher should state their rubrics during whole-class feedback so the students wouldn't wonder but rather understand where they were wrong.

[ST 14]

My ideal way is to point out errors one by one, and where learners should improve on. I observed that teachers when conducting whole-class feedback are not specific enough in pointing out errors such as vocabulary, grammar, citation, and etc. Perhaps it wouldn't be too much trouble for the teacher to at least give specific examples on what to change or improve.

[ST 5]

The students should know what they are heading towards, in a sense that they know what they should do to improve from the mistakes they made, from your explanation in your feedback.

[ST 4]

As explicitly stated by ST 5, whole-class feedback should be implemented in a way that it points to the errors without being too generalized but is still concise on the areas that need improvement by using a few specific examples from the outputs. Additionally, ST 14 suggests that whole-class feedback should be conducted so that learners become well-aware of their errors concerning ST 4 and ST 5's statement that the feedback should especially specify areas that need improvement aside from the technical errors.

In a related study, Van den Bergh et al. (2014) suggests that the value of feedback is partly affected by the establishment and communication of specific learning goals. Van den

Bergh et al. (2014) added compelling evidence that defining explicit goals, typically with criteria for high-quality performance on a task, dramatically improves students' performance. Thus, Gibbs (2004) claimed that standards or criteria must be transparent and comprehensible to students as the actual value may lie in internalizing the norms intended to increase the quality of their work.

**Explicit Criteria.** Refers to a criterion-based checklist for monitoring and assessing students' abilities in certain areas. This checklist is also used to help students improve and track their progress by describing their knowledge, mastery, and improvements on a scale (Guskey, 2000). The aim of a reference in feedback is threefold: (1) to direct student learning by defining the competencies that must be acquired. (2) enhance their consistency in areas where the class's objectives are being met. (3) gathers data to monitor students' progress toward course objectives (Goetz & Ridgway, 2001).

I think for a whole-class approach to be effective, you need to have a concrete basis for your feedback, like a checklist before giving the feedback itself. Most teachers just do whole-class feedback in an impromptu manner, and I really think there should be a plan laid out carefully.

[ST 7]

Prepare a general criteria, for technicalities, for the writing, their format, their content. It should be explained to the learners to make it clear for them what they should be hitting, and what they should and should not do. At the very least, the teacher and the learners have the same vision, and they understand what needs to be done.

[ST 4]

As manifested by ST 7 and ST 4's responses, the effectiveness of the whole-class feedback is shouldered by how carefully it is planned. He added that a checklist and a concrete basis should be in order for maximum effectiveness. This was further established by ST 4, stating that for the learners and the facilitator to have the same vision of what needs to be done, the facilitator should use a general criterion to ensure productivity and minimize errors.

In related literature, obtaining insightful feedback is critical for any educational experience (Lawrence, 2005). However, in practice, the format of such feedback differs considerably among programs. In pedagogical words, how a student understands feedback may differ from the message the pointer tries to convey. This does little to advance learners' comprehension and learning. According to Brown (2004), this phenomenon prompted various concerns across educational sectors about how feedback should be delivered and the type of input most beneficial to students' advancement. Developing criterion-referenced feedback is essential for meeting the needs of learners and considering the quality of information throughout the process. It satisfies the need for schools to pay attention to their pupils and investigates how revising feedback methods enables students to make active progress in their learning (Brown,2004). Additionally, Brooks and Brooks (1993) demonstrated that having a

basis for providing evaluations should result in a meaningful experience for students as they construct their knowledge, rather than teachers doing so for them.

Explicit feedback becomes crucial when delivering whole-class feedback, as it allows learners precise data of their outputs and provides more data for improvement and guidance. According to Carless (2015), feedback is the process through which students make sense of data about their performance and utilize it to improve the quality of their work or learning strategies. Effective feedback should consider instructors' efforts to increase student's awareness of the objective of assessment and assessment criteria. According to Lipnevich et al. (2013), providing students with specific criteria that break down the criteria for determining where they fall short can help students understand the feedback they received.

**Positive Motivational Belief and Self-Esteem.** Cultivating the learners' cognitive aspect is essential to their academic growth; however, the affective aspect is just as important, as their motivation is a combination of interest and perceived ability to succeed (Pickford, R. et al. 2009). Feedback may be a catalyst for the loss of their motivation when delivered too harshly, unappreciative, biased, or too generalized. The theme is divided into three specific aspects: sensitivity to the affective factor, constructive feedbacking, and prioritizing motivation.

**Avoidance of Using Negative Comments.** This describes the emphasis of placing importance on the affective factor that influences learners' academic growth. According to Sutton, J. Ph.D. (2020), harsh feedback may be counterproductive in various ways. In the context of whole-class feedback, this refers to taking into consideration the learners' feelings and the weight of the manner of delivery towards them. This encompasses the minimal use of degrading, insulting words, biased comments, and examples.

It should not sound biased, nor should it be too direct. There are students who will not take it lightly when their output becomes an example for the wrong outputs. The teacher first needs to consider the feelings of the students before delivery.

[ST 12]

It should not be biased, cause we cannot pinpoint or mention names. We need to be objective, and focus on what needs improvement.

[ST 16]

It should not be in a way that is insulting, it should be in a way that is constructive and provides for more learning opportunities.

[ST 3]

ST 12 and ST 16 had both manifested that the Feedback delivery should avoid all forms of biases in consideration of the feelings of the owners of each output. Specifically, ST 16 mentioned that explicitly pinpointing outputs and dropping names should also be avoided and instead focus on improvement rather than using names or unsatisfactory outputs. On a slight contrast but similar manifestation, ST 3 recommended feedback should be done in a way that still corrects the learners but not in a way that degrades them or strips them of their motivation, but instead in a way that opens them to learning opportunities.

The degree to which students are satisfied with their learning environment, on the other hand, is tremendously variable (Chandler, 2001; Chyung, Winiecki, & Fenner, 1998; Hall, 1990). Student happiness with their learning environment is a significant indicator of educational perseverance (Chandler, 2001; Chyung, 2001). Although numerous individual characteristics influence student pleasure, one controllable instructional component is the level of feedback provided by the teacher to the student. Student motivation is aided by feedback incorporating affective components, promoting student pleasure and persistence in learning. Supportive language was defined as language that encourages and motivates students to do better through increased effort and more effective tactics for valuing learning. Additionally, it gives information about progress toward goals, which is utilized to supplement and aid in establishing contextual awareness.

**Constructive Feedbacking.** Feedbacking is often perceived as a critique of one's output or performance. Constructive feedback is a critique given in a manner that is centered on the purpose of improvement rather than highlighting what is lacking or the errors in the given output (CFI, 2020). Similarly, that whole-class feedback should be centered on the points of potential improvement and less on the errors committed by the learners.

Teachers should utilize whole class feedbacking in a way that everyone can easily follow as to what they want to address. Teachers should have it done in a constructive way so that the students will not be offended, and make it sound like not too demanding. I mean, doing it positively so that students will not be afraid to commit mistakes in their work  
[ST 10]

I've also read that on the internet because I thought whole-class feedback is all about the problems you need to address, but it includes the praising of exemplary students and recognizing satisfactory outputs.  
[ST 18]

The approach here of the teachers would also matter. It should not be in a way that is insulting, it should be constructive and provides learning opportunities.  
[ST 3]

Aside from the sensitivity teachers should have with their words, the delivery still would not suffice with only consideration as manifested by ST 3 and ST 18. Their responses brought up the concepts of recognition of excellence and provided recommendations for learning opportunities for feedback to be constructively productive. In agreement with the previous responses above, ST 10 added a beneficial result to the implementation of constructive feedbacking, which is that students are less intimidated to commit mistakes, thus making the learning more meaningful and productive.

The most effective feedback is those in which teachers and students collaborate across organizational levels in the classroom. When teachers' expertise is sufficient to meet students' requirements, feedback should be sensitive and effortless. According to The Globe and Mail

(2020), commending pupils with genuine appreciation builds their confidence, particularly in their academic experiences. When providing feedback, practice diplomacy. One can reframe criticism as questions or insightful suggestions to ensure that one's intent and the recipient's response are consistent. Anon (1986) also developed many ways for assessing instructors' proficiency to improve classroom feedback processes, although they remain largely unstructured. As a result, Lahti's (1978) investigation became a justification for these acts lacking the sophisticated appraisal systems that could have been employed to enhance learning experiences.

**Words of Praise and Encouragement.** This refers to highlighting the importance of motivation in one's learning process. In the context of whole-class feedback, it is concerned that the feedback itself should present as motivating to the learners and prompt them to improve their writing skills. This is achieved by delivering corrections, words of appreciation for their effort, and praise for those who displayed excellence in their work.

If there is feedback, it's sweet for the ears when it is taken constructively, and is motivating. Even if it is simple, it increases motivation thus, the learner will strive to improve in the next activities. So yeah, motivation has a vital role in feedback.  
[ST 18]

The Pygmalion effect. It's a type of motivation that places expectations on students to activate their drive to impress or to meet those expectations and better themselves and not fail the facilitator expecting better results.  
[ST 1]

As manifested by ST 1 and ST 18, both agree that prioritizing motivation does not necessarily mean sugarcoating one's critique. Instead, it focuses on the constructive aspect of feedback and improvement, as the anticipation of betterment becomes the motivation itself for the learners. Specifically, ST 1 made a point by explaining the use of the Pygmalion effect when implementing whole-class feedback. It is the use of placing expectations on the learners during whole-class feedback as a drive for learners to better themselves and become the primary source of motivation.

According to a study published in The Korea Times (2013), teacher expectations were more indicative of students' futures than student motivation or effort. Teachers, the survey discovered, were also more accurate in predicting a student's college achievement than parents or even the students themselves. In this regard, the Pygmalion effect enables people to internalize their labels, allowing those with favorable labels to grow. The core premise is that if an individual feels he or she can accomplish anything, that individual will succeed. The Pygmalion effect's importance in education and teaching drew researchers' attention, not only on a theoretical but also on a practical level. Gao (2009) discovered that the Pygmalion effect is prevalent in education because it can play a constructive role in enhancing the relationship between teachers and students, as well as in rehabilitating learners' confidence to tap into their potential and progress toward their goals.

The importance of motivational components and values within academic engagements on students' performance has been emphasized by researchers (Eccles and Wigfield, 2002). Dona and Berry (1994) state that only a tiny percentage of students experience stress and pressure in an educational setting. Which was reinforced by NCES (2006), providing a result of 19% of students who dropped out of high school all because they did not feel they belonged during their sophomore years; however, research has shown that motivational beliefs (e.g., self-efficacy or academic self-efficacy) will play an essential role in a variety of contexts.

**Quality Information to Students about their Learning.** Teachers aim to increase their learners' ability to understand the self-regulation process (Md. Mamoon-Al-Bashir, 2016). This refers to enabling the students to track their learning progress through whole-class feedback. The generated global theme is divided into the most evident among the responses: *Output return before feedback and Identifying own Action Points Based on Received Feedback*.

**Output Return Before Feedback.** This specifically refers to the output having already returned to the learners prior to conducting whole-class feedback, implying that whole-class feedback should not be implemented if this is not done, and will thus be missing to maximize the potential learning progress and transparency, as propounded by Kean et al., (2008).

The outputs must be returned because they need to see where they stand on the errors they made, so when the professor gives the feedback, they are guided with transparency of their own work.

[ST 18]

What you must do is the checking should be at the same time for all outputs, so no output error should be left out or unevenly graded, also for the class to improve as a collective unit.

[ST 4]

Manifested by the responses ST 4 and 18 provided, certain conditions need to be met or met before the facilitator can conduct whole-class feedback. ST 18's response was in consideration for the transparency of the learners of their progress and recommended that their outputs should be given back to them before conducting the feedback so they can track their errors and progress in line with the feedback in real-time. On a similar concept of conditions before conducting whole-class feedback, student 4 strongly recommended that all outputs be checked simultaneously, so no output error would be left unaccounted for, and the feedback would be more authentic and applicable to the class whole.

By transparency, according to Anderson et al. (2013), specifies the teacher's teaching style and how it correlates with the course goals, which clarifies students with the instructor's choices of the lesson plan. Kean et al. (2008) purported that teachers should intentionally be transparent with their students because it is how pedagogy works. Cuevas et al. (2010) extend the notion of intentionality and transparency to include the deliberate alignment of course-level outcomes, instructional, and learning activities. Moreover, according to (Vesely, 2011), the notion could be accomplished by discussing the chosen teaching techniques with students, acknowledging that teachers have taken into consideration that students have different learning styles that need to be considered and developing class activities and assessments with this in mind.



**Identifying own Action Points Based on Received Feedback.** The essence of feedback is to prompt corrections on the output and improve the receiver. This theme manifests the need to use specific techniques to emphasize the need and provide the learner's ability to track their progress to secure improvement. This includes emphasizing the clarity and conciseness of feedback and providing the learners the means to track their progress during the feedback (Bolkan, 2017).

What you ask for teachers is the clarity and conciseness of the feedback. This is so we clearly understand where we need to improve based on the feedback. That in itself would be motivating because you know exactly what to address with yourself, whether it is grammar, writing style, etc.

[ST 7]

The whole-class feedback should only be done when learners have already received their output after checking... Only that time, the teacher can do feedback, because upon seeing their output and upon listening to the feedback, they can reflect or they can trace.

[ST 3]

Placing importance on the clarity and conciseness of the feedback itself is highly beneficial for the learner to know where exactly they need to improve and track their progress. This, in turn, would also motivate them as it guides them to center their focus on a particular aspect in writing, as manifested by ST 3 and ST 7.

Teacher clarity is a practical instructional approach for learners of diverse backgrounds (Titsworth et al., 2015). Phuong et al. (2017) asserted that the discovery of teacher clarity in giving feedback practices has the potential to meet the needs of diverse learners and empower teachers to meet high-stakes accountability measures. Bolkan et al. (2017) further stated that the strategies and approaches that instructor use to ensure that students improve pedagogical practices encompass teachers' clarity in delivering the feedback. He also propounded that giving feedback should be straightforward, efficient, coherent, interactive, and structured instructions (Bolkan 2017).

**Development of Self-Assessment in Learning.** This refers to the facilitator encouraging metacognition in learning for the learners. It includes prompts to reflect on their output and the feedback provided individually and may include teacher-prompted self-assessments such as using ambiguity to evoke students into making deductions and improving their works, equipping, and empowering students as propounded by Rusk (1919). This central theme is divided into the self-enhancement and the teacher-prompted self-enhancement, as discussed below.

**Self-Enhancement of individual skills.** This refers to regulating students' improvement in the context of writing. Utilizing whole-class feedback, students are encouraged to reinforce and contemplate their own learning to better the areas that lack proficiency, emphasizing metacognition and self-enhancement, based on Catalano et al. (1995) 's

demonstration. Such self-enhancement is observed from the participants in the following responses:

The main point of whole-class feedback is to motivate students and develop their weak areas. Developing their thinking skills from generalized feedback will help students reflect on their output whether it's correct or not. And with that, it helps develop their skills and motivates them to do well.

[ST 6]

It is useful for students' part because we would be able to identify our mistakes, exactly. We would be able to comprehend well which aspects or areas need improvement.

[ST 2]

Student 6 demonstrated the importance of contemplation within one's output once the feedback has been given. She further stated that from generalized feedback students will develop in reflecting on their output. Moreover, student 2 asserted that it has proved useful for students since they can identify their mistakes and improve specific areas and aspects.

One of education's primary goals is to equip students with the skills necessary to maximize their potential and start educating themselves (Rusk, 1919). The primary objective of institutions in all spheres of life is to enable students to develop their cognitive abilities and establish career paths. Catalano et al. (1995) demonstrated, however, that academic problems contribute significantly to learners' vulnerability when viewed in a broader context. On the other hand, while academic problems are serious, research suggests that schools should prioritize skill-building or academic skill-enhancement programs that result in academic achievement gains.

**Learners' Teacher-prompted Self-Assessment.** This refers to a specific self-evaluation among students that is anchored on teachers' instructive and corrective feedback. Learners are encouraged to assess themselves based on the teachers' learning-oriented feedback while also developing their own strategies for dealing with areas that need improvement, as propounded by Boud (1991). Similarly, even if feedback is generalized, students must still self-study and assess their own learning.

Teachers will clearly explain the errors, so that learners will understand the areas where they went wrong. So, with that, learners will then create actionable steps or actionable ways on how to overcome that problem.

[ST 18]

If ever whole-class feedback is what my teacher would do in assessing or in feedbacking my output. Since I couldn't really pinpoint what went wrong or whatsoever, but it would encourage me to study; it would encourage me to assess what are the things that need my output lacking or etc., so I think in part where it encourages self-learning, it would be helpful.

[ST 9]

Student 18 ascertained that when clear feedback is given to explain the errors, learners will better understand the areas that lack mastery and create actionable steps to surmount them. Moreover, student 9 mentioned that when teachers use whole-class feedback in assessing outputs, it will encourage self-learning since pinpointing errors are not present.

Students who practice self-assessment may be more motivated to learn. According to Boud (1991), self-assessment among students allows them to provide learning-oriented feedback, which helps them improve in the coming years as students become more reflective, confident, and prepared for professional practice (Fink, 2003). According to studies, self-assessment has been fairly used in practice by higher educators, regardless of its assistance in motivating students to learn. In this phenomenon, where teachers' roles are an important influence in shaping a better youth for learners, Rogers (1951) and Axline (1969) stipulated that interaction should be brought for personal growth and skills that will enable them to provide nurturance and guidance, establish and maintain relationships, and so on.

Across institutions, the method of self-assessment has been accepted for continuous improvement. The discipline's incorporation has resulted in distinct and explicit features for improving students' learning experiences. Self-assessment, from a scholarly perspective, is a tool that both teachers and students can use to improve their performances and identify strengths and weaknesses in any area. Further, this section is divided into two (2) detailed sections, namely: *Self-Enhancement of Individual skills and Learners' teacher-prompted Self-Assessment*. Student self-assessment is unique in the current era of standards-based education in terms of its potential to increase student motivation and engagement in learning. There is substantial evidence to support this type of assessment, as it has been shown to be positively associated with students' motivation and academic achievement (Black & William, 1998). Schunk (2004) argued that students who self-monitor tend to be deliberate in their actions, frequently in relation to external standards. As a result, they are more cognizant of their learning progress. To summarize, self-assessment is necessary for effective learning participation (Sadler, 1989 & Black & Williams, 1998).

**Feedback Collaboration.** This theme is the process of an instructor initiating collaborations with students to improve their learning with feedback and de-antagonizing feedback itself (Bordo, R. 2019). The feedbacking process comes with the encouragement of peer interaction and learning challenges the teachers set for students to cooperate with, which are cluster themes discussed below.

**Regulating Peer Interaction.** This refers to whole-class feedback providing an avenue for collaboration between learners, encouraging them to compare outputs and share writing strategies, improving their interpersonal skills as well as their learning stance. A pedagogical intervention that provides learners by modeling collaborative patterns in their interactions and explicitly instructing them to provide peer feedback in the process. (Kim & McDonough, 2011 as cited in Sato, Masatoshi. 2013.)

I would use whole-class feedback to lessen misconceptions, and encourage referencing other outputs. If I were a student, I could easily refer to my classmates' output to see if they did it right or wrong, then refer back to my own work, even if it is negative.

[ST 15]

For me, this collaboration is helpful, but it should be limited because there is a chance of the abuse of imitation. I would like uniqueness, however, there are collaborations that may be a healthy contribution, so I will still allow it anyway.

[ST 2]

Students should be allowed to collaborate with classmates to improve their works and learn from one another, sharing strategies is beneficial but should be limited as the outputs may have the tendency to be too similar to each other.

[ST 5]

Learner-to-learner interaction is never new in the context of learning; thus, collaborations between them are nothing new as well. Both ST 2 and 15 suggest that the feedback itself should encourage referencing other outputs in order to learn further. However, mentioned by ST 2 and 5 that there should be limitations in place as imitations, and complacency might result in too intimate peer collaboration or reliance.

It is essential for high-quality learning designs to facilitate instructors' monitoring and evaluation of students' self-directed learning (SRL) (Paterson and Prideaux, 2020). The success of students in online higher education depends heavily on the regulation of peer interaction, but this aspect of the research process has received little consideration (Broadbent and Poon, 2015). Consequently, it is crucial to learn the most effective ways to assist students in managing their online peer interactions. Students require an explanation of the "teacher as designer" in order to regulate their interactions with their peers.

**Student-Teacher partnership.** This refers to the cooperation of the learner to comply and adhere to the teacher's expectations and learning challenges for them. It is also given that the teacher must set expectations and learning challenges that are plausible and attainable for a student's level, meeting halfway with the student in the learning process, as supported by Brooks, C. (2022) in a related and online context, as manifested by the responses below.

I would say I would relate it to the pygmalion effect. Setting expectations to drive themselves to improve and reach it. There would be accountability, a burst of attention and motivation to learn. So yes, I think that would be best paired with whole-class feedback.

[ST1]

Of course, it is important to set a goal, if there are no expectations then most outputs would be mediocre. But if I set attainable expectations that they can reach as a student, then I can be able to draw their outputs to a much better quality and their cooperation on my expectations.

[ST 2]

Students will seek explicit feedback, so for them to understand and comply with the feedback, it needs to be clear, and based on their writing skills. This is to ensure their compliance, and motivation.

[ST 7]

As manifested in the responses of student one and student 2, they both believed that setting expectations are important to give learners a boost of motivation while, at the same time, giving them accountability with the feedback to do better next time. Also, attainable feedback must be emphasized for learners not to give up halfway and become complacent. As also manifested in the response of student 7, he advocates for the clearness and conciseness of feedback given by the teachers ensuring that students have an idea on how to apply the feedback exactly and enthusiastically.

The teacher-student partnership was established because it was deemed essential for fostering a more positive environment in the classroom and the larger community (Lave & Wenger, 2011; Mitra, 2008). Students and teachers collaborate in this approach to school reform to identify and address the most pressing issues in their schools (Mitra, 2008, Kennedy & Datnow, 2001). While teachers and administrators are encouraged to hear from students, they are also expected to participate in the group's activities on an equal basis. Significant change is brought about because of the previously repressed and disregarded student's voice. As a result of student voice initiatives, students and faculty no longer adhere to traditional power hierarchies in schools. Instead, they work together to investigate a phenomenon in greater depth as equals.

This pertains to the collaboration of the learners with their classmates and learners with their teachers. The different collaborations yield different learning processes and experiences. Peer interaction improves interpersonal skills and information gathering skills, whereas student-teacher partnership involves more compliance to expectations and setting attainable goals and challenges. Collaboration has the potential to transform student learning. Students who work together to solve a problem they both face benefit low-achieving students greatly. Roschelle (1992) discovered that the convergence of shared meaning and notes facilitates collaborative interaction, knowledge construction, and monitoring. As a result, students can explain and reorganize their knowledge in a collaborative learning environment (Van Boxtel et.al, 2000).

**Computer-Assisted Learning and Feedback.** Computer-assisted learning refers to any form of learning that is mediated by a computer or electronic gadget that makes interaction possible for a learner and the instructor without direct presence. Computer-assisted feedback, as the name implies, is simply a means of delivering feedback with the assistance of a computer. The global theme emerged from the cluster themes that focus on assistive checking tools, digital media on feedback delivery, and their varying ways.

**Assistive Checking Tools for Writing.** The utilization of Assistive tools such as Grammarly and Quillbot are not necessarily academic crimes or hindrances. These are tools that are beneficial and are for assisting the user and facilitating different technicalities in writing (Stanberry, K. & Raskind, M. 2009). Promoting authentic information, as well as

contents of feedback, is just a few of the benefits entailed by the progressive shift of means in assisting teachers throughout the development of professional responsibilities.

There should be a limit to the utilization of these applications, learners are indeed encouraged to use it during the feedback process but they should not solely rely on it. As a teacher, I also use it but I practice vigilance and discretion to its use. So I would still encourage it when conducting whole-class feedback.

[ST 5]

Yes, I remember telling my students to use grammarly. It is very controversial because some argue that it would allow students to become lax in their grammar. But I believe integrating technology would help them self-correct and may serve as an extra feedback to the whole-class feedback should it prove insufficient for them. It's for free too, so it's better to utilize tools as they are meant to be used.

[ST 20]

Manifested by ST 5 and ST 20, in the context of being 21st-century learners and teachers, we have to integrate the technology we are in so as to not waste the tools that are available to us to improve our writing skills. However, ST 5 noted a limit to the utilization of assistive checking tools as they may have a side effect, as students may rely on them completely and not learn from the tools provided. Despite the suggested limitation, ST 5 still is in favor of encouraging the use of assistive checking tools during feedback.

Gupta (2010) demonstrates that when students utilize computers, the complexity and length of their writing improve; he further claims that these effects persist even when students return to writing by hand. Additionally, Gupta (2010) concluded that the use of computers helped students produce better essays. He believes that one of the reasons for the improvement is that students have access to the correct spelling of new words and words they passively know. As a result, students can confidently use these words without fear of making spelling errors that would have a significant impact on their evaluation. However, Salomon et al. (2004) concluded that in the context of teaching, it is not technology but instruction that leads to progress in writing skills.

**Digital Media on Feedback Delivery.** The feedback has always been delivered in the classroom or written into the outputs themselves; however, due to the 2020 pandemic, all educational interactions and transactions were held online. In the context of whole-class feedback, the feedback itself has been delivered into two major types: real-time and non-real-time. These types utilize technology that can disseminate feedback through live video, online forums, recorded videos, or audio conferences. This theme will focus solely on feedback mode of delivery, which is manifested below by the participants.

I had experienced forums in which the whole class can access the feedback, and also recorded video sessions especially for online teaching demonstrations. It's effective considering the current situation and it is the best we can do as of now.

[ST 1]

For me, it's better if it is in Gmeet or Zoom. It is more verbal, and students are able to question. I cannot see the beauty of non-real time whole-class feedback because students rarely have the courage to question or add input in the comment section. Unlike in live whole-class feedback they are more comfortable speaking their minds and asking questions compared to the forum or recorded videos.

[ST 5]

While there are various ways to deliver feedback, ST 5 strongly suggested the use of live delivery using zoom or google meet. The purpose of this is to ensure the learners are able to participate and question the feedback for deeper understanding and to preserve the learning momentum as opposed to ST 1's non-real-time suggestions such as the use of forums and recorded feedback which is centered on the needs and convenience of the teacher, rather than the student.

Given that feedback is one of the most essential learning principles, it must be purposefully incorporated into the online learning course (Theory into Practice, 2003). According to Dean (1998), instructor feedback helps student achievement; yet a lack of appropriate feedback is a possible "weak spot" of distance education (Willis, 2002). Due to time constraints, teachers cannot regularly provide such thorough feedback when teaching online courses (Graham et al., 2001). Consequently, instructors must incorporate student input into the instructional design process for distance learning courses with the use of audio-visual recordings that are frequently more informative and simpler for students to comprehend than text-based comments (Mahoney, Macfarlane, & Ajjawi, 2018). In addition to facial emotions, body language, tempo, and tone, recordings can convey additional information to pupils through facial expressions and body language. These additional cues may also help establish a sense of social presence (Ice, Curtis, Phillips, & Wells, 2007).

This pertains to the assistance and integration of computer-based technology, and its impact on the delivery of feedback. Education in the twenty-first century utilizes a computer-assisted tool that is one of the most valuable gifts of the current digital age. Many have remarked that for feedback to be helpful, students must interact with it in some way (Sachs and Polio, 2007). Due to the necessity to analyze computer-assisted feedback, Suzuki (2012) claimed that for students who can accept ambiguity, computer-assisted feedback could boost input engagement. Also, with computer-assisted learning, we can study at any moment (Srivani & Manhar, 2020).

### **Conclusion**

The research journey involved engaging with twenty-two college education students, allowing us to tap into their rich perceptions and insights regarding the implementation of whole-class feedback. Our findings have illuminated the multifaceted contributions of whole-class feedback to enhancing students' writing skills. These encompass the responsiveness of teachers to students' unique needs, the advantageous features of self-regulation tools, motivational gains, the reinforcement of learning programs, the employment of sophisticated instructional approaches, and the elimination of issues related to task uniformity, while also highlighting

certain shortcomings in addressing individual concerns. The results further underscore the multifaceted nature of whole-class feedback, which incorporates explicit feedback, positive motivational belief, quality information dissemination to students about their learning progress, the development of self-assessment skills, fostering collaborative dynamics between peers and teachers, and the integration of computer-assisted delivery methods.

In the process, our research has allowed us to bear witness to a diverse spectrum of viewpoints from recipients of this feedback strategy. While some participants voiced their preference for individualized feedback, others stood in opposition, advocating for the effectiveness and utility of whole-class feedback. We've had the privilege of observing how whole-class feedback functions as a self-regulatory tool, significantly improving students' writing skills and equipping them with valuable strategies and tips shared by educators or peers to enhance the quality of their written work. The findings also emphasize the importance of complementing whole-class feedback with explicit elements such as a strong emphasis on criteria and the incorporation of informative tutoring to maximize its impact on students' writing proficiency.

Despite the unique challenges posed by the pandemic, our research journey has been a remarkable learning experience. It has offered us the privilege of delving into the thoughts, ideas, and perceptions of participants as they generously shared their insights during online interviews. This investigation, which centrally focused on feedback, initially posed a risk to us as researchers. However, it provided us with a gateway to showcase our capabilities and dedication as researchers and students. The complexity of whole-class feedback gradually unraveled as the online interviews unfolded, further enhancing our understanding of the topic and motivating us to delve deeper.

Throughout the research process, we've incorporated multiple perspectives and insights, drawing from various sources, including academic literature, to enrich our analysis. The countless hours spent transcribing, analyzing, and interpreting copious amounts of data, coupled with the occasional frustrations and exhaustion, have only served to strengthen our bond as a research team. We firmly believe that our research has made a substantial contribution by gathering a diverse range of perceptions and recommendations regarding whole-class feedback, while also shedding light on the time constraints faced by teachers when providing written feedback. Our findings recognize both the challenges and merits of whole-class feedback, especially in light of the demanding workload placed on educators. Despite individual preferences for feedback types, whole-class feedback has proven to be effective for a majority of students. Looking ahead, we acknowledge the importance of further studies exploring different contexts of whole-class feedback within the broader educational landscape.

## REFERENCES

- Adachi, C., Tai, J. H. M., & Dawson, P. (2018). Academics' perceptions of the benefits and challenges of self and peer assessment in Higher Education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(2), 294–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1339775>
- Al-Bashir, et al. (2016). The Value and Effectiveness of Feedback in Improving Students' Learning and Professionalizing Teaching in Higher Education. *Journal of Education and Practice Vol.7, No.16, 2016*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1105282.pdf>



- Anderson, A., Hunt, A., Powell, R., Dollar, C. B. (2013). Student Perceptions of Teaching Transparency. *The Journal of Effective Teaching*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 2013, 38-47. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695.
- Andrade, H. & Du, Y. (2005). Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(3), 1-11. Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/pdf/v10n3.pdf>
- Andrade, M. S. (2016). Effective organizational structures and processes: Addressing issues of change. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 173, 31-42. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20177>
- Asian Development Bank. (2020). Meeting the Challenges of the New Normal in School Education: An Online Workshop for Policymakers, Teacher Educators, and School leaders. <https://events.development.asia/learning-events/meeting-challenges-new-normal-school-education-online-workshop-policymakers-teacher>
- Black, P., & William, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2). Retrieved from [www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kbla9810.htm](http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kbla9810.htm)
- Black, P., and D. Wiliam. 1998. "Assessment and Classroom Learning." *Assessment in Education* 5(1): 7-74.
- Black, P., and D. Wiliam. 1998. "Assessment and Classroom Learning." *Assessment in Education* 5(1): 7-74.
- Bolkan, S. (2017a). Development and validation of the clarity indicators scale. *Communication Education*, 66(1), 19-36. doi:10.1080/03634523.2016.1202994
- Bolkan, S. (2017b). Instructor clarity, generative processes, and mastery goals: Examining the effects of signaling on student learning. *Communication Education*, 66(4), 385-401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2017.1313438>
- Bolkan, S., Goodboy, A. K., & Myers, S. A. (2017). Conditional processes of effective instructor communication and increases in students' cognitive learning. *Communication Education*, 66(2), 129-147. doi:10.1080/03634523.2016.1241889
- Bonner G, (2018). Focus on Feedback: Examining Alternative Methods for Efficiency and Effectiveness. Available from: <http://ihjournal.com/focus-on-feedback-examining-alternative-methods-for-efficiency-and-effectiveness>
- Brown, A.L. (1994/2001). 'The advancement of learning, *Educational Research*, 23 (8): 4-12.
- Bordo, R. (2019). Collaborative Feedback: *Creating Accountability*. Advantexe.com Retrieved from: <https://www.advantexe.com/blog/collaborative-feedback-creating-accountability>

- Brooks, C. (2022) Improving Feedback and Fostering Collaboration with Technology. Edutopia. Retrieved from: <https://www.edutopia.org/article/improving-feedback-and-fostering-collaboration-technology>
- Brown, T. (2000). *A descriptive study of peer-editing in a middle school language arts classroom*. Retrieved May 16, 2008, from the ProQuest database.
- Brown, G. T., Harris, L. R., & Harnett, J. (2012). Teacher beliefs about feedback within an assessment for learning environment: Endorsement of improved learning over student well-being. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(7), 968-978. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.05.003>
- Brown, K. M. (1996). The role of internal and external factors in the discontinuation of off-campus students. *Distance Education*, 77(1), 44-71.
- Burns, R. (2021). Whole-class Feedback: Strategies and Experiences. <https://www.headteacher-update.com/best-practice-article/whole-class-feedback-strategies-and-experiences-pedagogy-marking-assessment-classroom-practice-teachers/237988/>
- Butler, R. (1987). Task-involving and ego-involving properties of evaluation: Effects of different feedback conditions on motivational perceptions, interest, and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*
- Butler, S., & McMunn, N. (2006). *A teacher's guide to classroom assessment: Understanding and using assessment to improve student learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 219-233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572132>
- Carless, D., Salter, D., Yang, M., & Lam, J. (2011). Developing sustainable feedback practices. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(4), 395-407
- Carless, D. (2015). *Excellence in university assessment: Learning from award-winning practice*. London: Routledge.
- CFI team (2022) Constructive Feedback. Corporate finance institute.com retrieved from <https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/careers/soft-skills/constructive-feedback/>
- Christodoulou D (2019) Whole-class feedback: Saviour or fad? In: *The No More Marking Blog*. Available at: <https://blog.nomoremarking.com/whole-class-feedback-saviour-or-fad-5c54c463a4d0> (accessed 11 December 2019).
- Cawley, J., (2020). Marking and feedback, is whole-class feedback the answer? <https://voices.britishschool.nl/2020/03/05/marking-and-feedback-is-whole-class-feedback-the-answer/>
- Cuevas, N. M., Matveev, A. G. & Miller, K. O. (2010). Mapping General Education Outcomes in the Major: Intentionality and Transparency. Peer Review (Winter), 10- 15.

- Davis, W. D., Carson, C. M., Ammeter, A. P., & Treadway, D. C. (2005). The interactive effects of goal orientation and feedback specificity on task performance. *Human Performance*, 18, 409–426
- Deeley, S. (2019) Exploring the Wicked Problem of Student Dissatisfaction with Assessment and Feedback in Higher Education. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23752696.2019.1644659>
- Educational Endowment Foundation, (2015). Feedback. Available from: <http://www.Educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/toolkit/toolkit-a-z/feedback/>
- Elliot V et al., (2016) A Marked Improvement. A Review of the Evidence On Written Marking. Available from: [http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/public/files/Presentation/Publications/EF\\_Marking\\_Review\\_April\\_2016.pdf](http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/public/files/Presentation/Publications/EF_Marking_Review_April_2016.pdf)
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND THE ACQUISITION OF L2 GRAMMAR. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 339-368. doi:10.1017/S0272263106060141
- Fatmala, R. (2020). Teachers' classroom instruction reinforcement strategies in English language class.
- Fedor, D. B. (1991). Recipient responses to performance feedback: A proposed model and its implications. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 9, 73–120
- Gao, Z, (2009). A utilize study on Pygmalion effect of idea education in middle schools: Northeast Normal University <https://www.proquest.com/pq1academic/docview/1870008532/7166616DAE6E4CEB/PQ/7?accountid=50192>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2007). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 14.0 update*. Boston: Pearson.
- Gibson, S., et al., (2015). Workload Challenge: analysis of teacher consultation responses research report. London: Department for Education. Available from: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/401406/RR445\\_-\\_Workload\\_Challenge\\_-\\_Analysis\\_of\\_teacher\\_consultation\\_responses\\_FINAL.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/401406/RR445_-_Workload_Challenge_-_Analysis_of_teacher_consultation_responses_FINAL.pdf)
- Gibbs, G. & Simpson, C. (2004). Conditions under which Assessment Supports Students' Learning in *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, I. Hyejin, K. et al., (2016). Characteristics of Qualitative Descriptive Studies: A Systematic Review. US National Library of Medicine. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5225027/>
- Hattie, J. and Timperley, H. (2007) *The power of feedback*. *Review of Educational Research*, 77 (1), 81-112
- Ishii, Y., (2011). A survey of learners' preferences about teachers' feedback on writing. Proceedings of the PAAL. China, 16, 403-409.

- Ishii, Y. (2001). A survey of learners' preferences about teachers' feedback on writing. *Proceedings of the PAAL*. China, 16, 403-409. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337447005\\_The\\_Importance\\_of\\_Immediate\\_Constructive\\_Feedback\\_on\\_Students'\\_Instrumental\\_Motivation\\_in\\_Speaking\\_in\\_English](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337447005_The_Importance_of_Immediate_Constructive_Feedback_on_Students'_Instrumental_Motivation_in_Speaking_in_English)
- ITWRG, (2016). Eliminating unnecessary workload around marking. Available from: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/401406/RR445\\_-\\_Workload\\_Challenge\\_-\\_Analysis\\_of\\_teacher\\_consultation\\_responses\\_FINAL.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/401406/RR445_-_Workload_Challenge_-_Analysis_of_teacher_consultation_responses_FINAL.pdf)
- Kean, R. C., Mitchell, N. D. & Wilson, D. E. (2008). Toward Intentionality and Transparency: Analysis and Reflection on the Process of General Education Reform. *Peer Review*, (Fall), 4-8.
- Kharel, Y. K. (2012). Practice of Reward in ELT Classroom. Thesis. Tribhuvan University: Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 254–284.
- Lad, N. (2020). Thoughts on feedback. In: The researcher teacher. Available at: <https://researchteacher.home.blog/2020/11/07/thoughts-on-feedback> (accessed 15 November 2020).
- Lee, P-M. and Quazi, H.A. (2001), "A methodology for developing a self-assessment tool to measure quality performance in organizations", *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol. 18, pp. 118-41
- .Lee, D., Watson, S. L., & Watson, W. R. (2019). Systematic literature review on self-regulated learning in massive open online courses. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 35(1), 28–41.
- LeFebre, L., & Allen, M. (2014). Teacher Immediacy and Student Learning: An Examination of Lecture/ Laboratory and self-contained course sections. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 14, 29-45. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337447005\\_The\\_Importance\\_of\\_Immediate\\_Constructive\\_Feedback\\_on\\_Students'\\_Instrumental\\_Motivation\\_in\\_Speaking\\_in\\_English](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337447005_The_Importance_of_Immediate_Constructive_Feedback_on_Students'_Instrumental_Motivation_in_Speaking_in_English)
- Lipnevich, A. A., McCallen, L. N., Miles, K. P., & Smith, J. K. (2013). Mind the Gap! Students' use of exemplars and detailed rubrics as formative assessment. Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht, <https://doi/10.1007/s11251-013-9299-9>
- McColskev, W., & Leary, M.R. (1985). Differential effects of norm-referenced and self-referenced feedback on performance expectancies, attribution, and motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 10, 275-284

- McDonal, R. (2021). What does effective whole-class feedback in English looks like? Driffield School and Sixth Form, UK; English Subject Lead, The Education Alliance, UK. [https://my.chartered.college/impact\\_article/what-does-effective-whole-class-feedback-in-english-look-like/](https://my.chartered.college/impact_article/what-does-effective-whole-class-feedback-in-english-look-like/)
- McMillan, J. H., & Hearn, J. (2008). Student self-assessment: The key to stronger student motivation and higher achievement. *Educational Horizons*, 87(1), 40-49. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ815370&login.aspx&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- McMillan, J. H. (2009). Synthesis of issues and implications for practice. In T. R. Guskey (Ed.), *Practical solutions for serious problems in standards-based grading* (pp. 105-120). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Md. Mamoon-Al-Bashir (2016). The Value and Effectiveness of Feedback in Improving Student' Learning and Professionalizing Teaching in Education. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1105282.pdf>
- Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 501-517. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1105282.pdf>
- OECD (2015), "Responsiveness of schools to student needs", in *Government at a Glance 2015*, OECD Publishing, Paris
- Orrell, J. (2006). Feedback on learning achievement: rhetoric and reality. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(4), 441-456. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1105282.pdf>
- Palinkas, L. et al., (2015). *Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research*. US National Library of Medicine. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4012002/>
- Phuong, A. L., Nguyen, J. J., & Marie, D. D. (2017). Conceptualizing an adaptive and data-driven equity-oriented pedagogy. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal*, 10(2), 1-20.
- Pickford, R., Priestley, J., Ashgar, M., Brown, S., Race, P., Procter, K., Thomas-Osbourne, R., Rayner, A. & Taylor, J. (2009) *Designing first-year assessment and feedback: a guide for university staff*. Assessment, learning & teaching, Leeds Metropolitan University, available at [http://www.leedsmet.ac.uk/0906016-36503\\_Designing\\_1st\\_Assessment\\_LoRes.pdf](http://www.leedsmet.ac.uk/0906016-36503_Designing_1st_Assessment_LoRes.pdf)
- Race, P. (2019). *The lecturer's toolkit: A practical guide to assessment, learning and teaching*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429060205>
- Reeves, D. B. (2008, February). Leading to change/ effective grading practices. *Educational Leadership*, 65(5), 85-87.

- Riches, A. (2019). *Whole-class feedback: Practical tips and ideas*. UK Primary School Headteachers. <https://www.headteacher-update.com/best-practice-article/whole-class-feedback-practical-tips-and-ideas-assessment-pedagogy-teaching-marking-1/236434/>
- Ryan, M., Hodson-Carlton, K. & Ali, N. (2005). A model for faculty teaching online: confirmation of a dimensional matrix. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 44(8),357-365. Retrieved from A model for faculty teaching online: confirmation of a dimensional matrix
- Sadler, D. R. 1989. "Formative Assessment and the Design of Instructional Systems." *Instructional Science* 18(2): 119–144.
- Schünemann, N., Spörer, N., Völlinger, V. A., & Brunstein, J. C. (2017). Peer feedback mediates the impact of self-regulation procedures on strategy use and reading comprehension in reciprocal teaching groups. *Instructional Science*, 45(4), 395–415. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-017-9409-1>
- Shute, V. J., Woltz, D. J., & Regian, J. W. (1989, May). *An investigation of learner differences in an ITS environment: There's no such thing as a free lunch*. Paper presented at the 4th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Education–AI-ED '89, Amsterdam, Holland.
- Shute, V. J., Hansen, E. G., & Almond, R. G. (2007). *An assessment for a learning system called ACED: Designing for learning effectiveness and accessibility*. ETS Research Report No. RR-07-26, Princeton, NJ.
- Simon, M. (2011). The Role of the Researcher. Retrieved from <https://portal.regenesys.net/course/discussions/editors/kcfinder/upload/files/The%20roles%20of%20the%20researcher%20202011%20httpdissertationrecipes.com-wp-content/uploads-2011-04-Role-of-the-Researcher.pdf.pdf>
- Sleeman, D. H., Kelly, A. E., Martinak, R. W. (1973). *Towards more Intelligent Teaching*. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1974-01834-001>.
- Stanberry, K. & Raskind, M. (2009). *Assistive Technology Tools: Writing. Reading Rockets.org*. Retrieved from: <https://www.readingrockets.org/article/assistive-technology-tools-writing>
- Sutton, J. (2020) 15 Ways to Give Negative Feedback, Positively (+ Examples). *Positive Psychology.com*. Retrieved from: <https://positivepsychology.com/negative-feedback/>
- The Asia-Pacific Education. (2021). *Understanding Changes in EFL Teachers' Feedback Practice During COVID-19: Implication for Teacher Feedback Literacy at a Time of Crisis*. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40299-021-00583-9>
- The Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (2001). *What is Descriptive Research. The Association for Educational Communications and Technology*. <http://members.aect.org/edtech/ed1/41/41-01.html>

- Titsworth, S., Mazer, J. P., Goodboy, A. K., Bolkan, S., & Myers, S. A. (2015). Two meta-analyses exploring the relationship between teacher clarity and student learning. *Communication Education*, 64(4), 385–418. doi:10.1080/03634523.2015.1041998
- Topping, K. J. (2017). Peer assessment: Learning by judging and discussing the work of other learners. *Interdisciplinary Education and Psychology*, 1(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.31532/interdiscipeducpsychol.1.1.007>
- University College London (UCL), (2019). UCL Verbal Feedback Project report 2019. Available at: [www.ucl.ac.uk/widening-participation/sites/widening-participation/files/2019\\_verbal\\_feedback\\_project\\_final\\_4\\_print.pdf](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/widening-participation/sites/widening-participation/files/2019_verbal_feedback_project_final_4_print.pdf) (accessed 11 December 2019).
- Van den Bergh, L, Ros, A & Beijaard, D, 2013, ‘Teacher feedback during active learning: Current practices in primary schools’, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol 83, no. 2, pp 341-362.
- Vasileiou, K. et al., (2018). *Characterising and justifying sample size sufficiency in interview-based studies: systematic analysis of qualitative health research over a 15-year period*. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. <https://bmcmmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12874-018-0594-7>
- Vesely, M. (2011). Transparency in Teaching. University of Waterloo Centre for Teaching Excellence Blog. Retrieved from <http://cte-blog.uwaterloo.ca/?p=2467>
- William D. (2011). *Embedded Formative Assessment*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Williams, S.E. (1997). Teachers’ written comments and students’ responses: A socially constructed interaction. *Proceeding of the annual meeting of the Conference on College of Composition and Communication*, Phoenix, AZ. Retrieved
- William, D. (2007). Keeping learning on track: Classroom assessment and the regulation of learning. In F.K. Lester Jr. (Ed), *Second handbook of mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 1053-1098). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- William, D. (2013). Assessment: The bridge between teaching and learning. *Voices from the Middle*, 21(2), 15.
- William, D. (2020). *Whole-class Feedback: Making it work at a Distance*. Class Teaching: A Popular Move. <https://classteaching.wordpress.com/2020/10/12/whole-class-feedback-making-it-work-at-a-distance/>
- William, D. (2020). Whole-class feedback: Making it Work in a distance. October 12, 2020. Class Teaching Find the Bright Spot. <https://classteaching.wordpress.com/2020/10/12/whole-class-feedback-making-it-work-at-a-distance/>
- Wenglinsky, H. (2000). *How teaching matters: Bringing the classroom back into discussions of teacher quality*. Princeton, NJ: The Milken Family Foundation and Educational Testing Service.

Yorke, M (2003) Formative assessment in higher education: Moves towards theory and the enhancement of pedagogic practice, *Higher Education*, 45(4), 477-501.

Zamora, Á., Suárez, J. M., & Ardura, D. (2018). Error detection and self-assessment as mechanisms to promote self-regulation of learning among secondary education students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 111(2), 175–185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2016.1225657>

Zubin, A. & Sutton, J. (2015). *Qualitative Research: Data Collection, Analysis, and Management*. National Library of Medicine. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4485510/#>