Journal of Educational Analytics (JEDA)
Vol. 4, No. 3, 2025: 733-744

# Enhancing Students' Writing Performance Using Interactional E-Feedback Method

Ralph P. Casas[1], Allia Rhey B. Ignacio[2], Cindy A. Sebugon[3], Claudine L. Igot[4], Geryl D. Cataraja[5*]
Palompon Institute of Technology, Palompon Leyte, Philippines
**Corresponding Author:** Geryl D. Cataraja gerylc30@gmail.com

A R T I C L E I N F O

*Keywords:* Writing Performance, Interactional E-feedback, Action Research, Palompon Institute of Technology

*Received : 6, July*
*Revised : 26, July*
*Accepted: 28, August*



A B S T R A C T

The aim of this research study was to investigate the effects of Interactional E-feedback Method on students' writing performance in online learning. The respondents of the study were the Grade -12 students of Palompon Institute of Technology. The study utilized the action research design and the instruments used were the in-class writing test and ESL Composition Profile. Findings of the study revealed that the level of writing performance of the students before the intervention was not that high. The result of the initial in-class writing test of the students needs improvement. The researchers have found out that there is a significant difference on the initial and final level of students' writing performance and the respondents got a good to average writing performance as interpreted after the exposure of the intervention. This means that when the students were exposed to Interactional E-feedback Method, their writing performance increases and enhances. It also implies that the Interactional E-feedback Method has significant effect in improving the writing performance in the English for Academic and Professional Purposes class. Thus, interactional e-feedback is a great method that teachers may employ in their online writing class.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55927/jeda.v4i3.234
ISSN-E:2830-0432
https://nblformosapublisher.org/index.php/jeda

## INTRODUCTION

Language plays a vital role in education and literacy, especially in mastering receptive and productive skills, with writing often emphasized as a key outcome. In many educational contexts, including the Philippines, students are expected to demonstrate proficiency in writing as part of their academic development (Bhamani et al., 2013). Writing helps students structure their thoughts, support arguments, and communicate ideas clearly, essential for both academic and future professional success (Domantay & Ramos, 2018). However, studies show that Filipino senior high school students struggle with writing, particularly in academic essays, due to issues like limited ideas, poor sentence construction, and lack of proper citations (Pablo & Lasaten, 2018; Lasala, 2014).

Despite writing being a crucial skill, oral abilities often surpass writing performance, pointing to the need for targeted interventions. Feedback is a fundamental component of second language writing instruction and is key to helping students improve. In light of the shift to online learning, the use of interactional e-feedback has emerged as an effective strategy. Interactional e-feedback involves an interactive exchange between teachers and students using tools like Google Docs, allowing for real-time, detailed feedback embedded in students' work. This method not only enhances the writing process but also fosters student engagement and understanding. In response to the challenges posed by distance learning, this study explored the use of interactional e-feedback to improve the writing performance of Grade 12 students at Palompon Institute of Technology. The results of this intervention provided valuable insights into the effectiveness of tech-integrated strategies in writing instruction under the new normal in education.

### *Objectives of the Study*

The primary objective of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the interactional e-feedback method in enhancing the writing performance of the Grade 12 students of Palompon Institute of Technology, Palompon, Leyte, for school year 2021-2022.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of the students' writing performance before the intervention?
2. What is the level of the students' writing performance after the intervention?
3. Is there a significant difference between the students' initial and final writing performance after the exposure to e-feedbacking?
4. What pedagogical considerations for using the interactional e-feedback method be formulated to enhance the students' writing performance?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing is one of the core academic skills that plays a vital role in the development of students' literacy and communication abilities. It serves not only as a medium for expressing ideas but also as a tool for critical thinking and learning. According to Bhamani et al. (2013), writing competence is essential for academic success and professional advancement, as it enables learners to organize thoughts and communicate effectively. However, research has

consistently shown that students, particularly those in the Philippines, struggle with academic writing due to limited vocabulary, poor organization, and difficulties with grammar and mechanics (Pablo & Lasaten, 2018; Lasala, 2014).

To address these challenges, feedback has been highlighted as a critical element in the teaching and learning of writing. Graham & Perin (2007) emphasized that effective feedback supports learners in refining their writing skills by identifying weaknesses and guiding improvement. In the context of second language writing, Qismullah, Zalina & Yunisrina (2019) observed that writing is one of the most challenging skills to master because it requires creativity, critical thinking, and adherence to linguistic standards. This challenge underscores the necessity of effective instructional strategies, including feedback mechanisms.

The integration of technology in education has given rise to new forms of feedback, particularly electronic feedback (e-feedback). Ebadi & Rahimi (2017) explored online peer-editing through Google Docs and found that it significantly improved students' academic writing by fostering collaboration and enabling real-time revisions. Similarly, Bradley & Thouësny (2017) highlighted the value of collaborative peer reviewing in online platforms, emphasizing how digital environments create opportunities for interactive learning.

Interactional e-feedback, in particular, has been shown to enhance student engagement and writing performance. Saeed & Qunayeer (2020) pointed out that interactive e-feedback encourages learners to actively interpret teacher comments and apply them in revisions, thereby deepening their understanding of writing conventions. Chang (2011) further argued that e-feedback provides scaffolding by guiding learners through the writing process, encouraging higher-level thinking, and improving time management skills. Wihastyanang (2017) also confirmed that electronic feedback significantly improves students' essay writing quality.

Additionally, dialogic approaches to feedback, as discussed by Steen-Utheim & Wittek (2017) and Merkel (2018), highlight the importance of two-way interaction between teacher and student. Such interaction not only clarifies misunderstandings but also creates a supportive environment where learners feel more confident in addressing writing issues. Carless et al. (2011) added that sustainable feedback practices should be designed to build learners' capacity for self-regulation and independent improvement.

Studies also suggest that e-feedback aligns well with the demands of online and distance learning. Harasim (2017) noted that digital platforms provide flexible avenues for communication, making it easier for instructors to give timely and detailed feedback. Alharbi (2019) emphasized the potential of Google Docs in fostering innovative teaching and learning practices, particularly in EFL writing courses. The convenience and accessibility of e-feedback make it a valuable method in the "new normal" of education shaped by the COVID-19 pandemic.

In summary, the literature underscores the significance of feedback, particularly electronic and interactional forms, in improving students' writing performance. Previous studies demonstrate that interactional e-feedback not

only enhances technical aspects of writing such as grammar, vocabulary, and organization but also fosters learner autonomy, motivation, and collaboration. Therefore, adopting interactional e-feedback as an instructional strategy is well-grounded in theory and empirical evidence, making it an effective approach to addressing the persistent challenges in students' academic writing.

## METHODOLOGY

This study employed an action research design based on the framework of Boschmans et al. (2019), which involves collecting data on existing educational outcomes, analyzing the information, implementing an intervention, and evaluating the results. The process followed three key phases—pre-intervention, intervention, and post-intervention—to determine the effectiveness of the strategy used. This design was appropriate for assessing what occurred before, during, and after the intervention.

The research was conducted at the Senior High School Department of Palompon Institute of Technology (PIT) in Palompon, Leyte. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, classes were conducted online through Google Meet. The participants were 42 out of 47 enrolled Grade 12 STEM students during the school year 2021–2022. Some students were unable to participate due to challenges related to internet connectivity, power interruptions, and weather conditions.

The study utilized four instruments: an in-class writing test on the topic Identifying Author's Tone and Point of View, the ESL Composition Profile developed by Jacobs (1981) and adapted by Condinato (2006) for rating compositions, Google Docs for writing and receiving e-feedback, and Google Classroom for submission and communication. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the school head, adviser, and subject teacher. Data collection was carried out over one week—Day 1 for the pre-test, Days 2 to 6 for the intervention, and Day 7 for the post-test. The researchers introduced the study through Google Meet, then distributed the Google Classroom code where students accessed instructions and completed the writing tasks using Google Docs. Three practice teachers rated the students' outputs using the ESL Composition Profile, providing scores and written feedback directly in Google Docs to help learners identify and correct their mistakes. After five days of exposure to the e-feedback method, students took the same writing test to measure improvement. The data collected were analyzed using Microsoft Excel. The mean was used to determine students' performance before and after the intervention; standard deviation measured the variability of responses; and a Z-test was used to assess whether there was a significant difference between the pre- and post-test scores, given the sample size exceeded 30.

All information provided by participants was treated with strict confidentiality. Participation was voluntary, and no financial compensation was given. Ethical considerations were observed to avoid reputational harm to both the participants and the institution.

## RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### *Level of the Students' Writing Performance Before the Intervention*

The purpose of this study's first specific research question was to find out the level of the students' writing performance before the intervention.

Table 1. Level of the Students' Writing Performance Before the Intervention

| Pre-Intervention | Mean | Standard Deviation | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Content** | 22.10 | 1.56 | Good to Average |
| **Organization** | 13.38 | 1.71 | Fair to Poor |
| **Vocabulary** | 14.36 | 1.51 | Good to Average |
| **Language Use** | 15.74 | 2.40 | Fair to Poor |
| **Mechanics** | 3.00 | 0.62 | Fair to Poor |
| **Overall** | **68.57** | **4.10** | **Good to Average** |

Table 1 presents the students' writing performance levels before the intervention was given. It shows that the students' writing performance level before the intervention is good to the average stage, with a mean of 68.57 and a standard deviation of 4.10, respectively. It implies that the students have some knowledge of composition writing, and there is still room for improvement.

The level of writing performance before exposure to the interactional e-feedback was not that high. By looking at their overall weighted mean, it can be noted that the result of the initial in-class writing test of the students' needs improvement.

According to Boo, Ai, & Voon (2019), students always need sincere and kind guidance. Hence, true customer orientation is instrumental in teaching English as it is always good to understand the students' needs to improve their performance.

Moreover, Qismullah, Zalina & Yunisrina (2019) writing is believed to be the most challenging skill to acquire by language learners, albeit crucial, as it involves the creative process of reaching out for one's thoughts, discovering them, and demands standard forms of grammar, syntax and word choice.

The ability to write is a requirement that is frequently required within classrooms, and deficits in writing can cause students to struggle in school (Graham & Perin, 2007).

However, difficulties with writing do not end when students exit school. As a result, based on Carnegie Mellon University (2022), students have not had enough practice to develop a set of sophisticated writing skills. When students lack skills in these areas, their writing may be unsatisfactory in multiple ways – from poor grammar and syntax to unclear organization to weak reasoning and arguments.

### *Level of the Students' Writing Performance After the Intervention*

The purpose of this study's second specific research question was to find out the level of the students' writing performance after the intervention was given.

Table 2. Level of the Students' Writing Performance After the Intervention

| Post-Intervention | Mean | Standard Deviation | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Content** | 27.24 | 1.91 | Excellent to Very Good |
| **Organization** | 17.64 | 0.93 | Good to Average |
| **Vocabulary** | 18.07 | 1.67 | Excellent to Very Good |
| **Language Use** | 22. 29 | 1.20 | Excellent to Very Good |
| **Mechanics** | 4.33 | 0.85 | Good to Average |
| **Overall** | **89.57** | **2.95** | **Excellent to Very Good** |

Table 2 presents the students' writing performance level after the intervention given, and the weighted mean interpreted as very poor, fair to poor, good to average, and excellent to very good.

After the intervention, the overall mean of the result was interpreted as Excellent to Very Good, with a mean of 89.57, respectively, and a standard deviation of 2.95. It implies that the interactional E-feedback method contributed to the improvement of the students' writing performance.

In the study of Chang (2011), feedback guided the students individually through the assessment process to develop an understanding of how to improve their performance, encouraged them to think at a higher level, pointed out areas that required their attention, addressed their time management skills, and helped improve their writing skills. The provided feedback also played a significant role in providing scaffolding for student learning. The students' favorable feelings toward the e-feedback were also because it was convenient for the instructor and students to communicate electronically, centering on submitted or revised assignments.

Moreover, according to Seliem & Ahmed (2009), as cited by Wihastyanang (2018) in the study, electronic feedback is proved to be essential in the teaching and learning of essay writing.

After presenting the initial and final writing performance levels, it is better to test the differences between the students' initial and final writing performance. The succeeding tables will show the results of the differences.

***Difference Between the Students' Initial and Final Writing Performance After the Exposure to Interactional E-Feedback Method***

Tables 1 and 2 show the results of the level of students' writing performance before and after the intervention, which helped determine the significant difference between the initial and final writing performance of the students exposed to the Interactional E-feedback method by comparing the results of table 1 & 2. This part will answer the third statement of the problem.

It can be observed in the table that the students' writing performance after the intervention had a final mean score of 89.57 and a standard deviation of 2.95, which is greater than its initial mean score of 68.57 and a standard deviation of 4.10, respectively.

Table 3. Significant Difference Between the Students' Initial and Final Writing Performance after the Exposure To E-Feedback Method

| Writing Performance | Mean | z-score | p-value | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Pre-Intervention** | 68.57 | 28.04 | 0.0E+00 | Significant |
| **Post-Intervention** | 89.57 | | | |

These results showed that the students improved their writing performance from good to average to excellent to a very good level. When the data was subjected to a z-test due to its large sample size of 42, it was found that there was a significant difference in the initial and final mean scores of the students, with a p-value of 0.0E+00, which is less than 0.05.

However, a study indicated that the ineffectiveness of e-learning is caused by the differences in students' learning styles, and the first thing to do before the implementation of e-feedback is to provide good facilities and infrastructure (Latief, 2018).

On the contrary, Saeed (2020) confirms that teacher e-feedback is essential in fostering learners' interactions, not just interaction. Still, the interactive feedback has enabled the learners to have a broader interpretation of the effectiveness of teacher feedback on students' writing.

It was also supported by the study of Condinato (2006) that students learned from the feedback given by the teacher and that feedback in whatever form plays an essential role in improving the students' writing performance.

With the following results, the null hypothesis is rejected; there is a significant difference between the initial and final writing performance levels of the students exposed to the Interactional E-feedback method. This implies that the Interactional E-feedback method has been effective in improving the writing performance level of the students.

After presenting the results and interpretation of the difference between the students' initial and final writing performance after exposure to the interactional e-feedback method, the succeeding paragraphs are the pedagogical

considerations formulated after determining the results of the third statement of the third problem.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Effective e-feedback has been identified as a powerful tool for enhancing learning and student achievement (Fulmer et al., 2017). Vadia and Ciptaningrum (2019) further supported this by proving that e-feedback significantly improves students' writing scores. Based on the findings of this study, the implementation of the Interactional E-feedback Method was effective in improving students' writing performance in the English for Academic and Professional Purposes class. The significant difference between the students' initial and final writing outputs confirmed the method's success, as it addressed key writing components such as content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Thus, interactional e-feedback is a practical and essential method that teachers should consider to help students enhance their writing performance.

In line with these conclusions, the researchers recommend promoting the use of e-feedback across schools to improve students' writing skills. Teachers are encouraged to adopt the Interactional E-feedback Method by using the study's output—the Pedagogical Considerations—which provides guidance on implementing the method in an online learning setup. Further studies are also recommended to explore the use of interactional e-feedback in other subjects beyond English for Academic and Professional Purposes. Future researchers may build on this study by investigating areas such as: (1) Exploring Teacher Interactive E-Feedback on Students' Writing through Google Docs, (2) Improving Writing Proficiency via Interactional Feedback, and (3) Online Interactional Feedback in Second Language Writing through Peer or Tutor Support.

## ADVANCED RESEARCH

Building upon the findings of this study, advanced research on interactional e-feedback could focus on integrating artificial intelligence–driven platforms with collaborative digital tools (e.g., Google Docs, Microsoft Teams, or LMS-integrated feedback systems) to examine how adaptive, real-time feedback shapes learners' long-term writing development across diverse academic disciplines. Such research could adopt a mixed-methods design, combining longitudinal quantitative analysis of writing performance with qualitative insights into students' perceptions, engagement, and autonomy in managing feedback. Moreover, investigating cross-cultural contexts and comparing teacher-, peer-, and AI-mediated interactional e-feedback would provide a deeper understanding of its pedagogical implications, equity in access, and scalability in both second language acquisition and broader academic writing proficiency. This approach would not only refine theoretical models of feedback but also contribute to the development of sustainable, technology-enhanced teaching practices in global education.

## REFERENCES

29, Learning and Teaching Writing Online, ed. G. Rijlaarsdam, M. Deane and T. Guasch, 13–30. Leiden: Brill

Agricola, B. T., & Prins, F. J. (2019, November 11). Impact of feedback request

Alharbi. (2019, January 28). Exploring the potential of Google Docs in facilitating innovative teaching and learning practices in an EFL writing course. Retrieved last March 12, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3LDUSMN

Alvarez. (2011, May 24). The value of feedback in improving collaborative writing assignments in an online learning environment. Retrieved last March 15, 2022, from https://bit.ly/3MLhvAh

Amelia. (n.d.). Feedback and reporting. Retrieved last March 15, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3sS4hcY

Barbecho, E. T. (2019). Writing competence of senior high school students of Cebu Technological University: Intervention for scientific writing development. Retrieved last December 8, 2021 from https://bit.ly/3sUfBFI

Berge, Z. L. (2002, January 1). (PDF) Active, interactive, and reflective eLearning. ResearchGate. Retrieved January 7, 2022, from https://bit.ly/3MHn16Y

Bhamani, S., Naqvi, S. M., & Nasir, L. (n.d.). Enhancing students' creative writing skills: An action research project. ERIC - Education Resources Information Center. Retrieved last January 3, 2022 from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1053632.pdf

Boo, H. F. (2020, October 20). Enhancing Students' Writing Performance in Higher Learning through Think-Write-Pair-Share: An Experimental Study. Retrieved last May 20, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3Nvv3Qr

Bradley, L., & Thouësny, S. (2017). Students' collaborative peer reviewing in an online writing environment. Retrieved last January 14, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3wLjD4r

Carless, D., D. Salter, M. Yang and J. Lam. 2011. Developing sustainable feedback practices. Studies in Higher Education 36,

Carnegie Mellon University. (2022). Why are students poorly prepared to write - Eberly center - Carnegie Mellon University. Retrieved last May 20, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3wQOhL3

Chang, N. (2011, April). Pre-service teachers' views: How did e-feedback through assessment facilitate their learning? Retrieved last January 15, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3Gi66po

Condinato, M. (2006). The effectiveness of interactional feedback and fragmented feedback in the writing performance of first year students of Northern Leyte College [Master's thesis].

Domantay, M. D., & Ramos, L. (2018). English writing performance of Grade 11 students. Retrieved last December 8, 2021 from https://bit.ly/3lCcaiG

Dyan, V. L. (2010). Improving writing skill through guided writing. Retrieved last January 3, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3wQuFqp

Ebadi, S. and M. Rahimi. 2017. Exploring the impact of online peer-editing using Google Docs on EFL learners'academic

Ebadi, S., & Rahimi, M. (2017, August 14). Exploring the impact of online peer-editing using Google Docs on EFL learners' academic writing skills: A mixed methods study. Taylor & Francis. Retrieved last February 7, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3MN8aIg

Ene, E., & Upton, T. (2014, October 1). Learner uptake of teacher electronic feedback in ESL composition. ResearchGate. Retrieved last January 6, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3x5rr19

forms and verbal feedback on higher education students' feedback perception, self-efficacy, and motivation. Taylor & Francis. Retrieved last May 20, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3lJe3ui

Graham, S., & Berninger, V. (2007, July 1). (PDF) The structural relationship between writing attitude and writing achievement in young children. ResearchGate. Retrieved last May 20, 2022 from https://bit.ly/38eHDVb

Guasch, T. and A. Espasa. 2015. Collaborative writing online: unravelling the feedback process. In Studies in Writing: Vol.

Harasim, L. (2017, May 26). Learning theory and online technologies | Linda Harasim | Taylor & Fra. Taylor & Francis. Retrieved last March 17, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3lBK5ID

Harris and Graham, M. (2019, March). Changing how writins is taught. Retrieved last December 3, 2021 from https://bit.ly/3lCfUAK

How the pandemic has changed the landscape of education - 2simple.com. (n.d.). https://bit.ly/3wNdDI9

Hyland, F. (2006, September 19). Teacher management of writing workshops: Two case studies. Retrieved March 15, 2022, from https://bit.ly/3LEnCFb

Ishtaiwa, F. F., & Aburezeq, I. M. (2015, December). The impact of Google Docs on student collaboration: A UAE case study. Retrieved last December 14, 2021 from https://bit.ly/3sXwFun

Kerr, K. (2017, May 7). Exploring student perceptions of verbal feedback. ResearchGate. Retrieved last December 14, 2021 from https://bit.ly/38MCAM2

Language Writing 39: 16–28

Lasala, C. B. (2014, May 15). Communicative competence of secondary senior students: Language instructional pocket. Retrieved last February 28, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3LHG2F8

Marasigan, B., & Hassan, H. B. (2019, March). Second language academic writing: A study of teachers' beliefs and pedagogical practices in senior high school, online submission, 2019-Mar. Retrieved last February 28, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3PDvzO8

McKinley, M. (2019, March 4). Importance of communicating in the classroom. Career Trend. Retrieved last April 15, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3PEhgsJ

Merkel, W. (2018, March 1). Role reversals: A case study of dialogic interactions and feedback on L2 writing. ResearchGate. Retrieved last February 4, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3ySlZRt

Merkel, W. 2018. Role reversals: a case study of dialogic interactions and feedback on L2 writing. Journal of Second

Nicol, D. and C. Milligan. 2006. Rethinking technology-supported assessment practices in relation to the seven principles

Nicol, D., & Macfarlane, D. (2006, May 1). Formative assessment and self-

no. 4: 395–407

of good feedback practice. In Innovative Assessment in Higher Education, ed. C. Bryan and K. Clegg, 84–98. London:

Pablo, J., & Lasaten, R. C. (2018, January 1). Writing difficulties and quality of academic essays of senior high school students. Retrieved last February 28, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3lF8Rax

regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. ResearchGate. Retrieved last May 25, 2022 from https://bit.ly/39OODZo

ResearchGate. Retrieved last January 14, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3wKFkBE

Routledge

Saeed, M. U., & Qunayeer, H. (2020, August 1). Exploring teacher interactive E-feedback on students' writing through Google Docs: Factors promoting interactivity and potential for learning. Taylor & Francis. https://bit.ly/3wG22fe

Safa, J. A. (2018, April 31). A brief overview of key issues in second language

Saxhaug, K. B. (2017). How interacting with teacher feedback impacts students' writing. Retrieved last February 28, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3PFcE5x

Schnee, A. K. (2010, May). Student Writing Performance: Identifying the Effects when Combining Planning and Revising Instructional Strategies. Retrieved last May 19, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3LJ9NFJ

Schutz, R. E. (2019, October). Stephen Krashen's theory of second language acquisition. Retrieved last March 17, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3sQNs2o

Social Interaction 15: 18–30

Steen-Utheim, A. and A.L. Wittek. 2017. Dialogic feedback and potentialities for student learning. Learning, Culture and

Swan, K. (2001, January 1). (PDF) Virtual interaction: Design factors affecting student satisfaction and perceived learning in asynchronous online courses.

Urbano, C. M., & Gumangan, M. A. (2021, June 30). Reading and writing needs of senior high school students: The case of Filipino students in the Philippines. Retrieved last December 8, 2021 from https://bit.ly/38H23Xl

Utheim, A. S., & Witek, L. (2017, June 1). Dialogic feedback and potentialities for student learning. ResearchGate. Retrieved last February 28, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3GcgoY0

Vadia, M. (2020, January 1). (PDF) Improving students' writing skill using online feedback. ResearchGate. Retrieved last December 14, 2021 from https://bit.ly/3yWeN7c

Walberg, H. (2003). Teaching speaking, listening and writing. Retrieved last December 13, 2021 from https://bit.ly/3GecygU

Wihastyanang, W. D. (2017, December). The impact of electronic feedback on second year English college students' writing quality. Retrieved last December 2021 from https://bit.ly/3MLMZGD

writing skills: a mixed methods study. Computer Assisted Language Learning 30, no. 8: 787–815

writing teaching and research. Retrieved last March 17, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3wUvtuk

Yeste, M. G. (2018). View of electronic feedback: Pedagogical considerations for the implementation of software | The EuroCALL review. Retrieved last January 16, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3GgQbY4

Yusuf, Q. (2019, January 3). (PDF) Cooperative learning strategies to enhance writing skills among second language learners. ResearchGate. Retrieved last May 20, 2022 from https://bit.ly/3Nz6qSO