LIBYAN EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK METHODS: A QUALITATIVE EXPLORATION

Alhadi Bilban

Faculty of Education, Alliant International University, Pomerado Rd, San Diego, CA 92131, San Diego, United States

Corresponding Author Email: abilban@alliant.edu

Article Info	Abstract
	Writing in English is an essential skill for ESL learners, and qualified teachers play a key role in providing effective written corrective feedback (WCF). While much research has examined the general effectiveness of WCF, less attention has been given to teachers' perceptions of WCF methods and expected outcomes. This qualitative study investigated Libyan university English teachers' perceptions of their knowledge, experience, and training related to WCF. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with four participants and were analyzed thematically to identify patterns in their beliefs and practices. Findings revealed that participants held clear views on providing writing corrections but showed inconsistencies in their understanding and use of specific WCF types, often due to limited training. These results underscore the need for targeted professional development programs that help teachers apply various feedback methods effectively. Such initiatives can strengthen EFL pedagogy by aligning teacher feedback practices with students' learning needs and institutional writing objectives. Future research may explore the long-term effects of WCF on learners' writing proficiency and feedback retention.

INTRODUCTION

Corrective feedback (CF) has long been a central concern in second language acquisition (SLA) and writing pedagogy. While early research (e.g., Allwright, 1975; Chaudron, 1977) explored the discourse of error correction in classroom interaction, contemporary studies have focused more on identifying effective types, timing, and delivery of feedback (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Lee, 2020; Storch, 2018). Written corrective feedback (WCF), in particular, plays a crucial role in helping learners notice, understand, and correct their writing errors, thereby fostering linguistic accuracy and learner autonomy.

Recent scholarship has highlighted the complexity of teachers' beliefs and practices in providing WCF, emphasizing the influence of contextual factors such as institutional policy, teacher training, and students' proficiency levels (Yu, 2021; Zhang & Hyland, 2022; Saeli & Cheng, 2023). However, much of this research has been conducted in Asian or Western contexts, with limited exploration in Middle Eastern or North African regions. In Libya, despite growing interest in improving English writing instruction, there remains little empirical evidence about how EFL university teachers perceive and implement various WCF methods in their classrooms.

This gap is significant because understanding teachers' perceptions can reveal how their beliefs, experiences, and training shape the quality and consistency of written feedback. Addressing this gap can also inform teacher education programs and professional development initiatives that aim to enhance feedback literacy among Libyan EFL instructors.

Therefore, this study aims to explore Libyan university English teachers' perceptions of written corrective feedback methods, focusing on their knowledge, experience, and training related to WCF practices. This study addresses the following research questions:

How do Libyan university EFL teachers perceive their knowledge, training and experience regarding written corrective feedback?

What Methods of WCF do they report using, and what factors influence their choices?

How do teachers' beliefs and training experiences shape their WCF practices in university writing classrooms?

Issues Related to Corrective Feedback

Ellis et al. (2008) asserted that there are theoretical reasons for expecting the focused approach to be more beneficial to accuracy development than unfocused CF. Learners are more likely to notice and understand corrections when they target a specific set of error types (Ellis, 2005; Schmidt, 1994). More recent research continues to support the role of focused feedback in promoting noticing and accuracy, emphasizing that learners' engagement with feedback is central to improvement (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Shintani, 2019). Moreover, studies such as Yu and Liu (2021) and Saeli and Cheng (2023) have expanded this perspective by linking teachers' feedback literacy to the effective implementation of focused WCF in classroom contexts.

Written Corrective Feedback Preferences

The type of WCF that teachers prefer may or may not align with what is most effective for students. Hamid et al. (2021) found that instructors preferred indirect feedback with metalinguistic comments, while students favored direct feedback. Similarly, Zhang and Hyland (2022) reported that teachers' preferences are often shaped by contextual constraints such as time, workload, and institutional expectations. Recent work by Lee (2020) also emphasizes that feedback effectiveness depends not only on type but on teachers' ability to align feedback strategies with learner needs and writing goals.

English Language Teachers' Perceptions

Research on teachers' perceptions and beliefs (Borg, 1998, 2003, 2011; Pajares, 1992) has shown that educators' prior experiences and professional knowledge strongly shape classroom practices. Recent studies continue to confirm this link, particularly in WCF contexts. For instance, Yu (2021) and Kartchava and Ammar (2018) argue that teachers' feedback literacy—how they understand, value, and use feedback—directly influences the quality of feedback provided and students' responses to it. This highlights the need to explore teachers' cognition not only as belief systems but as dynamic constructs shaped by contextual and cultural realities.

Libyan Teachers' Feedback Methods

Most Libyan English teachers tend to rely on traditional approaches shaped by their educational experiences and institutional norms (Jahbel et al., 2020; Orafi et al., 2021). However, recent regional studies show a gradual shift toward more reflective and feedback-based pedagogy. For example, Mahfoodh and Pandian (2019) found that EFL teachers in Arab universities are increasingly aware of the value of formative feedback but often lack the training to apply it

effectively. Similarly, Alharbi (2022) emphasized the importance of developing teachers' feedback literacy through sustained professional learning opportunities.

RESEARCH METHOD
Participants

In this qualitative study, the researcher used purposive sampling and that four participants were enough to reach data saturation or representative perspectives, so four faculty members from Janzour College were recruited to take part in the study survey. For the in-depth interview portion, members of the English department were invited to participate, resulting in a total of four interviews. All interviewees majored in English during their undergraduate study and possessed a master's degree or higher in English from universities in the U.S., the U.K., Malaysia, or Libya. They represented a diverse range of nationalities, including Libyan, Egyptian, Filipino, Indian, Iraqi, and Jordanian, with teaching experience ranging from approximately seven to twenty-three years. The diversity of the participants' academic and cultural backgrounds enriched the data and offered multiple perspectives on written corrective feedback (WCF) practices.

Instruments

To collect the data needed to address the research questions, the researcher administered semi-structured interviews. This method was chosen because it allows for flexibility in exploring participants' perspectives in depth while maintaining consistency across interviews (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The interview guide contained 11 open-ended questions derived from the Borg (2003) and Ellis (2008) frameworks, as discussed in the literature review.

Questions based on Borg's framework addressed teacher cognition, including teacher training and professional experience, while those based on Ellis' framework explored the types and contextual use of written corrective feedback. Prior to data collection, the interview questions were reviewed by two senior researchers in applied linguistics to ensure clarity, relevance, and alignment with the research objectives. During the interviews, participants discussed their understandings of WCF, how students responded to feedback, and their beliefs about the most effective methods of correction. The semi-structured format encouraged elaboration, enabling the researcher to probe further into emerging themes and contextual insights.

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher scheduled individual appointments with each participant to conduct the semi-structured interviews. As the researcher was based in the United States, the interviews were conducted via the Hello Libya application, which allowed secure video communication with local Libyan teachers. Hello Libya provided a secure, convenient, and ethically appropriate platform for communication with participants during data collection. Each interview lasted approximately 30–40 minutes, depending on the participant's responses. Before the interview began, participants received a consent form via email explaining the purpose of the study, voluntary participation, and confidentiality measures. Verbal consent was reconfirmed before recording. Interviews were conducted in English, though participants were permitted to respond in Arabic if they wished, to ensure linguistic comfort and accuracy of expression. All interviews were audio-recorded using a smartphone and later transcribed verbatim by the researcher. Data collection took place over a two-week period in February 2025. After each interview, notes were written to capture immediate impressions and contextual observations. These memos contributed to later data analysis and helped ensure reflexivity throughout the research process.

Data Analysis Procedures

The interview data were analyzed thematically following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase model of thematic analysis. After transcribing each interview verbatim, the researcher read the transcripts multiple times to become familiar with the data. Initial codes were manually generated using Microsoft Word comments and highlighting to capture key ideas relevant to the research questions. The researcher then grouped similar codes into broader categories and examined patterns across participants to identify overarching themes. These themes were refined through repeated comparison and interpretation until a coherent thematic framework emerged. To ensure trustworthiness, the researcher engaged in member checking by sending preliminary findings to two participants for feedback and confirmation of accuracy. Additionally, peer debriefing was conducted with a research colleague who reviewed the codes and theme definitions to minimize researcher bias. An audit trail of coding notes, memos, and decision logs was maintained throughout the analysis process.

Ethical considerations were strictly observed. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any time, and pseudonyms were used in transcripts and reporting to ensure confidentiality. The data were stored securely on a password-protected device accessible only to the researcher. Potential sources of bias included the researcher's background as an English language instructor, which may have influenced interpretations of teacher beliefs. However, this was mitigated through reflexive journaling and triangulation across participant accounts. While the small sample size limits generalizability, the findings offer rich, contextualized insights into Libyan EFL teachers' perceptions of written corrective feedback.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
Research Findings

The interview methodology that was used in the current study allowed participants to respond with depth and clarity that revealed several salient themes and sub-themes that addressed the teachers' thoughts, knowledge, experience, and opinions, as well as their training and pedagogical practice.

Table 1
Highlights the Themes and Sub-themes

Interview Themes and Sub-themes
Global themes and sub-themes with their corresponding qualitative research question and questionnaire section

Global Theme	Sub-Theme	Survey section	Research Question
Teachers' beliefs, opinions, and perspectives	• General thoughts about providing WCF to students' writing • Observing students' errors • Passive and training challenges • Flexible or not flexible corrections	1	RQ1
Approaches to providing WCF	• An appropriate method teachers used • Planning teachers to follow • Proficiency and ability • The relationship between type and the level • An appropriate method teachers used	2	RQ2
Outcomes teachers hope to achieve with WCF	• The effectiveness of providing feedback	3	RQ3

- Revisions and assignment issues

Findings from the semi-structured interviews are presented below. Each globally themed sub-section under this broad section is associated with one of the study's research questions. As illustrated in Table 1, RQ1 is paired with findings and results under the global theme and sub-themes of "Teachers' beliefs, opinions, and perspectives on written corrective feedback in relation to their training and experience over their careers." RQ2 is similarly paired with the global themes of "Teacher Education Programs" and "Teachers' Classroom Practice and the Development of Intercultural Competence." RQ3 addresses the theme "English teachers' perceptions of written corrective feedback and the outcomes they hope to achieve in developing their students' writing abilities."

Qualitative Data Analysis

This section explores several themes that emerged from interviews with the Libyan English teachers regarding their beliefs, opinions, and perceptions of providing feedback to their EFL students studying in the English Department College of Education at Tripoli University in Libya. It discusses the teachers' views about the aspects of their knowledge in giving written feedback. More importantly, it is through their own methods that this group of teachers adopts in their classrooms which creates the potential for its success as well as for its failure. Finally, these classroom practitioners shared their beliefs about the perceived abilities of their learners to successfully acquire competence in this important domain.

Genal Thoughts About Providing WCF to Students' Writing

The participants in this study highlighted a very traditional view regarding WCF in the classroom, demonstrating that such traditional thoughts are rather central to their classroom practice.

Observing Students' Errors

Mistakes happen regularly when learning a new language, and in English language writing, EFL students generate numerous errors. Errors happen in different situations, so each interview participant provided examples of what mistakes their students make when it comes to writing. Almost all the interviewees face the same errors made by the students, though with slight differences. Here is what each interviewee said:

Aisha considered more than one type of error that students make: "Arranging the ideas from the topic sentence to supporting sentences, to giving details and to the conclusion. Moreover, in joined sentences, and joining ideas, they do not know how to maintain unity."

Monem centered his response on the steps of writing an essay. In this situation, students made mistakes that should not happen. Choosing a good start for writing is the main purpose students should consider, otherwise their writing will be hard to understand. He declared that "In generating the ideas that are needed in writing coherent paragraphs or essays, the students do not write a good thesis statement, which is the main step to begin writing the essay."

Nassr expressed his answer in an interesting way compared to Aisha and Monem. His comment was: The verb tenses and their position, problems in putting the word classes in the right opposition, different usage of the plural, and continuing to miss the wrong order of the words, or drop words and sentences. Too much translating the sentences with no exact meaning. In contrast to Aisha, Monem, and Nassr, Daw considered the mistakes that the students made depending on the level of the student's English proficiency. The major mistakes done by most of the students,

whether by the beginners or by advanced students, is the thesis statement, the main idea of the topic, as well as providing the correct idea also incorrect verb forms, subject-verb agreement, run-on sentences, and comma splices.

Challenges in Writing Teacher Training

Aisha, Monem, and Daw mentioned that they have not attended any training since they became teachers. Aisha introduced her experience in this way: "I did my practicum with students who were in high school. It was really helpful and suitable in terms of providing them correction. But as for my work at college, I have had no training or workshops so far." Monem, on the other hand, presented his experience as follows: "My major is translation, and my focus is only on teaching translation courses one and two." Daw shared information similar to Aisha and Monem when he said, "I only improved myself, and the university does not offer such training or a chance to take workshops in all my years of teaching."

According to Nassr, in regard to training, he said, "I only trained a little bit with the small group a long time ago about direct corrective feedback type, and not all the types of written corrective feedback."

While training is very important in increasing teachers' knowledge in developing teaching their skills, without training the education process will deeply affect both teachers as well as students.

Flexible or Inflexible Approach to Corrections

Nassr and Daw have the same view about how to avoid difficult situations regarding the correction. Nassr suggested that "If the teacher does not use the types of correction he adopts regularly, he will have many difficult situations and this will negatively affect students' outcomes and their understanding of the teacher's notes." In the same way, Daw noted that "knowing or determining the difficulties of the students should be the teacher's concern in order to help them to not do it next time."

The level of the students' differences causes many hard situations in correcting students' errors, and this happens when the class includes students, for example, who are in semester three and students who are in semester five. In Libya, it is normal to have those situations. Monem commented on such differences: "I have level issues inside the classroom. When there are different levels in the classroom, it is hard for me to cover the lesson content properly."

Table 2
Summary of Subthemes Under "Genal Thoughts About Providing WCF to Students' Writing"

Theme	Subtheme	Description	Example Evidence (Interview Quote)
Teachers' General Thoughts about WCF	Observing Students' Errors	Teachers identified common writing issues such as poor thesis statements, weak idea organization, and incorrect grammar or tenses.	"Students do not write a good thesis statement, which is the main step to begin writing the essay." (Monem)
	Challenges in Writing Teacher Training	Participants reported insufficient or no formal training in WCF practices.	"The university does not offer such training or a chance to take workshops." (Daw)
	Flexible or Inflexible	Some teachers preferred consistent correction strategies, while others adjusted their	"If the teacher does not use the types of correction he adopts regularly, he will have

Approach to Corrections	feedback based on student levels and contexts.	many difficult situations." (Nassr)

The interviews revealed that Libyan EFL teachers share similar perspectives on providing written corrective feedback (WCF). Most participants identified frequent student writing errors—such as grammatical mistakes, disorganized ideas, and weak thesis statements—as central challenges in their classrooms. A notable concern was the lack of institutional training, which teachers believe limits their ability to apply diverse feedback strategies effectively. While some teachers maintained a fixed correction style, others emphasized flexibility depending on student proficiency and classroom context. Overall, teachers valued WCF as essential to improving student writing but expressed the need for systematic professional development to enhance their practices.

Methods Teachers Use in Providing Corrections

Two teachers shared a different point of view on this issue, and their choices in selecting the preferred type of correction depends on the situation they are facing. Nassr gave an explanation of his views on this topic without specifying the exact type of WCF he gives to his students. Instead, he reported that he uses most of the types of feedback, depending on the effectiveness of each type that works depending on the subject he is teaching.

There are many types of theories that one can adopt. For example, metalinguistic, focused and unfocused, and electronic. So, it is hard to apply all these types of written corrective feedback, but I do it in a brief way and see which approach is interacting with that one, and find the one that is really important for the students as well as for me. So, I need to focus on one and see which one they prefer, and which one they find suits them. In that case, it is not a random choice of which type I prefer; in other words, it depends on the situation. In addition, time is limited, and this factor should take into consideration. All in all, my preferred type is flexible.

Monem and Daw adopt only direct feedback, and they consider this type as their favorite. They believe that it works with both low-level and high-level students because their students' knowledge of the language is not vast. Monem commented, "*I believe that the direct type motivates students and actively checks every mistake individually*." Similarly, Daw commented that due to his long experience and his knowledge of the different types of written corrections he uses, he believes in direct feedback. "*I acknowledge that direct correction is my preferred type, this type works with all levels of students*."

Teacher Process for Giving Feedback

Each interviewee talked about the process he adopts as impacted by the situation they teach in. Aisha focused on following the process of providing feedback: "I review the main idea of the topic, looking for the ideas, and the conclusion. I usually do that by underlining the student's errors, and I ask them for clarification."

Monem commented on the process he adopts when he gives feedback in this way: "I usually divide the classroom into groups or pairs, and I monitor the class at the time of giving feedback. Sometimes the correction is oral or written, and I try to involve the groups or give them the chance to participate."

Nassr preferred not to depend on a single process of giving feedback. In his opinion, doing this takes a lot of time, and the level of the students in the class is another problem that prevents him from following this process. Instead, Nassr believes in a flexible approach depending on the situation. Perhaps focusing on one or two types of errors will help him a lot. "I correct all the

student's work, and then I return the papers or the book notes to each one. This process is easy for me and for my students."

Daw is quite similar to Nassr, in that he always uses a very traditional approach. *I collect students' work after class time is finished, correct students' mistakes, and correct them during work time, or take the papers with me to finish correcting the rest of the students' papers, and in the next class, I review the students' work with each student and sometimes if there is no extra time, I deliver the papers to students without continuing the revision.*

Teacher/Student Relationships and WCF

Monem, Nassr, and Daw commented that a good relationship between teachers and their students is the key to knowing the best approach help them go forward. Monem commented that the time when he is delivering correction helps him get a chance to meet all the students to work with them throughout the semester period. Now I know how to change the negative to positive; for example, I give a chance to students who do not do their assignments by sitting with them like individually to fix the weak areas in their writing, and at the same time, I give the opportunity to the class for discussion. Nassr believes that feedback is a mix of encouragement and hope so that the student will never be disappointed.

Student Preferences of Feedback Method

Knowing students' preferred type of feedback is quite important as it helps teachers when they use the type that the students prefer. Teachers can build their plan through this information. Sometimes students do not understand their teachers' notes when the teachers use new types of correction; consequently, the teachers may use the type that students prefer, so teachers should bear this in mind. The interviewees Aisha, Monem, and Daw agreed that direct written feedback is the type that all students preferred; however, Nassr believes that many students like different types and not only one type. On this topic he commented, "Some of the students like direct feedback. As a teacher, the only technique I use all the time when I do corrections is direct feedback. I correct all the mistakes, without focusing on specific types of errors."

Table 3
Summary of Subthemes Under "Methods Teachers Use in Providing Corrections"

Subtheme	Description	Example Evidence (Participant Quotes)	Teachers Mentioning
Flexible Feedback Methods	Teachers select correction types based on classroom situations, time constraints, and student proficiency.	"It is not a random choice… it depends on the situation. My preferred type is flexible." (Nassr)	1
Preference for Direct Feedback	Direct feedback is favored for all student levels, as it provides clear guidance and individualized correction.	"Direct type motivates students and checks every mistake individually." (Monem)	2
Feedback Process Strategies	Teachers use various processes such as underlining errors, group feedback, or individual corrections during and after class.	"I underline the student's errors and ask them for clarification." (Aisha)	3
Teacher–Student Relationship	Positive relationships enhance the effectiveness of feedback and student engagement.	"Now I know how to change the negative to positive… I sit with them individually." (Monem)	3
Student Preferences	Teachers recognize students' preferences for direct feedback and adjust their strategies accordingly.	"Some students like direct feedback… I correct all mistakes." (Nassr)	4

The theme "Methods Teachers Use in Providing Corrections" revealed that participants employed diverse approaches shaped by teaching context, time, and learner needs. While one teacher emphasized flexibility in choosing feedback types, most preferred direct written corrective feedback, viewing it as effective across proficiency levels. Teachers also described different feedback processes, including underlining errors, organizing peer or group corrections, and post-class revisions. A consistent thread across interviews was the importance of a supportive teacher–student relationship, which encouraged active engagement and improvement. Finally, most teachers acknowledged students' preferences for direct feedback, reinforcing the practicality of this method within Libyan EFL classrooms.

The Effectiveness of Providing Feedback

Two participants shared the same thought that it is hard to expect good outcomes from low level students or those who are still at the beginning stages of writing a good paragraph, for instance. Aisha commented, "I taught Writing 1, 2, and 3 courses and these levels of students are not at a place to expect them to let me receive something special [in terms of their written work] unless there is an exceptional student."

Similarly, Monem believes that good outcomes from the feedback he provides come from advanced level students and not from low level students. *The expectation depends on the type I use to determine if the results are positive or negative. In fact, low-level students interact with direct feedback much better than other types of correction. The situation with high-level students is different. They interact well with both direct and indirect; however, some high-level students do not interact with focused and unfocused feedback. Generally, the level of students should factor in the teacher's decision.*

Revisions and Assignment Issues

Monem commented about his students this way: *I have different types of students. I have smart students and lazy students, so some students care about what I ask for, and they do well. And a few of them respond or review the notes immediately, and they are better than those who never respond at all. I believe that some are very slow in responding, and some of them are very late.*

Nassr does not feel satisfied with the students' reactions when he corrects their assignments. Many of the students were negative; in other words, they accepted whatever I did, but they felt shame about their mistakes. The teacher always has the right to do anything regarding the correction, a few students argued and did not try to understand what my note means regarding that error.

Table 4
Summary of Subthemes Under the outcomes English teachers to achieve in their students' skills

Subtheme	Key Insights	Example Quotations
Effectiveness of Providing Feedback	Teachers noted that the success of WCF depends largely on students' proficiency levels. Low-level students often struggle to apply feedback effectively, while advanced learners show more noticeable improvement.	"Low-level students interact with direct feedback much better than other types of correction." (Monem) / "These levels of students are not at a place to expect them to let me receive something special." (Aisha)
Revisions and Assignment Issues	Teachers observed varied student attitudes toward revising their work. While some students actively reviewed feedback and improved, others showed	"Some students care about what I ask for, and they do well." (Monem) / "Many of the students were negative; they accepted whatever I did but felt shame about their mistakes." (Nassr)

| minimal engagement or resistance to |
| correction. |

Teachers' perceptions of the outcomes of written corrective feedback (WCF) highlight the influence of student proficiency and motivation. Most teachers agreed that while WCF is crucial for language development, its effectiveness varies by learners' levels. Advanced students are more responsive and capable of incorporating feedback, whereas beginners often struggle to apply corrections meaningfully. Furthermore, teachers observed disparities in students' willingness to revise — some engaged constructively with feedback, while others were passive or discouraged by frequent corrections. Overall, educators view WCF as valuable but recognize that its success relies on both student readiness and the teacher's adaptive approach.

Discussion

The first research question explored the English teachers' beliefs, opinions, and perspectives on written corrective feedback (WCF) in relation to their training and experience. Participants consistently highlighted a lack of formal preparation in providing WCF, echoing findings from Cao (2017) and Lee (2019) that teachers often receive minimal or no training in feedback pedagogy. For example, Nassr shared, "I only trained a little bit with the small group a long time ago about direct corrective feedback type," while Monem similarly explained that the university "does not offer such training or a chance to take workshops."

These comments reveal that most teachers rely on self-improvement through classroom experience rather than institutional professional development. This pattern is consistent with Breen et al. (2001) and Ferris (2010), who suggest that teachers' beliefs about feedback evolve through ongoing practice rather than formal instruction. Furthermore, teachers' emphasis on grammatical accuracy as a foundation for writing development supports Bitchener and Ferris (2012) and Ellis (2009), who note that grammar-focused feedback remains a common preference among EFL instructors.

Table 5
Summary of Major Themes and Supporting Literature Related to RQ1

Theme	Key Findings	Example Quotation	Supporting Literature
Lack of WCF Training	Teachers report little to no formal feedback training.	"I only trained a little bit with a small group a long time ago." – Nassr	Lee (2019); Cao (2017)
Self-Improvement Through Experience	Teachers rely on classroom practice for feedback skill development.	"I only improved myself; the university does not offer training." – Monem	Breen et al. (2001); Ferris (2010)
Emphasis on Grammar as Foundation	Grammar correction viewed as essential for improving writing.	"Teachers should focus on grammar errors, which are the foundation of better writing." – Nassr	Bitchener & Ferris (2012); Ellis (2009)

The second research question examined teachers' preferred methods and techniques for delivering WCF. The majority of participants reported using direct feedback as their primary approach. Aisha explained, "I obviously use direct correction all the time," indicating her belief that direct correction benefits lower-level students. This aligns with Hyland & Hyland (2019) and Ellis (2009), who argue that direct feedback provides clarity for beginner writers and can be more effective for accuracy improvement.

Similarly, Monem and Nassr both mentioned that they "correct all mistakes" without focusing on specific error types, reflecting what Orafi, Othman, and Elshiltamy (2021) describe as the persistence of traditional, teacher-centered feedback practices in Arab EFL contexts. Despite this, some teachers acknowledged the need to balance direct correction with strategies that foster learner autonomy and reduce anxiety.

Table 6
Teachers' Approaches to WCF and Corresponding Perspectives to RQ2

Approach	Teacher Practice	Rationale	Supporting Literature
Direct Feedback	Used consistently for low-level students	Provides explicit correction and clarity	Hyland & Hyland (2019); Ellis (2009)
Comprehensive Correction	Correction of all errors regardless of type	Ensures full coverage of language issues	Orafi et al. (2021)
Contextual Flexibility	Adjusting correction based on student reactions	Reduces stress and promotes learning	Lee (2020); Ferris (2010)

The third research question explored how teachers perceive the effectiveness of their feedback and the outcomes they hope to achieve. The teachers largely agreed that the effectiveness of WCF depends on students' proficiency level. Monem noted that "low-level students interact with direct feedback much better," while advanced students respond more flexibly to both direct and indirect feedback. This pattern supports findings by Ellis (2009) and Bitchener & Ferris (2012) that feedback type effectiveness varies by learner proficiency.

Teachers also described mixed student reactions to feedback. Some students revise immediately, while others ignore comments or feel demotivated. These reactions reflect the complex emotional dimensions of WCF discussed in Hyland (2010), who emphasized that students' affective responses can shape the impact of feedback on writing improvement.

Table 7
Perceptions of WCF Effectiveness and Student Outcomes to RQ3

Theme	Key Findings	Example Quotation	Supporting Literature
Proficiency-Level Dependence	Feedback success linked to students' writing level	"Low-level students interact with direct feedback much better." – Monem	Ellis (2009); Bitchener & Ferris (2012)
Variation in Student Engagement	Differences between responsive and unresponsive students	"Some students care about what I ask for, and they do well." – Monem	Hyland (2010); Ferris (2010)
Emotional Responses to Feedback	Students may feel shame or stress when corrected	"They accepted whatever I did, but they felt shame about their mistakes." – Nassr	Hyland & Hyland (2019)

Pedagogical Implications

Overall, the findings demonstrate that WCF practices are influenced by teacher beliefs, training, and contextual challenges. Teachers would benefit from professional development that promotes evidence-based feedback techniques, reflection, and learner autonomy (Lee, 2020;

Ferris, 2010). Institutions such as the University of Tripoli should establish workshops and collaborative communities of practice to sustain ongoing growth in WCF application.

Limitations of the Study

This present study focused on an examination of WCF from the perspective of English teachers, which helps contribute to an understanding of written corrective feedback practices of the teachers in the University of Tripoli in Libya. Because the present study focused only on the EFL teachers from the University of Tripoli its participant sampling, it will be beneficial if other studies examine different universities in the Libyan context. Additionally, because of the cultural and linguistic similarities, additional studies can explore this issue in other Arab countries in order to identify similarities and differences from the Libyan context.

Moreover, there are other groups of English teachers – such as primary and secondary school teachers – whose knowledge and practices related to WCF need to be explored as English writing has increased its prominence in Libya. If future studies can provide information which will improve writing instruction at earlier grade levels, the entire system of writing in Libyan education can be strengthened. In short, because this study looked at a specific context, this narrow focus may limit the generalizability of findings to broader educational settings.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate Libyan university English teachers' perceptions of their knowledge, experience, and training directly connected to their perceptions and beliefs regarding WCF. The current investigation makes two theoretical contributions. Findings demonstrate how teacher cognition is mediated not only by experience and institutional context but also by the absence of professional development opportunities. In the Libyan EFL context, this absence shapes teachers' internal beliefs and external practices, suggesting a refinement to Borg's model that incorporates training scarcity as a contextual variable influencing cognition and practice. Teachers' preferences for direct feedback confirm Ellis's typology, yet their differential use across proficiency levels (low vs. high) provides contextual evidence for the situational adaptability of feedback types. This nuance contributes to the theoretical understanding that feedback effectiveness depends not only on type but also on learner level and classroom culture

The paper used semi-structured interviews of four teachers to illuminate their beliefs on this topic. The descriptive findings of the study showed that most of the participants have clear perceptions of the process of providing writing corrections. However, there were also deviations from other studies when it comes to their focus on the specific WCF types. Among the findings from the paper responses, it was revealed that the teachers had little training on WCF types, and they are largely influenced by traditional ways of correction and provide direct feedback.

FUNDING

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. By agreeing to take part, the participants acknowledge that they have been informed about the purpose, procedures, potential risks, and benefits of the study. Participants understand that their identity are kept confidential and that all information they provide are used solely for research purposes. They have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise

entitled. By continuing, they give their informed consent to participate in this research under the conditions described.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Alharbi, M. A. (2022). Exploring the impact of teacher feedback modes and features on students' text revisions in writing. Assessing Writing, 52, Article 100610.

Allwright, J. C. (1975). Optimal output feedback without trace. Applied Mathematics and Optimization, 2(4), 351–372.

Alsuhaibani, Z. (2021). Corrective feedback controversies in language learning: With a focus on direct written corrective feedback. International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies, 8(4), 35–43

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing. Routledge.

Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching. Language Awareness, 7(2), 79–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658419808667163

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. Language Teaching, 36(2), 81–109. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903

Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. System, 39(3), 370–380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.010

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Cao, Y. (2017). Teacher cognition and classroom practices: A case study of EFL writing instruction. Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly, 41(3), 233–255.

Cheng, X., Liu, Y., & Wang, C. (2023). Understanding student engagement with teacher and peer feedback in L2 writing. [Journal name], [Volume(Issue)], [pages].

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Ellis, N. C. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27(2), 305–352. https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310505014X

Ellis, N. C. (2012). Formulaic language and second language acquisition: Zipf and the phrasal teddy bear. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 32, 17–44. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000025

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. ELT Journal, 63(2), 97–107. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2008). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar: An exploratory study. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 30(3), 301–334. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263108080199

Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32(2), 181–201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490

Hamid, M. O., et al. (2021). Teachers' and students' perceptions and justifications for direct vs. indirect feedback with metalinguistic comments. [Journal Name], [Volume(Issue)], [pages].

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2019). Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Jahbel, A., et al. (2020). Libyan English teachers' beliefs and practices in relation to teaching English. [Journal Name], [Volume(Issue)], [pages].

Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2020). A meta-analysis of the effects of written corrective feedback. Language Teaching Research, 24(5), 620–642. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818770969

Kartchava, E. (2018). Planned versus incidental focus on form in oral communication. In J. I. Liontas (Ed.), The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching (pp. 1–7). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0413

Lee, I. (2019). Teacher written corrective feedback: Still evolving. Language Teaching, 52(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000390

Lee, I. (2020). Teacher feedback literacy and its impact on student writing development. Language Teaching Research, [volume], [pages].

Liu, Q. (2021). Written corrective feedback in L2 writing: Advances and prospects. System, 103, 102671. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102671

Mahfoodh, O. H. A., & Pandian, A. (2019). EFL university teachers' feedback practices and perceptions in Arab contexts. System, 80, 110–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.11.006

Nassaji, H. (2020). The interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning: Linking theory, research, and practice. Bloomsbury Academic.

Saeli, H., & Cheng, M. (2023). Exploring EFL teachers' feedback literacy: Beliefs and practices. TESOL Quarterly, [Volume], [pages].

Schmidt, R. (1994). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), Attention and awareness in foreign language learning and teaching (pp. 1–63). University of Hawai'i Press.

Shintani, N. (2019). The role of feedback in second language writing: Focusing on noticing and uptake. System, 80, 197–207. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.12.011

Storch, N. (2018). Researching written corrective feedback: Theoretical and methodological considerations. System, 78, 130–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.07.009

Yu, S., & Liu, C. (2021). Developing teachers' feedback literacy in second language writing: Trends and future directions. Journal of Second Language Writing, 51, Article 100118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100118

Zhang, Z., & Hyland, K. (2022). Teachers' beliefs about written feedback and their classroom practices: Insights from EFL contexts. Assessing Writing, 51, Article 100586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100586