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Abstract
The present study investigates EFL teachers' perceptions of electronic corrective feedback in Saudi Arabia and the impact of electronic feedback on students' learning process. It also seeks to elucidate the benefits and limitations of using electronic feedback through the Madrasati platform on students' writing. The significance of this study lies in its exploration of the evolving landscape of educational technology in Saudi Arabian EFL teaching and learning providing insights to optimize feedback practices and enhance professional development, policy making, and student outcomes. The study addresses two primary questions: a) what are EFL teachers' perceptions of electronic corrective feedback? b) which types and methods of electronic feedback did teachers utilize the most and were found effective? This research employs a quantitative approach, utilizing a questionnaire to gather data. The study sample comprised 141 EFL teachers from public secondary and high schools in Saudi Arabia. Several significant conclusions were drawn from the study. Firstly, the results indicated a high level of satisfaction with the benefits of electronic corrective feedback among Saudi Arabian teachers; they highly value the feedback provided by this method. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Madrasati platform emerged as the most frequently used tool, as teachers were initially mandated to utilize it for delivering feedback. The findings revealed that Saudi EFL teachers identified explanation and description as the most effective forms of correction. Furthermore, the study's results demonstrated that Saudi teachers did not believe electronic corrective feedback would impede their ability to provide adequate student feedback. The study also discussed several pedagogical implications and recommendations.
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Introduction

One way to define corrective feedback in education is as the teacher's response to students' errors. Corrective feedback is the process through which teachers correct students in various forms (Mubarak, 2013). Feedback plays a crucial role in the teaching and learning process, potentially leading to either successful outcomes or the contrary. Recently, a new form of corrective feedback has emerged: electronic corrective feedback (e-feedback), which involves instructors delivering feedback electronically with the assistance of a computer (Ene & Upton, 2018). E-feedback be categorized as asynchronous, synchronous, or a combination. According to Ene and Upton (2018), asynchronous e-feedback (delayed) is typically delivered through written comments after students have completed their writing is beneficial. In contrast, synchronous e-feedback (immediate) consists of real-time text-based chats between teachers and students, usually given simultaneously while students write (Shintani, 2015). Synchronous feedback (immediate) supports students' language acquisition processes and allows them to mediate and consolidate their writing on the spot (Canals et al., 2021; Shintani, 2015). Therefore, the timing of feedback (immediate or delayed) has significant effects on students' writing performance.

This study aims to investigate EFL teachers' perceptions of electronic feedback (e-feedback) in Saudi Arabia and its impact on students' learning processes. It will also elucidate the benefits and limitations of using e-feedback through the Madrasati platform on students' writing.

Understanding teachers' perceptions of this new form of feedback will provide insights into their knowledge of electronic corrective feedback, including its types and methods within the Saudi context. Additionally, it will help determine if teachers require further training in delivering effective electronic feedback.

Research Objectives and Questions

1. To explore EFL teachers' perceptions of electronic corrective feedback in Saudi Arabia.
2. To identify the types and methods of electronic feedback most frequently utilized by teachers and evaluate their effectiveness.
3. To assess the impact of e-feedback on students' learning processes, particularly in enhancing their writing performance compared to traditional feedback.
4. To investigate the limitations and challenges associated with using e-feedback on students' writing in EFL classrooms, focusing on beginner second language learners.

By addressing these research objectives, this study aims to provide comprehensive insights into the dynamics of e-feedback implementation in EFL education in Saudi Arabia, contributing to both theoretical understanding and practical implications for teaching practices. Thus, the research aims to address the following research questions:

- What are EFL teachers' perceptions of electronic corrective feedback?
- Which types and methods of electronic feedback do teachers utilize most frequently, and which are found to be effective? Conversely, which types and methods present the most challenges?

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge (TPACK)

The TPACK model, introduced by Mishra and Koehler (2006), explores the intersecting knowledge domains that enable teachers to effectively integrate technology into teaching and
engaging students. This model comprises three primary domains: content knowledge (CK), which refers to teachers' understanding and expertise in the subject areas they teach; pedagogical knowledge (PK), which encompasses teachers' expert knowledge of teaching methods and strategies; and technological knowledge (TK), which examines the role of electronic tools in enhancing students' learning. Additionally, the model includes intersections such as Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK), which addresses how teachers utilize their knowledge to effectively engage students in learning concepts and skills. Historically, scholars like Shulman (1986) viewed PCK as the pinnacle of teaching excellence. However, Mishra and Koehler (2006) introduced Technological Knowledge (TK) to 21st-century teaching, creating new intersections such as Technological Content Knowledge (TCK), which pertains to the use of technology in a subject area to facilitate deep and lasting learning. Another intersection is Technological Pedagogical Knowledge (TPK), which refers to the teacher's ability to select and manage appropriate electronic tools to support students' learning processes.

At the core of this model, where all intersections converge, is Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge (TPACK). This area reflects teachers' understanding of how technological tools can enhance teaching and effectively support students' learning. The success of TPACK application in classrooms is influenced by context, as each teacher, student, and classroom environment is unique. Therefore, it is crucial to consider the goals and objectives of students' learning, rather than focusing solely on technology. The TPACK model is highly relevant to language teaching as it provides a framework for understanding how technology, pedagogy, and content knowledge intersect in the educational context. Language teachers with well-developed TPACK are better equipped to navigate the complexities of integrating technology into their teaching practices while focusing on language content and effective pedagogy. This model emphasizes the importance of a balanced approach that incorporates a digital-age perspective, considering the unique needs of language learners. Vygotsky stated, "The only good learning is that which is in advance of development" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 89). Ultimately, this led to the discovery of the learner's Zone of Proximal Development (ZDP), i.e., what he or she is capable of doing alone versus what he or she can do with help. In contrast to Krashen's i+1, Vygotsky's ZPD recognizes what has been accomplished by the learner and what is being accomplished through others' assistance (Vygotsky, 1978).

Electronic corrective feedback

Recently, technology has had an essential role in education, and electronic feedback is one example of employing technology in the teaching/learning process. Electronic feedback (e-feedback) refers to computer-facilitated feedback delivered electronically by teachers with the assistance of a computer. It is common currently for students to submit their assignments and complete tests through online platforms (e.g., Blackboard or Madrasati), and they would receive electronic feedback from the instructor, such as comments on their Word document or detailed email of error repair (Bruce, 2017; Ene & Upton, 2018). The best approach to measure the effectiveness of corrective feedback is to observe students' uptake. As defined by Laribi and Boulfous (2020), uptake is the learner's immediate response to their writing feedback provided by the teacher. The influence of corrective feedback on students' writing has been discussed in past studies, including whether it contributes to L2 acquisition and which errors should be corrected. However, many scholars have yielded that many electronic tools mediate issues arising from
traditional face-to-face feedback and that e-feedback enhances students' L2 pragmatic comprehension (Lam, 2021; Yousefi & Nassaji, 2019).

Using e-feedback tools has proven effective in dealing with such issues. For instance, teachers tend to be reluctant to give explicit corrective feedback to students in traditional classrooms, as they are not inclined to deal with sensitive students' emotional responses (Dabboub, 2019). Alshammari (2021) found that e-feedback is beneficial regarding students' emotional responses, as they can process the feedback at their own pace. Also, time limitations have been reported that restrict teachers from giving elaborate feedback to each student immediately because marking papers takes time, and teachers can only provide feedback during class. Teachers were able to overcome this issue by using electronic tools to deliver feedback, as it reduces marking time and enables them to return feedback more quickly by email or other online platforms (Al Maqbali & Mohin, 2022; Denton et al., 2008; Al-Saleh, 2018; Bailey & Lee, 2020; Nugent, 2020).

Moreover, those platforms helped teachers easily track students' progress, as these platforms have tools to keep organized history records for each student (Bailey & Lee, 2020; Gao & Zhang, 2020; Yamashita, 2021). Many scholars stated that e-feedback could be an effective tool to facilitate learning and improve students' writing performance, as students who received e-feedback from their teachers and peers significantly outperformed participants in other conditions in most writing aspects related to punctuation, grammar, and spelling (Al-Olimat et al., 2015; Yamashita, 2021). Mujtaba et al. (2022) asserted that audio-based feedback improved students' grammar accuracy most effectively. Another factor in validating the usefulness of e-feedback is that it allows students to revisit the teachers' explanations and corrections when needed (Bailey & Lee, 2020; Lenkaitis et al., 2020). Xu (2021) and Taghizadeh and Basirat (2019) further indicated that students held a positive view of receiving e-feedback, which led teachers to be able to extend their feedback to their students. These platforms created a comfortable space where students could often review the online feedback and learn at their own pace.

Scholars provided potential explanations for how e-feedback is effective in language learning. In order to facilitate students' writing success, it is crucial to identify their individual needs and preferences, discuss errors, and provide them with proper metalinguistic feedback. Students would receive more individual attention from the teacher through e-feedback, which promotes teacher-student interactions (Al Maqbali & Mohin, 2022; Al-Saleh, 2018). Regarding students' uptake, Xu (2021) demonstrated why students react differently to e-feedback; he stated that students receive positive and negative feedback that encourages them to engage more in their writing activities. Denton et al. (2008) and Chang et al. (2012) stated that students valued e-feedback far more than traditional handwritten feedback, as electronically, feedback is understandable due to structured word-processed sentences; this can be supported by a feature offered in Microsoft Word files, where the teachers can highlight a word or a sentence and type the feedback. In addition, scholars shed light on the importance of developing students' self-repair skills as students reflect upon their mistakes in the future, which will result in a long-term uptake (Bahrourni & Tuzlukova, 2019; Gutiérrez et al., 2020; Nikouee & Ranta, 2020). Thus, e-feedback often draws students' attention to differences between their output and target norm, as it promotes developing students' self-repair skills (Akbar, 2017; Hosseini, 2012).

In conclusion, integrating e-feedback into EFL classrooms offers significant advantages over traditional feedback methods. Future research should continue to explore its implementation across diverse educational contexts and investigate optimal strategies for enhancing its effectiveness in fostering student learning and language acquisition.
Debates of electronic feedback

Dabboub (2019) agreed with previous scholars that e-feedback implementation would significantly improve students' writing quality. However, it should not substitute the interaction between students and their instructors. According to the Interaction Hypothesis, corrective feedback is beneficial (Long, 1981, 1996). To illustrate, collaborative efforts between L2 learners and their interlocutors and oral interaction can improve language comprehension. Interaction allows learners to connect form and meaning, facilitating their language acquisition. Regarding language development, Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1981, 1996) highlights the importance of negotiation by connecting learners' input and internal capacities. Thus, teachers believe physical presence is necessary for students' social growth, and electronic learning cannot replace face-to-face interactions between teachers and their students (Sa'di et al., 2021; Taghizadeh & Basirat, 2019). In addition, teachers often avoid using some e-feedback tools, such as automated corrective feedback (ACF), which is feedback provided by a system on texts written by language learners. A wide range of errors can be identified and corrected in real-time and comprehensively in seconds with ACF (Barrot, 2023; Shadiev & Feng, 2022). Scholars stated that electronic automatic correction could be very challenging to ensure its success, as the teacher's presence is irreplicable, and the absence of face-to-face interaction could lead to students' demotivation (Aldossry, 2021; Altuwairesh, 2021). Hyland and Hyland (2006) pointed out the main disadvantage of ACF as the "potential dangers of ignoring meaning negotiation in real-world contexts" (p. 95). Mohsen (2022) added that content errors seem difficult for automated e-feedback; incidentally, human teachers can identify these errors accurately.

To sum up, research has revealed a clear vision of teachers’ awareness of the importance of feedback on students and its effects on students writing, along with supporting factors such as learners’ uptake. Nonetheless, the benefits of implementing technology and using it to deliver feedback in EFL classrooms outweigh the drawbacks. The researcher believes that e-feedback positively supports EFL teaching/learning. In addition to supporting personalized learning, e-feedback engages students in the learning process, improves teaching productivity, and is always available. Hence, the study aims to determine which aspects contribute to the successful implementation of technology in EFL classrooms.

Online Learning in the Saudi Context

In the last few years, learning management systems (LMSs) have gained increasing importance as a complement to traditional classroom instruction. During the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic in Saudi Arabia, the Ministry of Education developed the Madrasati platform to facilitate communication between students and teachers and ensure successful continuous learning in general education (1 to 12 grade) in Saudi schools (Aldossry, 2021). Teachers in Saudi had a high degree of acceptance among students to employ the Madrasati platform in their learning process due to the factors that aided the platform's success: system quality, service quality, and content quality (Almaiah et al., 2022). However, Aldossry (2021) found that teachers needed more technical knowledge and intensive training to use the platform with its full pentanal, and the platform is unsuitable for elementary school students as they have little to no experience with this type of technology. Since several teachers admitted that they lacked the digital literacy to use these computer-mediated corrective feedback effectively, they suggested conducting a training course or workshop on using these tools, as they found it highly effective (Sadeghi et al., 2014). Teachers proficient in technology used it creatively in the classroom and overcame obstacles. Consequently,
scholars such as Sadeghi et al., 2014 and Aldossry (2021) stated that teachers should receive training about technology in the classroom as part of their professional development.

One feature that teachers loved and asserted that they would continue using the platform for, as stated by Aldossry (2021): Continuing to use the Madrasati Platform will be beneficial as it will enable electronic correction to be applied to the majority of tests, homework, and assignments, thereby decreasing the time and effort required by teachers and providing students with immediate results and feedback on their work.

The evidence indicates that many studies have explored electronic feedback in Saudi higher education. However, few have investigated the use of e-feedback by EFL teachers in general education. This study will examine these Saudi EFL teachers' perceptions of e-feedback, the most effective type and method, and its limitations.

Method
This study employed a quantitative research design. The researcher believed in the importance of identifying the characteristics of e-feedback and understanding their influence on students' learning process. Given the extensive public school system in Saudi Arabia, necessitated by the large population and vast geographic areas, a quantitative approach was essential to ensure comprehensive coverage of this educational system.

Participants
The participants of this study were 141 EFL teachers from public secondary and high schools in Saudi Arabia. This study excluded higher education teachers as the sample of this study was focused on general EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia. Fricker (2017) discussed sampling methods for online surveys and indicated their challenges, and he divided them into two categories: Probability-based and Non-probability. The present study employed the probability-based sampling method, and surveys were conducted using a list-based sampling frame. A list-based sampling frame can be used for online surveys just like a traditional sampling frame for a conventional survey; in our case, the target is secondary and high school teachers. A mix of male and female participants held bachelor's degrees, master's degrees, and doctoral degrees. Those teachers had an average of ten years of teaching experience, and most were familiar with technology. In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic and the mandatory lockdown protocols that followed immediately, all teachers in Saudi Arabia had an experience with virtual learning and are familiar with e-feedback. The government utilized the Madrasati website during the pandemic, ensuring that teachers delivered e-feedback to their students at the time.

Research Instruments
The online questionnaire utilized in this study was initially developed by Zareekbatani (2015), with some questions adopted from Laribi and Boulfous (2020). The objective was to explore Saudi teachers’ perceptions of e-feedback and assess their readiness to implement it as a fundamental tool. The study employed a Likert scale format for the statements. The questionnaire comprised 25 closed-ended items, beginning with demographic questions such as educational degree, years of teaching experience, and familiarity with classroom technology. Subsequently, the questionnaire addressed various aspects of e-feedback compared to traditional in-class feedback. It aimed to investigate teachers' awareness and preferences regarding e-feedback and to measure its effects on students' uptake.
**Research Procedures**

Several steps were undertaken before conducting the study. First, a letter was sent to the Head of the Academic Affairs Unit, the Head of the Graduate Studies and Academic Research Unit, and the ELI Vice-Dean of the women’s campus, seeking approval to conduct the study. Upon receiving approval, the questionnaire was piloted on ten randomly selected teachers from different schools. Based on their feedback, modifications were made to ensure the questionnaire suited the present study.

Google Forms was used to collect data for the quantitative part of the study. Descriptive statistics were applied to the data encoded in a spreadsheet using SPSS Version 25. The researcher conducted a reliability test (Cronbach's Alpha coefficient) on the primary data (10 samples) via SPSS. Initially, the questionnaire consisted of 26 items; however, three items (16, 25, and 26) were removed to ensure reliable results.

After editing, the questionnaire was distributed to EFL teachers at secondary and high schools in various regions across Saudi Arabia through WhatsApp and Telegram groups. Approximately 180 EFL teachers completed the questionnaire, but 39 responses were disregarded as they did not meet the study's criteria. The data was then exported from Google Forms, prepared, and transferred for analysis using SPSS. All categorical variables were recorded, and a descriptive analysis was conducted on 25 variables.

**Validity and Reliability**

In terms of validity, measuring the accuracy of the instruments as data collection tools is crucial (Nardi, 2018). To establish the validity of the instruments used in the study, the researcher used referee validity, the questionnaire draft, and the interview questions were sent to be evaluated by two EFL assistant professors from the English Language Institute at King Abdulaziz University. Both professors had a few comments and modification recommendations, such as reviewing the number of questions and modifying the scale employed in this study. After modifications had been made, the questionnaire was ready to be piloted.

A high-quality test is crucial for evaluating the reliability of data provided during a research project. The piloting stage consisted of ten EFL teachers who completed the questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha was used to measure the reliability of the pilot data gathered from questionnaire responses, which measure the internal consistency of the ordinal data to Likert items of the questionnaire (Items 9-24, excluding Items 16, 25, & 26). A value of .729 was generated as a result (see Table 1), which is considered good according to Tavakol & Dennick (2011), as they stated that acceptable results range from 0.70 to 0.95.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha based on standardized items</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis**

The data analysis process of this study included two stages. The first stage included a descriptive analysis, where numerical variables were reported regarding means and standard deviations, while categorical variables were described using frequencies and percentages. The
second stage included hypothesis testing using the chi-squared test, which was applied by IBM SPSS Statistics 25.0.

**Results**

This study delves into the perspectives of Saudi EFL teachers on e-feedback and explores various types and methods employed in language education. The research focuses on teachers' perceptions, ranking responses based on agreement levels and mean scores. Noteworthy findings include the high regard for e-feedback's effectiveness, time efficiency, and positive impact on teaching strategies. While most participants favored electronic platforms, particularly the Madrasati website, limitations concerning spelling, grammar, and punctuation were minimal. These insights provide a deeper understanding of the dynamics of e-feedback in EFL classrooms by emphasizing its benefits and nuances among Saudi educators.

The results indicate that 77% of participants in this study were BA teachers with an average of ten years of teaching experience, and 70% of them teach high school students. Also, 84% of teachers were familiar with technology as they used computers for over ten years, and 70% stated they were very comfortable using computers. The results also indicate that 60% of the participants preferred e-feedback over face-to-face or paper feedback, and most utilized Madrasati to deliver e-feedback to students. Resultantly, 91% stated they preferred to describe and explain more to students, and 60% preferred to provide direct feedback.

This study aimed to investigate Saudi EFL teachers’ perceptions of e-feedback. This section reports the combined results of the questionnaire's 'Strongly Agree' and 'Agree' options as well as the 'Strongly Disagree' and 'Disagree' options. By ranking the participants' responses, the highest perception according to the mean score reported in Figure 1. For further details (See appendix A).

**EFL teachers' perceptions of electronic corrective feedback.**

![EFL teachers' perceptions of electronic corrective feedback.](image)

*Figure 1. EFL teachers’ perception of electronic corrective feedback*

Teachers’ perception of e-feedback: 95% of participants strongly agreed that they like the fact that students can go back to the feedback, and 89% of participants strongly agreed that e-feedback indeed takes less time to deliver over face-to-face and paper feedback. In addition, 87% of them agreed on the benefit of not needing to consider students’ emotions while providing feedback, and
71% of participants believe that students acquire skills to self-edit their work. In addition, 69% of teachers think that e-feedback can raise students’ motivation. Furthermore, 68% agreed that e-feedback helped them make better educational decisions and develop more teaching strategies, and 67% of participants agreed that e-feedback helped them manage the learning demands of this course and to control their students learning progress. As 65% agreed that e-feedback helped them track their students’ progress, 65% of participants agreed that they prefer e-feedback. Meanwhile, 57% agreed that students seek further advice after receiving e-feedback. The result of this study indicates that the Madrasati website was the most used and found effective by teachers in Saudi Arabia (n=123), followed by MS teams (n=94) and MS Forms (n=85). Moreover, teachers in Saudi Arabia found metalinguistic feedback to be the most effective method of correction for their students (n=129).

Table 3: The limitations of using electronic corrective feedback on students' writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Neutral n (%)</th>
<th>Agree n (%)</th>
<th>Strongly agree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I face difficulty in correcting spelling errors electronically.</td>
<td>27 (19.1)</td>
<td>83 (58.9)</td>
<td>18 (12.8)</td>
<td>11 (7.8)</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I face difficulty in correcting misuse of grammar rules electronically.</td>
<td>8 (5.7)</td>
<td>80 (56.7)</td>
<td>24 (17.0)</td>
<td>25 (17.7)</td>
<td>4 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I face difficulty in correcting punctuation mistakes electronically.</td>
<td>29 (20.6)</td>
<td>83 (58.9)</td>
<td>17 (12.1)</td>
<td>9 (6.4)</td>
<td>3 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates that 80% of participants disagreed that e-feedback limits their ability to correct punctuation mistakes, and 78% disagreed that e-feedback would limit correcting spelling errors. At the same time, 62% disagreed with the limitation of correcting grammar rule misuse. At the same time, 62% disagree with the limitation of correcting grammar rules misuse. These results indicate that most Saudi teachers do not believe that e-feedback limits their ability to correct students' errors electronically regarding punctuation, spelling, and grammar.

Discussion

The subsequent section discusses the data results pertaining to the research questions, set within the backdrop of the literature review previously addressed in this study. It explores the implications of EFL teachers' perceptions of e-feedback, the influence of electronic feedback on students' learning processes, and the advantages and constraints associated with using the Madrasati platform to improve students' writing skills.

The study's findings reveal that teachers place significant value on the continuous availability of e-feedback which is consistent with previous research by Bailey and Lee (2020) and Lenkaitis et al. (2020). Additionally, teachers highlighted that e-feedback saves time compared to conventional methods, aligning with conclusions drawn in studies by Al Maqbali and Mohin (2022), Al-Saleh (2018), Bailey and Lee (2020), Denton et al. (2008), and Nugent (2020). The explicit nature of e-feedback, which allows teachers to focus solely on correcting errors without managing students' emotional responses, was also highlighted, in line with observations by Alshammari (2021) and Dabboub (2019). Additionally, the study found that e-feedback fosters student autonomy, supported by literature including Akbar (2017), Aldossry (2021), Bahrouni and Tuzlukova (2019), Gutiérrez et al. (2020), Hosseini (2012), and Nikouee and Ranta (2020).
Moreover, teachers reported that e-feedback aids in monitoring and adjusting students' learning progress, consistent with findings from Bailey & Lee (2020), Gao & Zhang (2020), and Yamashita (2021).

Conversely, some literature suggests that e-feedback may not significantly enhance student motivation (Sa'di et al., 2021; Taghizadeh and Basirat, 2019), highlighting the continued importance of physical interaction in educational settings. Moreover, while the present study found that e-feedback helps manage learning demands for most participants, contrasting views are expressed in the literature, such as Gao and Zhang's (2020) assertion that e-feedback may not facilitate effective class management. Furthermore, while some teachers view electronic feedback as inauthentic (Sadeghi et al., 2014), the current study demonstrates widespread support for e-feedback among participants.

Regarding tools and methods, the study identified the Madrasati website as the most utilized and effective platform among Saudi Arabian teachers, echoing findings by Aldossry (2021). This preference surged during the COVID-19 pandemic, necessitating widespread adoption. Additionally, metalinguistic feedback was identified as the most effective correction method, consistent with Al Maqbali and Mohin (2022) and Al-Saleh (2018), emphasizing its role in providing explicit error information and supporting long-term retention of correct forms.

Despite these advantages, approximately half of the participants in the study perceived limitations in addressing grammar errors through electronic tools, aligning with studies by Al-Olimat et al. (2015), Mujtaba et al. (2022), and Yamashita (2021). These challenges underscore the TPACK model's relevance, emphasizing the integration of Technological, Pedagogical, and Content Knowledge. While technology effectively addresses basic aspects like spelling and punctuation, its application in addressing complex grammatical issues may be limited, potentially affecting student engagement and comprehension.

In conclusion, this study underscores the substantial benefits of implementing e-feedback in EFL classrooms. Future research should explore teachers' proficiency in utilizing these platforms and assess the need for additional training. Despite the advantages identified, minor limitations were perceived by EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia, suggesting areas for further investigation and improvement in electronic feedback practices.

**Conclusion**

This research study investigated Saudi EFL teachers' perceptions of electronic feedback (e-feedback), its impact on students' learning processes, and the limitations and challenges associated with its use in EFL classrooms. The findings revealed that teachers in Saudi Arabia hold favorable perceptions of e-feedback, appreciating its benefits. The study highlighted the Madrasati platform as the most commonly used tool for delivering feedback, mainly due to its widespread adoption during the COVID-19 pandemic. Saudi EFL teachers identified description and explanation as the most effective methods of correction. Moreover, teachers expressed confidence that e-feedback does not impede their ability to provide effective feedback to students. However, the study also indicated a limited range of tools available for delivering e-feedback in Saudi Arabia, underscoring teachers' limited knowledge of such tools.

**Contributions of the Study**

These findings contribute to existing evidence regarding the beneficial impact of e-feedback on students’ writing performance. Moreover, the results confirmed that technology can effectively...
support teachers appropriately. Therefore, investing in acquiring knowledge of new technological tools is strongly recommended, as it can cater to students’ individual needs, enhance engagement, and facilitate better retention of information. Additionally, technology enables more effortless teacher-student connectivity, aids in identifying student needs, and strengthens the feedback process.

Limitations and Future Research

This study encountered several limitations. Initially, the aim was to gather more than 300 responses for comprehensive inclusion. However, recruitment of teachers proved challenging, resulting in only half of the targeted number being attained. Additionally, the author conducted semi-structured interviews to supplement the questionnaire, aiming to gather in-depth insights from EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia regarding their experiences with e-feedback, particularly focusing on the Madrasati platform.

Future research could expand on these findings by conducting experimental studies in authentic classroom settings to empirically assess the implementation and impacts of e-feedback on students' writing.
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Appendix A

**EFL teachers' perceptions of electronic corrective feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level of perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Electronic feedback is effective in supporting my teaching.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>High perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe in the value of electronic feedback and their effect on students writing.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I believe that students can improve their self-editing skills after receiving electronic feedback.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The students are motivated towards achieving their learning goals when working with electronic feedback.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>High perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Delivering electronic feedback takes less time than traditional feedback.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very high perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I like the fact that students have the ability to go back to the electronic feedback.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very high perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I most prefer electronic feedback over paper feedback, or face-to-face feedback.</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>High perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Electronic feedback can help my students to check their progress towards their learning goals.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>High perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Electronic feedback helped me to make better decisions as I was able to develop strategies to develop writing activities through electronic tools.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Electronic feedback helped me to manage the learning demands of this course and to control my students learning progress.</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Students frequently try to seek my advice to help them with their drafts after receiving electronic feedback.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I do not need to consider students’ emotional responses while delivering electronic feedback as much in comparison while delivering face-to-face feedback.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High perception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Score** | **3.84**