

International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research
Vol. 21, No. 7, pp. 330-344, July 2022
<https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.21.7.17>
Received Apr 27, 2022; Revised Jul 15, 2022; Accepted Jul 29, 2022

Exploring Perceptions of Online Feedback in Teaching EFL Speaking and Writing Skills during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Paul Gonzalez-Torres* , Paola Cabrera-Solano 
and Luz Castillo-Cuesta 

Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja (UTPL), Loja, Ecuador

Abstract. The purpose of this study was to analyze perceptions of how online feedback was provided in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes, particularly to enhance speaking and writing skills, during the COVID-19 pandemic. The participants were 102 teachers, 40 managers, 80 parents and 120 students from junior high school, senior high school, and higher education levels from 40 public and private educational institutions in southern Ecuador. The sample selection was based on purposeful sampling (voluntary participation). The instruments included questionnaires from students, teachers, parents and educational authorities. In addition, an interview was used to ascertain students' views about the feedback received in speaking and writing activities. The instruments were designed to collect information about perceptions regarding online feedback in EFL remote teaching of speaking and writing skills. The questionnaires were designed to collect information about feedback for productive skills in EFL remote teaching. The collected data were tabulated and analyzed using descriptive statistics. The results indicate that online feedback is perceived as an aspect that seems to have a better quality in private institutions, especially in activities related to EFL speaking and writing skills. Another important finding was that technological tools in the EFL classroom are believed to be efficient since teachers in public and private institutions use a variety of technological resources for teaching speaking and writing skills. The fundamental aspects of feedback were time and teacher training.

Keywords: online feedback; pandemic; remote teaching; technological skills; speaking and writing skills

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic changed many aspects of life, including education. According to Khatoony and Nezhadmehr (2020), the pandemic presented a variety of challenges for EFL teachers, including the use of online teaching

* Corresponding author: *Paul Gonzalez-Torres*, pfgonzalez@utpl.edu.ec

strategies to improve students' language proficiency. In this context, there is a need for exploring perceptions related to online feedback in remote teaching. Feedback has been considered an essential element of evidence of the students' learning, performance, knowledge or understanding. However, feedback does not necessarily lead students to self-correction and improvement (Lee, 2017). The information from the feedback given has been regarded as helpful to improve learners' linguistic knowledge (Bitchener, 2009), which enhances EFL learners' skills. Feedback can also help learners overcome errors that they make while acquiring the target language (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). From this perspective, feedback is the information provided to EFL students to overcome their errors and improve their EFL skills. This process of providing and receiving feedback is positively perceived and appreciated by both teachers and students (Chen et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2016).

Feedback is also important when teaching productive skills such as writing and speaking. In this respect, Harmer (2004) claimed that writing is a fundamental skill for foreign language learners, as much as for everyone using a first language; therefore, he explained that the reasons for teaching writing to EFL students include reinforcement, language development, learning style, and, most importantly, writing itself.

Speaking skills are essential in EFL teaching and learning and involve the active production of oral messages (As, 2016; Bahadorfar & Omidvar, 2014). In this respect, acquiring the ability to speak involves a great deal of effort, so a variety of teaching approaches should be implemented to enhance speaking skills (Leong & Ahmadi, 2017).

Considering feedback for teaching writing and speaking, technology has been very useful for this purpose. In fact, information and communication technology (ICT) has a fundamental role in the field of language teaching. Thus, EFL teachers are expected to integrate ICT in the classroom, but this application of technology in learning requires not only language skills and strategies but also technological skills (Cakici, 2016).

Considering the importance of feedback for enhancing speaking and writing skills, as well as the relevance of technology for EFL teaching, especially in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, the research questions addressed in this study are the following:

1. What are the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of feedback that students received for enhancing productive skills?
2. What types of feedback are more frequently provided for enhancing productive skills in the EFL remote teaching?
3. What are the technological resources used to provide feedback for productive skills in EFL remote teaching?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Teaching EFL Productive Skills

English as a foreign language teaching involves the acquisition of receptive and productive skills, which play a fundamental role in communication. According to Golkovaa and Hubackova (2014), receptive skills (reading and listening) are usually taught first, and they should be followed by productive ones (speaking and writing). This process contributes to achieving learning outcomes since they are dependent on each other. As for productive skills, they refer to transmitting information that a learner produces orally or in written form; however, it is necessary to mention that both types of skills would not be developed without the proper support of the receptive ones, so none of these active skills should be neglected (Golkovaa & Hubackova, 2014; Djabborova, 2020).

In a study about productive skills, Sokolik (2003) stated that writing may be defined in terms of three key contrasts. The first is that writing is both a physical and a mental act. Second, there are two purposes when writing, which are to express and impress, and the third refers to the process and product steps that a writer follows to create a piece of written work. As for the reasons for teaching writing, Harmer (2004) claimed that this skill should be enhanced in an EFL lesson to promote language reinforcement, and most importantly, writing itself. When students write correctly and logically, they are able to use appropriate language and style in their study and work (Dwivedi & Chakravarthy, 2015). For this reason, it is essential to look for new alternatives for teaching writing effectively in the EFL lesson.

In regard to speaking skills, Chaney and Burk (1998) stated that they refer to “the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols, in a variety of contexts” (p. 13). Speaking involves the active production of oral messages, and it is related to the act of producing words that can be understood by listeners. Speaking constitutes one of the most significant skills in EFL teaching and learning (As, 2016; Bahadorfar & Omidvar, 2014). Leong and Ahmadi (2017) also asserted that acquiring the ability to speak is a process that requires much effort, so a variety of teaching approaches should be employed to help students overcome any difficulty in speaking the target language. In this teaching process of productive skills, feedback is considered a fundamental aspect to enhance these types of skills.

2.2 The role of feedback in teaching productive skills

Feedback has been considered an essential element in the EFL classroom to provide evidence related to the students’ learning, performance, knowledge, or understanding (Hibbi et al., 2021; Bognár et al., 2021). However, feedback does not necessarily lead students to self-correction and improvement (Lee, 2017). The information from the feedback given is viewed as helpful to improve learners’ linguistic knowledge (Bitchener, 2009), which enhances EFL learners’ skills. Feedback can also help learners overcome errors that they make while acquiring the target language (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). From this perspective, feedback is the information provided to EFL students, so they overcome their errors and improve their language skills.

This process of providing and receiving feedback is positively perceived and appreciated by both teachers and students (Chen et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2016). Feedback has been proven to be effective (Irwin, 2017; Siewert, 2011; Zheng & Yu, 2018) and it is an aid in the students' academic progress, which can explain misunderstandings and make students aware of errors.

Some types of feedback can be applied in the teaching-learning process of productive skills. According to Lee (2017), it is necessary to engage students in learning by using the three main types of feedback: peer feedback, technology-enhanced feedback, and teacher feedback.

Peer feedback has been widely researched in a second language (L2). It requires learners' training before implementing it. The benefits of peer feedback include students' awareness of their strengths and weaknesses in writing, critical thinking, and learners' autonomy. In contrast, there are shortcomings in peer feedback such as learners' limited L2 proficiency and class size.

Technology-enhanced feedback, which can be also called computer-mediated/electronic feedback, is automatic and immediate. It has been put forth as an alternative to the feedback provided by people. This type of feedback has some advantages (such as saving teacher's time, fostering learner's autonomy) and disadvantages (such as limited impact on writing improvement).

In the case of teacher feedback, the instructor is seen as the most important source of error correction. A great deal of teacher feedback research has been conducted in university contexts, but the knowledge of teacher feedback in L2 school contexts is limited. This type of feedback has mostly focused on form (language), rather than other aspects, such as content or organization. Teacher feedback may be the most common way to support students while they attempt to apply their recently acquired knowledge (Borup et al., 2015).

Moreover, there are two main strategies: direct feedback and indirect feedback (Westmacott, 2017). Direct feedback involves providing the learner with the correct form, and indirect feedback means giving a hint that an error has been made but without providing the correct form (Sheen, 2011).

2.3 ICT tools for providing feedback

Providing feedback in an EFL class is not an easy task. Technology today offers a variety of options that can be utilized to provide feedback, Despite it being a complicated issue. Usually, feedback is mostly provided on productive skills (writing and speaking) but, to access feedback, students may have to use receptive skills such as reading and listening. The use and impact of technology on feedback is an aspect that has been researched, but it needs more study (Cunningham, 2019).

ICTs are another source that complements or facilitate feedback and supports students. One example of these ICTs would be online resources, including online

writing labs (OWLs) or other sites that provide students with materials, feedback, and exercises that will allow them to learn more about various aspects of the target language (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). Another example are the language-editing tools, such as Grammarly, which identify errors in grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, and even language style. Those tools provide feedback by underlining errors throughout the text (Barrot, 2020).

The integration of technology has extended the way teachers provide EFL learners with feedback (Abusa'aleek & Alotaibi, 2022). In the case of ICTs to provide feedback on writing and speaking, we can mention a variety of collaborative tools, such as is the case of blogs, social networks, Wikis, online collaborative writing and storing tools such as Google Docs, discussion boards and forums, podcasts, movie-making tools, digital story tools, or e-portfolios (Vicentini & De Oliveira, 2018).

Another ICT tool that can be used is video, which can also be used for providing feedback. The students are required to watch videos and revise their work (Soltanpour & Valizadeh, 2018). Feedback from peers and instructors can also be given by using audio tracks or any audiovisual media (Kawinkoonlasate, 2021). Additionally, web-based language learning is quite useful when it comes to speaking skills. Web-based tools that can help students are general websites providing linguistic inputs, blogging platforms, communication tools, project-based learning tools, and learning management systems (Cong-Lem, 2018). In this regard, e-feedback is feedback provided with the use of technology, which allows students to ask for clarifications, to engage in discussions, and to make effective revisions (Abusa'aleek & Alotaibi, 2022).

2.4 Previous Studies

Shang (2017) compared EFL university learners' experience of employing asynchronous peer feedback (APF) and synchronous corrective feedback (SCF) and if the use of these two types of feedback had an impact on the EFL learners' writing, specifically syntactic complexity. The main findings suggested that most participants received satisfactory results. The feedback that occurred in APF was more useful than that in SCF in writing more sentences. Additionally, students increased their writing scores after using APF.

Tseng and Yeh (2019) investigated students' perceptions of the importance of feedback for improving English speaking between students who received video feedback, those who received written feedback and their preferences for one of these types of feedback. The participants were 43 EFL learners who produced video clips before and after receiving peer feedback. A survey was used to identify students' preferences after receiving feedback in terms of pronunciation, intonation, fluency, grammar, and word use. The results evidenced that both types of feedback were useful for enhancing the participants' speaking skills. Written feedback helped the students learn grammar rules and word use. Video feedback allowed students to improve their intonation. However, pronunciation and fluency were not significantly improved. The participants also preferred written over video feedback because it was efficient and clear.

Ali (2016) analyzed the effect of using screencast video feedback on EFL students' writing and their perceptions of receiving screencast feedback. The participants were 63 students of an academic writing course at a university in Egypt. They were divided into an experimental and a control group. The researcher used a mixed-methods approach and applied two writing tests that were administered before and after the intervention, in which the experimental group received video feedback, while the control group received written comments. In addition, an online questionnaire was used to determine the participants' perceptions regarding screencast feedback, which was applied to the experimental group. The findings demonstrated that the students in the experimental group had better results than the control group. The results also evidenced that most of the participants in the experimental group had positive perceptions of screencast feedback. The participants mentioned some difficulties such as slow loading time and difficulty to download videos.

Xu and Yu (2018) conducted a study to determine the effects and benefits of computer-mediated communication (CMC) peer feedback. The study was conducted with 26 second-year EFL students at a Chinese university. The project aimed to increase EFL students' engagement with peer feedback activities and to help them enhance their writing by means of CMC peer feedback. The analysis of various sources of data, including questionnaires, interviews, blog-based peer comments, student writing assignments, classroom observations, and teacher reflections, demonstrate the way in which blog-based CMC peer feedback can enhance students' engagement with peer feedback tasks.

Soria et al. (2020) investigated the best form of giving feedback through a messaging technological application to students from various primary education schools located in Tarragona, Spain. A total of 30 EFL learners participated voluntarily and were divided into three groups according to their age. The experiment took place for three weeks. The researchers collected data through questionnaires and used a mixed-method approach to analyze them. In the questionnaire, participants were asked to reply to several questions, expressing their opinions about the type of feedback they received. The findings revealed that the most popular form of feedback among young learners were smileys and images, and other feedback that was not written. In addition, a set of varied images, even to send corrective feedback, motivated young learners.

3. Method

3.1 Setting and Participants

The sample for this study consisted of 342 participants divided into 102 EFL teachers, 40 educational authorities, 120 students, and 80 parents. They belonged to 40 public and private institutions (see Table 1) that included junior, senior high school, and higher education institutions in southern Ecuador. The students received EFL classes based on the emergency prioritized curriculum established by the Ecuadorian Ministry of Education and had different proficiency levels of the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe, 2020). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, these students took EFL lessons via remote learning.

Table 1: Sample distribution

Participants	N	Public	Private
Teachers	102	58%	42%
Students	120	75%	25%
Authorities	40	40%	60%
Parents	80	43%	57%

3.2 Research Instruments

The questionnaires used in this study were designed by the researchers using the Google Forms tool, adding a consent form before users started to answer the questions.

These questionnaires were directed to four types of participants:

1. A 15-item students' questionnaire was administered to examine their perceptions regarding the types and quality of feedback that they received through technological resources.
2. A 15-item teachers' questionnaire, which included 2 sections (feedback section and technology section), was applied to determine their experience when offering feedback on EFL productive skills during the pandemic.
3. A 10-item questionnaire was applied to parents of junior and senior high school students to identify their perceptions of the feedback that students received through technological tools.
4. A 10-item questionnaire was administered to educational authorities to explore their opinions on the feedback provided by EFL teachers in their institutions.
5. An interview was applied to gather students' perceptions regarding the feedback received in speaking and writing activities.

The questionnaires were based on a five point Likert scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree). These instruments were pilot tested with a group of teachers, educational authorities, parents, and students who were not part of the actual study. Data obtained from the pilot test were analyzed using Cronbach Alpha's statistical analysis, which produced an r coefficient of 0.78, which implies that the instruments have acceptable internal consistency.

3.3 Data Gathering Procedure

This study was exploratory in nature with a mixed-method approach to analyze the feedback and the technological resources on EFL writing and speaking. The educational institutions were approached to obtain their permission, and then purposeful sampling was applied to select teachers, educational authorities, parents, and students, who gave their consent to participate. The reason for applying purposeful sampling was that the researchers considered teachers, students, authorities and parents as individuals who can provide different points of view about online feedback. Moreover, their participation was voluntary.

The questionnaires were administered via e-mail to the participants after one year of receiving classes under the emergency adapted curriculum. These instruments allowed analysis of the types of feedback that were used, the participants' perceptions about the quality of feedback, and the technological resources used to

provide feedback in teaching EFL productive skills during the pandemic. In addition, a sample of 10 students was interviewed via Zoom about the feedback that they received in their writing and speaking activities in class.

After collecting the information from the respondents, the data of the questionnaires were detailed in the form of tables of frequencies using SPSS, indicating the trends found. The data collected from the questionnaires were contrasted for the presentation, analysis, and discussion of results. The data of the interviews were also used to cross-check the information provided in the questionnaires.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 What Are the Participants' Perceptions Regarding the Quality of Feedback That Students Received for Enhancing Productive Skills?

As for the perceptions about the quality of feedback for teaching speaking and writing skills, the results in Table 2 show that 68.8% of the teachers from private institutions provide feedback and establish learning goals, expectations, and rules of conduct. In public institutions, this percentage is lower (48.1%). These results indicate that there is a better quality of feedback in private institutions. Furthermore, students and parents also agreed on this aspect and say that teachers correct mistakes and encourage students to do activities to reinforce their EFL learning of speaking and writing skills based on learning goals, expectations, and rules of conduct. Similarly, authorities agreed on the aspect that students are satisfied with the feedback received in the classroom. In this context, it is necessary to point out that, although feedback does not always lead students to self-correction and improvement, it is an essential aspect that provides evidence of students' learning, performance, knowledge, or understanding (Lee, 2017). Our results are consistent with studies that have shown that providing and receiving feedback is positively perceived and appreciated by both teachers and students (Chen et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2016).

Concerning the time devoted to addressing students' concerns, offering feedback, and clearing up doubts, 50% of teachers from private institutions say that they spend enough time addressing students' doubts and providing feedback. In contrast, in public institutions, only 28.3% of teachers do this (see Table 2). Based on these perceptions, we can observe that teachers from public institutions may not invest enough time to consider these aspects of feedback. In regard to this aspect, Selvaraj et al. (2021) posited that, although feedback is an essential practice to improve students' academic performance, the time constraints can be a challenge for teachers to apply feedback in the classroom.

Learning styles are also a central aspect that teachers embrace when providing feedback. Most of them, in both private (79.2%) and public (74.1%) institutions, consider learning styles and students' needs when providing feedback (see Table 2). Students also have their perceptions of the feedback received in speaking and writing tasks. For instance, most students in private (80.2%) and public institutions (68.3%) express that teachers correct students' errors individually, which means more personalized feedback, especially in private institutions. Most

students receive group feedback, which is common in both private (74.6%) and public institutions (82.9%).

Concerning personalized feedback, Planar and Moya (2016) asserted that this type of feedback is an academic demand that places learners at the center of the learning process. Group feedback can be effective, helping students to be part of a collective action (Troussel & Manrique, 2019). In this respect, authorities of both types of institutions, private (84.6%) and public (55.6%) generally believe that students are satisfied with the feedback provided by their English teachers.

Table 2: Teachers' perceptions regarding the quality of feedback provided in EFL remote classes

Items	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree	
	1* %	2* %	1* %	2* %	1* %	2* %	1* %	2* %	1* %	2* %
I provide feedback and establish learning goals, expectations, and rules of conduct.	1.9	0	0	0	1.9	0	48.1	31.3	48.1	68.8
During virtual classes, I have enough time to solve students' concerns, provide feedback, and clear doubts.	1.9	4.2	30.2	8.3	35.8	18.8	28.3	50	3.8	18.8
I consider students' learning styles and needs when providing feedback.	1.9	0	0	0	24.1	20.8	46.3	43.8	27.8	35.4

* 1 = public; 2 = private

4.2 What Types of Feedback Are More Frequently Provided for Enhancing Productive Skills in the EFL Remote Teaching?

Table 3 shows that direct feedback is provided in both types of institutions, public (64.8%) and private (87.6%). Indirect feedback is also provided in public (70.3%) and private (91.7%) institutions, which means that both direct and indirect feedback are offered when students do their speaking and writing tasks. When talking about unfocused feedback, there is a division of opinions, which may indicate that this type of feedback is not very common in these institutions in remote teaching. Therefore, focused feedback could be more frequent in the speaking and writing tasks. It is important to mention that most research studies

have demonstrated that indirect and focused feedback are the most effective in the EFL classroom in comparison to direct and unfocused feedback (Sheen, 2011). This means that the feedback for writing and speaking skills in our study is believed to be appropriate.

Table 3 also indicates that immediate feedback is often provided in private institutions, (83.3%: 50% agreed and 33.3% strongly agreed), while in public institutions, immediate feedback is less frequent (55.5%: 29.6% agreed and 25.9% strongly agreed). In contrast, delayed feedback seems to be rare in both types of institutions since the tendencies show that it is not frequently used by teachers when checking students' errors in productive skills. In addition, peer feedback is a practice that is more frequently used in private institutions (54.2%), while in public institutions, it is less common (40.7%). This tendency could be caused by the students' lower proficiency levels in public institutions, as well as the limited access to technological resources that these students might have. It is necessary to mention that the results of the students' questionnaire, related to the types of feedback provided for speaking and writing skills, are quite similar to the ones provided by the teachers, which further confirms the results that have been discussed.

Table 3: Teachers' perceptions regarding the types of feedback provided for enhancing productive skills

Items	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree	
	1* %	2* %	1* %	2* %	1* %	2* %	1* %	2* %	1* %	2* %
I provide direct feedback (pointing out mistakes directly) on my student's performance and tasks.	3.7	0	5.6	6.3	25.9	6.3	40.7	43.8	24.1	43.8
I provide indirect feedback (pointing out mistakes indirectly) on my student's performance and tasks.	0	0	9.3	4.2	20.4	4.2	44.4	56.3	25.9	35.4
I provide unfocused feedback (feedback on all types of errors) on my student's performance and tasks.	1.9	12.5	18.5	14.6	46.3	20.8	20.4	31.3	13.0	20.8

I provide immediate feedback on my student's errors.	1.9	0	7.4	8.3	35.2	8.3	29.6	50.0	25.9	33.3
I provide delayed feedback on my student's errors.	1.9	10.4	27.8	27.1	44.4	31.3	13.0	18.8	13.0	12.5
I divide students into groups so they can provide peer feedback.	7.4	16.7	25.9	8.3	25.9	20.8	29.6	25.0	11.1	29.2

* 1 = public; 2 = private

4.3 What Are the Technological Resources Used to Provide Feedback for Productive Skills in EFL Remote Teaching?

The findings on technological resources used to provide feedback showed that 81.5% of teachers (sum of the response from agree and strongly agree) from public and 95.7% of teachers (sum of the response from agree and strongly agree) from private institutions use a variety of these resources for teaching speaking and writing skills (see Table 4). Likewise, the students from public (90.5%) and private (85.3%) institutions claim that the use of technological tools in the EFL classroom is efficient.

Regarding the types of technological tools, the students in the interview mentioned some examples such as Word, PowerPoint, Zoom and Google Docs that teachers frequently use to provide online feedback. These results are consistent with Alzamil (2021) and Kusumawati (2020), who found out that the teaching and learning of EFL productive skills using technology did not present many challenges despite problems such as the global COVID-19 pandemic. Furthermore, most of the teachers in public (65%) and private (75%) institutions asserted that they use a variety of ICT tools to provide feedback on their students' performance and tasks. This knowledge might be due to the constant training that most of the teachers of public (75.9%) and private (89.3%) institutions receive in this area (see Table 4).

Considering the learners' perceptions about the technological resources used by their teachers, the students' views indicate an evident division of opinions, which could be a sign of difficulties using technological tools at the moment of receiving their classes. For instance, students in public institutions have more problems using some technological tools because they were not instructed on how to use them properly. Other common problems could also include limited internet connection and lack of technological resources (Shagiakhmetova et al., 2022). Therefore, it can be said that in the Ecuadorian context, the use of technological resources on the part of the teachers is not very common (Cabrera et al., 2021). The perceptions of parents and authorities support the perceptions of students and teachers with similar tendencies in public and private institutions. This means that

feedback is provided on speaking and writing tasks in the EFL classroom by using technological resources, but there could be some difficulties in this aspect.

Table 4: Teachers' perceptions regarding the technological resources used to provide feedback for productive skills in EFL remote teaching

Items	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree	
	1* %	2* %	1* %	2* %	1* %	2* %	1* %	2* %	1* %	2* %
I know how to use technological tools for teaching EFL speaking and writing.	0	0	1.9	0	16.7	4.3	35.2	38.3	46.3	57.4
I use a variety of multimedia tools to provide feedback on my student's performance and tasks.	0	0	7.4	2.1	27.8	20.8	37.0	37.5	27.8	39.6
I receive permanent training in using technological tools for EFL teaching and learning.	7.4	4.3	16.7	6.4	31.5	17.0	18.5	38.3	25.9	34.0

* 1 = public; 2 = private

5. Conclusions

The participants' perception is that online feedback is an aspect that seems to have a better quality in private institutions, especially when teaching EFL speaking and writing skills. This difference in the quality of online feedback might be caused by the lack of time in public institutions to consider students' doubts, needs, errors, and learning styles. In fact, personalized feedback when correcting students' errors is provided when teaching speaking and writing, especially in private institutions, probably due to the time devoted to this activity, the availability of technological tools, a smaller class size, and the Internet access facilities that these students have in comparison with learners from public institutions.

Direct and indirect feedback are widely provided in public and private institutions. As for focused feedback, it is also frequent in speaking and writing tasks. On the contrary, unfocused feedback does not seem to be common. Apart from the teacher feedback, peer feedback is also provided in these institutions, but this practice is less common in public institutions, probably because of the lower students' proficiency level as well as the limited access to technological resources. Immediate feedback is more frequent in private institutions than in public ones. Conversely, delayed feedback does not seem to be a common practice in these

institutions. In addition, the use of technological tools in the EFL classroom is perceived as efficient since teachers in private institutions use a wider variety of technological resources for teaching speaking and writing skills. Likewise, feedback is effectively provided using different technological resources, and, furthermore, teachers receive permanent training in the use of ICTs. However, in public institutions, there could be some difficulties about these aspects. In this context, our study was limited to a local level in our country. Thus, future research should consider a sample of public institutions at a national level to obtain a deeper knowledge of the problems to provide feedback, especially in a post-pandemic context.

6. Implications

The study has demonstrated that personalized direct and indirect feedback is believed to be imperative aspects when it comes to enhancing speaking and writing skills in remote learning. In this sense, teachers from private and public institutions should consider devoting appropriate time in their planning to providing and monitoring feedback. Furthermore, it has been seen that technology was an essential factor in education during the COVID-19 pandemic. For this reason, instructors should be trained in strategies to provide feedback when teaching with technological resources.

7. References

- Ali, A. D. (2016). Effectiveness of Using Screencast Feedback on EFL Students' Writing and Perception. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 106-121. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n8p106>
- Abusa'aleek, A. O., & Alotaibi, A. N. (2022). Distance Education: An Investigation of Tutors' Electronic Feedback Practices during Coronavirus Pandemic. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 17(4). <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v17i04.22563>
- Alzamil, A. (2021). Teaching English speaking online versus face-to-face: Saudi students' experience during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 12(1.2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3826486>
- As, A. (2016). Storytelling to improve speaking skills. *English Education Journal*, 7(2), 194-205.
- Bahadorfar, M., & Omidvar, R. (2014). Technology in teaching speaking skill. *Acme International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(4), 9-13.
- Barrot, J. S. (2020). Integrating Technology into ESL/EFL Writing through Grammarly. *RELC Journal*, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220966632>
- Bitchener, J. (2009). Measuring the effectiveness of written corrective feedback: A response to "Overgeneralization from a narrow focus: A response to Bitchener (2008)". *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(18), 276-279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.06.001\(2\)](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.06.001(2))
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.
- Bognár, L., Fauszt, T., & Váraljai, M. (2021). The impact of online quizzes on student success. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (ijET)*, 16(11), 225-244. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v16i11.21679>
- Borup, J., West, R. E., & Thomas, R. (2015). The impact of text versus video communication on instructor feedback in blended courses. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 63(2), 161-184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9367-8>

- Cabrera-Solano, P., Gonzalez-Torres, P., & Ochoa-Cueva, C. (2021). Using Pixton for Teaching EFL Writing in Higher Education during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(9). <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.9.7>
- Cakici, D. (2016). The use of ICT in teaching English as a foreign language. *Participatory Educational Research*, 4(2), 73-77.
- Chaney, A., & Burk, T. (1998). *Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: a case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 1(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y>
- Cong-Lem, N. (2018). Web-based language learning (WBLL) for enhancing L2 speaking performance: A review. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(4), 143-152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aialc.all.v.9n.4p.143>
- Council of Europe (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Cunningham, K. J. (2019). Student perceptions and use of technology-mediated text and screencast feedback in ESL writing. *Computers and Composition*, 52, 222-241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2019.02.003>
- Djabborova, F. (2020). Ways of developing listening skills of English learners in ESL and EFL classroom. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*, 8(10), 212-216.
- Dwivedi, R. & Chakravarthy, R. (2015). Problems Encountered by Rural Students in Writing English – Role of English Teacher - Some Solutions. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 3 (7), 27-38.
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. (2014). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Routledge.
- Golkova, D., & Hubackova, S. (2014). Productive skills in second language learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 143, 477-481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.520>
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. UK: Pearson Education.
- Hibbi, F. Z., Abdoun, O., & El Khatir, H. (2021). Smart Tutoring System: A Predictive Personalized Feedback in a Pedagogical Sequence. *IJET*, 2, 263. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v16i20.24783>
- Irwin, B. (2017). Written Corrective Feedback: Student Preferences and Teacher Feedback Practices. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(2), 35-58
- Kawinkoonlasate, P. (2021). A Study of Using E-Writing Instructional Design Program to Develop English Writing Ability of Thai EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 14(6), 43-61. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n6p43>
- Khatoony, S., & Nezhadmehr, M. (2020). EFL teachers' challenges in integration of technology for online classrooms during Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic in Iran. *AJELP: Asian Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 8(2), 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.37134/ajelp.vol8.2.7.2020>
- Kusumawati, A. J. (2020). Redesigning face-to-face into online learning for speaking competence during COVID-19: ESP for higher education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(2), 276-288. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v4i2.14745>
- Lee, H. H., Leong, A. P., & Song, G. (2016). Investigating teacher perceptions of feedback. *ELT Journal*, ccw047, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw047>
- Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Springer.
- Leong, L. M., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An analysis of factors influencing learners' English speaking skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 2, 34-41. <https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.1.34>

- Planar, D., & Moya, S. (2016). The effectiveness of instructor personalized and formative feedback provided by instructor in an online setting: Some unresolved issues. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, 14(3), 196-203.
- Selvaraj, A. M., Azman, H., & Wahi, W. (2021). Teachers' feedback practice and students' academic achievement: a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(1), 308-322. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.1.17>
- Shagiakhmetova, M. N., Bystritskaya, E. V., Demir, S., Stepanov, R. A., Grishnova, E. E., & Kryukova, N. I. (2022). Primary Teachers Difficulties Related to Compulsory Distance Education During COVID-19. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 14(2), ep357. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/11589>
- Shang, H. (2017). An exploration of asynchronous and synchronous feedback modes in EFL writing. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 29(3), 496-513. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-017-9154-0>
- Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*. Springer.
- Siewert, L. (2011). The effects of written teacher feedback on the academic achievement of fifth-grade students with learning challenges. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 55(1), 17-27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10459880903286771>
- Sokolik, M. (2003). Writing. In D. Nunan (Eds.), *Practical English language teaching (PELT)*, (pp. 87-88). McGraw Hill.
- Soltanpour, F., & Valizadeh, M. (2018). The effect of individualized technology-mediated feedback on EFL learners' argumentative essays. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 7(3), 125-136. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.3p.125>
- Soria, S., Gutiérrez-Colón, M., & Frumuselu, A. D. (2020). Feedback and Mobile Instant Messaging: Using WhatsApp as a Feedback Tool in EFL. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(1), 797-812. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13151a>
- Troussel, L. B. S., & Manrique, M. S. (2019). La retroalimentación más allá de la evaluación [Feedback beyond evaluation]. *Revista Latinoamericana de Educación Comparada [Latin-American Journal of Comparative Education]: RELEC*, 9(14), 89-104.
- Tseng, S. S., & Yeh, H. C. (2019). The impact of video and written feedback on student preferences of English speaking practice. *Language Learning & Technology*, 23(2), 145-158. <https://doi.org/10.125/44687>
- Vicentini, C., & De Oliveira, L. C. (2018). Using technology tools in writing instruction. *NYS TESOL Journal*, 5(2), 44-51.
- Westmacott, A. (2017). Direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback: Student perceptions. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura [Íkala, Journal of Language and Culture]*, 22(1), 17-32. <https://dx.doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n01a02>
- Xu, Q., & Yu, S. (2018). An action research on computer-mediated communication (CMC) peer feedback in EFL writing context. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 27(3), 207-216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-018-0379-0>
- Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. *Assessing Writing*, 37, 13-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.03.001>