

## Exploring EFL Instructors and Students Perceptions of Written Corrective Feedback on Blackboard Platform: A Case Study

**Abrar Basabrin**

English Language Institute  
King Abdulaziz University  
Jeddah, Saudi Arabia  
[aambasabrin@kau.edu.sa](mailto:aambasabrin@kau.edu.sa)

### Abstract

This case study examines the perceptions of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructors and students of written corrective feedback (WCF) preferences on the Blackboard platform from the two-way communicators' prospectors (students and teachers). It also aims to investigate the instructors' beliefs on feedback given via the Learning Management System (LMS) – Blackboard, along with the students' understanding of it. Three university-level EFL students and their instructor participated in this case study. As such, this study followed a qualitative data collection and analysis design where the primary data were recorded in semi-structured interviews regarding *Think-Aloud-Protocol*. The analysis and results showed four main classifications (emerging themes) which are: 1) Instructor's Beliefs and Mechanisms toward Feedback on Blackboard Writings. 2) Students' Preferences and Views on Error Correction (ER) on Blackboard 3) Students and Teachers' Views about Blackboard Usage 4) Obstacles that Faced both of the Language instructors and Students. The study concluded that students' personal factor significantly relies on their feedback preferences concerning feedback amount, type, and level. The study also revealed a positive attitude towards the LMS Blackboard usage.

**Keywords:** Blackboard learning, case Study, direct-feedback, EFL writing, indirect-feedback, written corrective-feedback (CF)

**Cite as:** Basabrin, A. (2019). Exploring EFL Instructors and Students Perceptions of Written Corrective Feedback on Blackboard Platform: A Case Study. *Arab World English Journal, Special Issue 1: Application of Global ELT Practices in Saudi Arabia*. 179-192.  
DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/elt1.13>

## 1.0 Introduction

Doubtlessly, feedback is “a continuous two-way communication that encourages teaching and learning among educators and students” (Singh, 2016, p. 79). Due to corrective feedback importance in language teaching, many language studies were devoted to understanding the efficiency behind WCF- whether in a long or short term (Bitchener & Storch, 2016; Ferris, 2014). As far as many feedback factors were addressed in research projects such as, feedback benefit among language learners, the amount and type that is most efficient in language teaching and what feedback methods would be the most applicable (Nassaji, 2017; Zhang & Hyland, 2018), students and instructors’ feedback preferences and perceptions of WCF in EFL studies (Rajab, Khan, & Elyas, 2016; Storch, 2018). Along with the current and increasing adoption of technology integration within language learning institutions, LMS Blackboard software has been largely and widely applied for language teaching purposes (Hossan & Sarah, 2017; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Blackboard can be defined as: “a learning system software application to facilitate teaching and learning. The system has capabilities of instruction, communication and assessment” (Tawalbeh, 2017). However, researchers have reported some obstacles and challenges regarding Blackboard usage and learning outcomes (Hossain, Akhtar, & Rahman, 2017) and some studied argued that the traditional face-to-face teaching or conferencing might be even more efficient and satisfactory than the implementation of Blackboard (Tichavsky, Hunt, Driscoll, & Jicha, 2015).

Notwithstanding, many researchers consider Blackboard LMS as reliable and plays an effective element in providing corrective feedback to language learners (Ai, 2017; Sauro, 2009). In that regard, this study aims to fill out the gap of the previous studies of corrective feedback along with the implementation of Blackboard LMS as a tool specifically utilized in the Saudi, EFL context.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Corrective Feedback on EFL/ESL Writing

Corrective feedback is defined as a type of negative response of learner’s language production (Ellis, 2009). Studies has shown a great deal on the impact of WCF on language learners; as it is mainly regarded to students’ success and might give the English as a second language (ESL). This is in addition to the fact that EFL teachers a clue about the language feature that is needed to be encountered in regard to students’ needs (Ellis, 2009; Yilmaz, 2013) However, other studies focused on the effectiveness of certain feedback types such as the direct, indirect corrective feedback of surface level content, and error coding (Ferris, 2012; Rajab et al., 2016). The direct CF form is perceived as merely editing the learner’s production to be a version free of errors with explicitly mentioning the mistakes (Hartshorn & Evans, 2015). Atmaca (2016) believes that the direct feedback correction stands as “spoon feeding” when the teacher trains students of what is must be written. On the other hand, the indirect feedback correction twists the process over and forces autonomous learning, in which the EFL/ESL instructor provides hints standing as gaps of desired textual form of language learner’s performance (Tang & Liu, 2018).

Corrective feedback has always been a controversial debate in foreign language writing (Bitchener, 2017; Bitchener & Knoch, 2015). The ongoing debate is regarded to its effectiveness

on language learning under the consideration of other varieties. The problematic part of corrective feedback is aligned with other engaging aspects. Cohen-sayag (2016) proposed, in a study of feedback reflection on learners' writings, that the effectiveness of feedback is ultimately measured not on behalf of feedback type, but concerning to the type of instruction, feedback receiving, feedback giver, and feedback receiver. To that extend, some research studies claimed that the assembly of different methodologies which are assigned for studies of corrective feedback on writing- results difficulties of proving the feedback effectiveness on ESL/EFL writing (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Another issue to be concerned is the need of feedback correction to reinforce and foster a source of language learning especially within an EFL context (Yilmaz, 2013).

### *2.2 Blackboard E-Learning Software*

Blackboard is one of the e-learning LMS commercial software that has been widely invested by universities and academic institutions worldwide; especially in North America and Europe (Caputi & Garrido, 2015). Blackboard advantages were highlighted in numerous studies within the last decade. For instance, Ioannou, Brown, and Artino (2015) assert that the core contributitional aspect of Blackboard falls within the asynchronous collaborative aspect that possesses unlimited access at any time and anywhere. Additionally, Khan, Egbue, Palkie, and Madden (2017) believe that the beneficial feature of Blackboard depends on the accessibility of the course materials at any time along with the freedom of both class time and the expressive edge of discussing and asking.

### *2.3 Research Questions*

The following three research questions guided this study:

1. What is the correlation between students and teachers' preferences of the amount of corrective feedback that is given on EFL writing topics on Blackboard?
2. What is the correlation between students and teachers' preferences of style and type of the corrective feedback that is given on EFL writing topics on Blackboard?
3. What are the students' understanding and beliefs to the given feedback about teachers' beliefs of feedback on Blackboard?

### **3.0 Methodology**

This paper follows a qualitatively based case study design. Think-Aloud-Protocol was applied in the interviews along with interviewee's questions. In order to answer the research questions, two main elements that the instructor was asked to apply were:

- a) the instructor gives a detailed analysis to one of her Blackboard writing corrections
- b) the instructor generally talks about her rationales and methodologies of feedback giving in term of the current integration to Blackboard. On the other hand, students are asked to retrieve one of their writings and think-aloud saying in what way did they understand the correction, and how do they prefer it to be.

### 3.1 Data Collection

#### 3.1.1. The Pace of English Language Institute Module

This study was conducted in an EFL context at the ELI at KAU university in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. The ELI's program contains four modules that must be achieved within the first preparatory year of the university. In each semester, two modules are accomplished. Thus, it is an intensive fast-track course of seven teaching weeks per module. It is also important to specify that the first teaching module of 101 (beginner's level) is not counted in the students' grade point average (GPA) of the preparatory year.

#### 3.1.2 Data Analysis

The instructor was asked to choose three students with different levels of English language skills. Each student stands for her grade whether A, B, or C. For instance, the first student's grade will be her aliases in this study. Furthermore, the instructor was asked to discuss one of her graded writings during the interview. It is important to specify that students' interviews were conducted in Arabic Language to ensure that they fully understood the given questions and they were able to express their thoughts during the think-aloud process. The interviews were translated to English and verified by two, translation-specialized, associate professors at KAU.

### 3.2. Participants

The participants of this study were an EFL instructor with three students of her last module section. First, the EFL instructor with Masters of TESOL and over six years of teaching experience at higher education. A female native speaker, from the United States of America, who is working at the ELI at KAU. Second, the student participants of this study were three female preparatory year program (PYP) students, who were majored to be science students studying English Language for Academic Purposes. The students were all female, Saudi and Arabic speaking.

## 4.0 Analysis and Results

The analysis of this study highlighted four main themes, in which they are explained in depth including their relevant subthemes.

### 4.1 The Instructor's Beliefs and Mechanisms toward Feedback on Blackboard Writings

#### 4.1.1 Feedback on Structure Level versus Content Level

The instructor believes that she corrects major errors for students whether these errors are structural or based on the writing content. Though she focuses more on the structure-level correction, as she states:

*“Actually, I live Mostly in the mechanics and sentence structure for students. What I do? I may highlight an area where maybe capital letters are not correct or not used properly. I also capitalize or highlight areas where they need punctuation marks. I also highlight how they need to change the order of their sentence or words that are used within the sentence. That's how I mostly do my correction and how I give feedback”.*

She reiterated the latter by stating: *“I correct everything; I look at the mechanics, grammar, structure, meaning... Everything”* However, the fewer amount of content level correction might be the result of the given topics on Blackboard; as the instructor explains that there are no writing techniques which are provided to them in term of the topic sentence, the body, and the conclusion. It is important to acknowledge here that Blackboard writing topics are fixed along with each English level, thus, the instructor does not authorise the topics. Nonetheless, the writing topics are about a specific title with its prompts in which the students must write about and include all of them.

#### *4.1.1 Teacher’s Rationales and Beliefs on Correcting Blackboard Writings: Think-Aloud-Protocol*

During the processes of the think-aloud-protocol, the teacher explains a very brief writing protocol on Blackboard. She states:

*“I highlighted like, were punctuation should’ve been, capitalization should’ve been there like in this one. And she sees her period or her full-stop, that is supposed to be capital (she knows that one, I spoke to her) and so things like that... and then these areas of course maybe need, umm maybe like, um may be punctuation mark or maybe these too far apart or something like that”.*

She further states:

*“I don’t always just highlight, but I...I highlight were... umm, sometimes I highlight just to let them know where the mistakes are.”*

While the teacher was clarifying her methods of assigning the corrective feedback, she added that she tends to use explanatory comments in each writing to illustrate more and make sure that her feedback effectively received. According to the teacher:

*“Not just highlighting, but also I tell them where the mistakes are and how they look and find some examples on how to correct”.*

She also specified that she does not fix sentences. When demonstrating her rationales, she explicitly agrees that feedback is very effective, though she is hesitant towards the concept of being fully absorbed by language students and this evidence in her statement that:

*“I think it’s helpful. Feedback is very helpful. They need that. Do they take it; apply it in the next writing? I don’t know. But I’ve done my job as an instructor to make them know hey, this is what I see, this is what you need to work on, this is what you can do in your next writing assignment. So, the longest they know the longest that I see it”.*

More interestingly that though the instructor doubts that students would not be able to apply it next time on their writings, clearly, she believes it is part of the teacher’s image in front of students. She added:

*I can tell them the errors and tell them how they do it. They still do it back in their next writing. I don't know, again they still do it in the next writing! So, I don't know! To me, again it goes back to having a separate writing class for students. They only do much in the class time... We've talked to the management, lots of teachers do.*

Part of this, she seems believing that feedback is a tool of building students-teacher rapport. For example, she mentioned that when she corrects, students will acknowledge that their teacher “cares”. According to her:

*“Feedback is helpful; it let the students know the instructor dose care. And, it let the students know that the teacher knows what's going on”.*

Thus, the teacher's rationales about feedback on Blackboard writings are obviously fused on the aspect of correcting the basics of writing, e.g. capitalizations, sentence structure, and punctuation through highlighting and giving comments and examples but not to fix the sentences. She focusses on both content and structure levels in order to ensure that the flow of the writing is in ease, though major errors are the most prior ones.

#### *4.1.2 The Amount of Corrective Feedback*

Although the instructor tends to correct all major aspects of the basics of writing (see Table 1), she does not correct every single mistake. As it is mentioned in the previous section of the teacher's rationales, she focuses on major errors and the fundamentals of writing. For instance, she states: *“As teachers, we can't spend a lot of time on one particular thing”.*

In other cases, she mentioned that students might commit same kind of language mistakes: *“Well, I would say 99% same issue; capital letter, grammar, sentence structure. Everybody has the same issue pretty much”.*

She would then, as a follow-up, at that point dedicate a lesson for it or discuss it in a regular teaching class. During the class discussion of the students' writing issues, she prefers to discuss extra details or questions- of course if needed during her office hours, as she clearly states:

*“Usually address it in the class on a PowerPoint and I tell them about the errors ...and then, that would give them a more than an idea of what they need to look out for their next assignment”- “I would talk about it in the class if they see it or not, if they have any questions, we can talk about it... to set-aside during the office hours”.*

Whereas, she assumes that the module pace is quite fast and there is no time to conference students and inform them about their actual level of English. Regardless to the follow-up point, she attempts to correct just what they have covered in the class, as she states:

*“I want to let them more focused of what we've covered in class time”.*

Table 1. *The category, type and amount of analysed feedback received from the instructor during the think-aloud process.*

<b>Feedback Category</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Feedback Type</b>
Structure Level (Grammar)	8	5 direct/3 indirect
Structure Level (punctuation)	4	3 direct/ 1 indirect
Content Level (Sentence ambiguity)	1	Indirect
Content Level (Sentence Order)	1	Indirect
Content Level (Compound sentence)	1	Direct

On top of that, she was not able to correct each writing on Blackboard due to time constraints and the number of students in the class. So, she follows:

*“picking and choosing” method to solve that issue. According to her, I try to correct as much as I can... umm, you know, because if I see, um, a lot of mistakes just in one paragraph. Then you know, it doesn’t take that much time. Just to correct a small like this. So, I don’t mind going to the whole thing. I can copy it, I can paste it and show them the highlighted areas for errors like this... So, yea, a small paragraph like this that doesn’t take that much time, I usually go through it.*

The teacher is probably concerned about time-consuming aspects the most, especially when the number of students in her class increased to 35 students, which is a huge increase in comparison to her previous one. Explicitly, she notes:

*“I try, I try... this module I have a large class. The last module I didn’t have such a large one. So, I was able to do this. Sometimes I just browse through it. Maybe I’ll pick certain ones that really need correcting. It does take time”.*

#### 4.1.3 Feedback Style: Direct vs. Indirect

Interestingly, the instructor noted during the interview that she tends to apply the direct type of feedback in her correction. However, when assembling think-aloud-protocol into the use, it turns out that she actually uses the indirect corrective feedback along with explanatory comments and examples. She mentioned that she does not fix her students errors directly, however, she aids them with examples of how the error should be written in that regard. Her usage of the indirect feedback can be considered as the lesser version of the direct one.

#### 4.1.4 Students’ Preferences and Views on Error Correction on Blackboard

During data gathering, it was impressive that Grade A and C students understood all of the given feedback. Grade A student indicated:

*“Everything was clear!”*

An example of her think-aloud-protocol is as following:

*“The teacher noted that I should add an –s for present simple. I understood what meant by the given example. Also, I had another error. I didn’t leave a space and the period was too close to the word. And, I understood that when the verb ends with (s) or (x), I should add –es for present simple”.*

Furthermore, Grade C student specified that she understood the feedback and the teacher gives comments on how to rewrite the errors which were obvious for her. In contrast, Grade B student claims she could not interrupt some areas of the corrective feedback. For instance, it was difficult for the student to comprehend the first, fifth, and final comments .

First comment:

*“I didn’t understand her first feedback. The instructor typed (what is A? ... They are one). I don’t get what does she didn’t understand from my writing?”-*

Fifth comment: *“She commented the sentence is hard to understand and sentences order aren’t good. Here, I didn’t know what I should write, though I understood her point. But then how can I correct the sentence?!”-*The final comment: *“In the last comment, I don’t understand where my mistake is until now. I even asked my friends but none of them knows”*

As shown in the previous example, the student expected a direct feedback for the fifth comment. She clarifies that she understood her error, however she struggles on fixing it. On her last feedback, she also did not perceive the mistake wishing to have a direct one.

#### 4.1.5 The Importance of Instructor’s Comments

Significantly, all of the three participants indicated that teacher’s comments were effective in a way that shaped their understanding in general. For example, Grade A student specified:

*“Everything was clear for me. And there are examples in different colour which helped me to understand!”*

Moreover, Grade B Student particularly mentioned that she understood the correction due to the given comments, e.g.:

*“When she specified that I need a space and a full-stop in the second comment, I got this one because she gives me a clear example”*

When Grade C student was asked about the comments, she *replied:*

*“Yes, I would like to have illustrative comments”*

#### 4.1.6 The Preferable Amount and Type of the Given Feedback

Grade B and A students prefer an appropriate amount of correction, but not every single mistake. Grade B student specified her reorganisation of the fact that she will be frustrated if she received a paper that is full of mistakes. Also, she aims to be corrected for structure level. For example, she noted:

*“I don’t like to be corrected for every single detail because if I see my writing being full of errors, I will be disappointed. So, I am rather corrected for the major errors.” – “I think simple errors are given by direct feedback, but the major complex ones with the indirect.”*

Similarly, Grade A student goes for structure level by stating:

*“Just major errors that I’ll be assessed for in the exam”*

On the other hand, Grad C believed that she must be corrected on everything. For instance, she said:

*“I would like to be corrected for all mistakes”*

and she also expressed her wishes to be assessed for both structure and content levels.

With regard to the preferred type, Grade B hoped to have a mixed-methods of correction; direct and indirect. She then explained that minor errors are approachable to find and understand while the major ones are hard for her to guess or to look for. From the given example, she clearly wished to receive a direct feedback as she admits the fact of understanding the error but not knowing how to fix it, e.g. She commented:

*“the sentence is hard to understand, and sentences orders aren’t good. Here, I didn’t know what I should write, though I understood her point. But then, how can I correct the sentence?”*

Grade A also wishes to have direct feedback whereas Grade C student just wanted to receive the indirect one. Moreover, they all wanted to know the aim of correction and how their writings are going to be assessed.

## 4.2 Students’ and Teacher’s Views about Blackboard Usage

### 4.2.1. Blackboard versus Paper-based/ Hand Written Feedback: Teacher’s and Students’ Prospectors

Clearly, the teacher preferences were based on Blackboard. She believes that paper correction means time-consuming, while in Blackboard she can easily adjust the correction such as, copying, pasting, and highlighting. However, she prefers handwriting correction in the way that it possesses privacy and gives her a clear idea of her students’ language level. She indicated that the problematic aspect of Blackboard is that most of the students copy and paste from each other. She states:

*“I would say good job, but I know this is not my student’s writing. Therefore, again going back to the issues of Blackboard students can cut and paste or people can see other’s people writings at the time and copy what is written. Even though, when saying good job or excellent” – “the Blackboard give them the chance to cut and paste however the paper gives me a clear idea where their strength and weaknesses are”*

Of course, technology aids students with some automatic correction when the paper does not. The instructor believes that students commit such plagiarism due to the limitation of time. She said:

*“They wanna finish. They don’t wanna take so much time! They have progress tests, they want to finish too!”*

From the opposite prospector, Grade B student prefers the paper-based feedback more than the Blackboard one. She describes the hand-written feedback as being “obvious” and she claims that at the moment of receiving the paper you can ask your teacher of what you did not understand. Clearly, she states:

*“In class feedback was better for me because I had the paper in my hand and it was clear, everything was clear, I can see my mistakes. It was more helpful than Blackboard”.*

Grade C stands for paper-based if it aligns with face-to-face feedback, otherwise she welcomes Blackboard more in a sense of being more “clearer”. For instance, she replies in the following manner:

Interviewee: *“Paper-based because she is going to advise me face-to-face”*

Interviewer: *“Choose one of them without the factor of face to face. Let me re-ask you the question. Do you prefer to receive your feedback on a paper without your teacher or on Blackboard?”*

Interviewee: *“Then I’ll choose Blackboard”*

Interviewer: *“Why?”*

Interviewee: *“It is clearer”*

Whereas, Grade A student is fond of Blackboard. She did not just choose Blackboard over handwriting feedback, but also, she believes that it stands as face-to-face feedback. She also stated:

*“I would choose Blackboard conferencing over face-to-face (if they offer it) because it is going to be easier and at any time”.*

#### 4.3.2 The Prior Expectations of Blackboard Usage

The teacher’s expectations of students’ writing on Blackboard was not that high. She relates that to her experience of teaching English in an EFL context, especially in Saudi Arabia, e.g.:

*“My expectation for level one was not that high on writing. They are 101!”*

In term of the teacher’s expectations of Blackboard usage, she admits that the whole process was quite “in a rush”. Furthermore, she is learning how to administrate and adjust things on Blackboard until now. She clarified that because she is not trained enough, she still attends Blackboard sessions that are running by the university. She added:

*“For the first module... umm, that was just a pilot run. For the first module I think most of the teachers had issues with the Blackboard. Again, it’s just, the Blackboard is just new in this module or in this school semester”.*

Despite the fact all three of the students who participated in this study have previously expected Blackboard of being difficult and hard to work on, of course none of them have had a prior experience with Blackboard. Notwithstanding, they then figured out that it is easy and even convenient for them. Grade C student believed that it assists her especially when she sees other

students' writings. However, this point might be a concerning issue as the teacher noted previously. The student stated:

*"I do read my colloquies' writings and sometimes I use some of their vocab or expressions".*

However, Grade A student noted:

*"Blackboard is helpful because I can know my mistakes, not in front of others, not as a class".*

In Addition, Grade B student gives good points in term of Blackboard efficiency and convenience, she said: Blackboard is very convenient:

*"It makes me connected to the course even though when I'm home".*

She added:

*"I like that the teacher can reply, there is time"*

Finally, she concluded the benefits of Blackboard by saying:

*"We all see our writings, mistakes, we can benefit from each other"*

#### 4.3.3 Challenges that Faced both Language Instructor and Students

Some factors negatively affected the learning process during the module. First, the module pace was quite fast and intense. Students believed that there was no time for them to do all of the required tasks. They were required to complete the progress tests along with the writing topics for each unit. They also had two midterms and the final which was about two exams as well as the mid-module ones. On the other hand, the teacher explained that she could not correct weekly all of the writings to thirty-five students. Second, along with pace of the module, the Blackboard section has been assigned to students by the second week. So, students had to write about four writing topics and four progress tests at once. Third, students had mentioned that they were not that much motivated to work on their own language or to take the course seriously. In fact, what mattered to them was just to pass the level as long as it is a required course for the next level in English but not counted in students' GPA. Fourth, the teacher believed that there is a significant need to writing classes. She indicated that students already received a considerable amount of teaching in the class. Fifth, students were concerned to ask or to get back to their teacher during the teacher office hours because she was a native speaker. One of the participants noted that she felt that her teacher will be unable to understand her points, or she might be unable to understand her teacher due to her (the student) low proficiency level of English. That was why she did not attempt to visit her teacher's office to ask for help.

## 5. Discussion and Conclusions

As it is apparent from the data analysis, the three EFL learners' answers were not generalizable to all EFL language students. However, this study attempts to narrow down the search and abstain a closer view of the students' feedback understanding about their teachers' feedback methodologies. Thus, the study highlights several interesting findings and two major conclusions in term of teacher-student relationship of a shared corrective feedback through Blackboard usage.

The first conclusion has been measured with regard to the students' feedback perceptions and understanding during the think-aloud-protocol. This is because considerable outcome of the teachers' given feedback was generated. Clearly, the students effectively perceived the corrective feedback as they did due to the application of two important factors, which were: a) illustrative comments, and b) the use of mixed feedback types. In this study, the importance and the need of illustrative comments was mentioned by all of the participants where two of them specified that they understood the corrections because of the given comments. As the Grade B participant noted that she is likely tends to be given feedback and comments and directly guided to her mistakes in complex errors which Glover and Brown (2006) indicated that feedback upon annotation and error correction does not necessarily bring much efficiency. However, explanatory notes must be added especially with particular rules. In that regard, mixed method or type of feedback is most approachable to fill in the gap of the students' variations and needs of perceiving the feedback in one class and also can be assigned to Glover and Brown (2006) study by giving a direct feedback to rule-based manners, when others minor features can be indirect. This study data shows personal differences of receiving the type of corrective feedback among three EFL learners of one class. However, it has been noted earlier in the literature preview that learners' preferences of feedback receiving, is dependent on the degree of education of the learner, the learner's English language performance, and the student's background (Singh, 2016). In this study, it has been found that there is additional factor which affected students' feedback preferences and that is the personal factor. In an EFL class, students' personal variations and skills of learning have been always an issue of language teaching. Thus, personal variations aspect is not just limited in class teaching methods, but also in their way of comprehension and perceiving feedback. This paper found no significant correlation between student's language skill and preferences on feedback type. That might be resulted due to the limitation relating to the number of participants in this study. The second conclusion relies on the specified preferences that students express during the interview. In this study, students preferred structure/surface-level feedback to the content-level. In particular, the correction must be based on major errors but not every single mistake. Numerous studies explored students' preferences of surface and content level feedback in second language practices showed a great reaction toward surface-level correction (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Kang and Han (2015) also indicated in their study that error correction must be selective to avoid discouraging learners. In that respect, face-to-face conferencing is found appealing for students, as they believe it keeps them away of being corrected in front of other classmates. A study of Sanz (2018) highlighted the significant role of face-to-face aligned with the written feedback. This study along previous research studies such as Ai (2017) and Vyatkina (2011), highlights the efficacy of utilising Blackboard as a tool for language learning which carries out a great convenience as perceived by EFL students and teachers alike.

#### **About the Author:**

**Abrar Basabrin** is an EFL instructor at the English Language Institute at King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. Her Master of Arts from the Department of Arts and Humanities was granted with the major of Languages, Literature, and Linguistics along with TESL, from Indiana State University, the United States of America. Ms. Basabrin's over five years of teaching experience to adult language learners in an EFL context.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8630-2004>

## References

- Ai, H. (2017). Providing graduated corrective feedback in an intelligent computer-assisted language learning environment. *ReCALL*, 29(3), 313-334.
- Atmaca, Ç. (2016). Contrasting perceptions of students and teachers: written corrective feedback. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(2), 166-182.
- Bitchener, J. (2017). Why some L2 learners fail to benefit from written corrective feedback. *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning*, 129-140.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*: Routledge.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2015). Written corrective feedback studies: Approximate replication of Bitchener & Knoch (2010a) and Van Beuningen, De Jong & Kuiken (2012). *Language Teaching*, 48(3), 405-414.
- Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development* (Vol. 96): Multilingual Matters.
- Caputi, V., & Garrido, A. (2015). Student-oriented planning of e-learning contents for Moodle. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, 53, 115-127.  
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnca.2015.04.001>
- Cohen-sayag, E. (2016). Student-Teachers across the Curriculum Learn to Write Feedback: Does It Reflect on Their Writing? *Journal of Effective Teaching*, 16(2), 5-19.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1).
- Ferris, D. (2012). Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing studies. *Language Teaching*, 45(4), 446-459.
- Ferris, D. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 6-23. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.09.004>
- Glover, C., & Brown, E. (2006). Written feedback for students: too much, too detailed or too incomprehensible to be effective? *Bioscience Education*, 7(1), 1-16.
- Hartshorn, K. J., & Evans, N. W. (2015). The effects of dynamic written corrective feedback: A 30-week study. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 1(2).
- Hossain, M. M., Akhtar, S., & Rahman, M. A. (2017). A STUDY TO EVALUATE USERS' SATISFACTION OF BLACKBOARD LEARN. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(1).
- Hossan, B., & Sarah, A. (2017). SAUDI FEMALE STUDENTS' ENGAGEMENT IN LANGUAGE LEARNING.
- Ioannou, A., Brown, S. W., & Artino, A. R. (2015). Wikis and forums for collaborative problem-based activity: A systematic comparison of learners' interactions. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 24, 35-45.
- Kang, E., & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta-analysis. *The modern language journal*, 99(1), 1-18.
- Khan, A., Egbue, O., Palkie, B., & Madden, J. (2017). Active Learning: Engaging Students To Maximize Learning In An Online Course. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 15(2), 107-115.
- Nassaji, H. (2017). *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning: Research, theory, applications, implications* (Vol. 66): Taylor & Francis.

- Rajab, H., Khan, K., & Elyas, T. (2016). A Case Study of EFL Teachers' Perceptions and Practices in Written Corrective Feedback. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 5(1), 119-131.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*: Cambridge university press.
- Sanz, C. (2018). Implicit Versus Explicit Grammar Feedback. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1-7.
- Sauro, S. (2009). Computer-mediated corrective feedback and the development of L2 grammar.
- Singh, M. K. M. (2016). Graduate Students' Needs and Preferences for Written Feedback on Academic Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 9(12), 79-88.
- Storch, N. (2018). Written corrective feedback from sociocultural theoretical perspectives: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 51(2), 262-277.
- Tang, C., & Liu, Y.-T. (2018). Effects of indirect coded corrective feedback with and without short affective teacher comments on L2 writing performance, learner uptake and motivation. *Assessing Writing*, 35, 26-40.
- Tawalbeh, T. I. (2017). EFL Instructors' Perceptions of Blackboard Learning Management System (LMS) at University Level. *English Language Teaching*, 11(1), 1.
- Tichavsky, L. P., Hunt, A. N., Driscoll, A., & Jicha, K. (2015). "It's Just Nice Having a Real Teacher": Student Perceptions of Online versus Face-to-Face Instruction. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 9(2), 2.
- Vyatkina, N. (2011). Writing instruction and policies for written corrective feedback in the basic language sequence. *L2 Journal*, 3(1).
- Yilmaz, Y. (2013). The relative effectiveness of mixed, explicit and implicit feedback in the acquisition of English articles. *System*, 41(3), 691-705.
- Zhang, Z. V., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 36, 90-102.