

The Role of Written Corrective Feedback in Developing Language Skills Perceptions of Libyan University EFL Teachers

Haneen Almabrouk Othman Alsaiyq*


Department of English Language, Faculty of Education, Tiji, University of Zintan, Zintan, Libya

ORCID ID: 0009-0008-2884-0630 Haneen.alsaiyq@uoz.edu.ly

دور التغذية الراجعة المكتوبة في تطوير المهارات اللغوية : تصورات أعضاء هيئة تدريس
اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية بالجامعات الليبية

حنين المبروك عثمان السايق*

قسم اللغة الانجليزية، كلية التربية تيجي، جامعة الزنتان ، الزنتان، ليبيا

Received: 05-12-2025	Accepted: 29-12-2025	Published: 20-01-2026
		
<p>Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).</p>		

الملخص:

تقصت هذه الدراسة تصورات أعضاء هيئة التدريس بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية في الجامعات الليبية حول دور التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية المكتوبة (WCF) في تعزيز المهارات اللغوية، وعلى الرغم من الأهمية النظرية للتغذية الراجعة في اكتساب اللغة الثانية، إلا أن تطبيقها العملي غالباً ما يواجه تحديات سياقية متنوعة. واعتمدت الدراسة على المنهج الوصفي الكمي، حيث جمعت البيانات من 50 مدرساً للغة الإنجليزية في عدة جامعات ليبية. كشفت النتائج عن مستوى عالٍ من الالتزام البيداغوجي، حيث اعتبر 96% من المشاركين أن تقديم التغذية الراجعة يمثل مسؤولية جوهرية للمعلم ومع ذلك تم تحديد فجوة كبيرة بين "المعتقد والممارسة"، حيث يفتقر 66% من المعلمين إلى التدريب الرسمي في هذا المجال، معتمدين بدلاً من ذلك على خبراتهم الشخصية. وبينما أدرك المعلمون أثراً إيجابياً قوياً للتغذية الراجعة على مهارات القراءة والكتابة، إلا أن العوائق اللوجستية — وفي مقدمتها ضيق الوقت (54%) وكثافة القاعات الدراسية (22%) — أعاقت جودة التغذية الراجعة بشكل كبير وتخلص الدراسة إلى ضرورة ملحة لإطلاق برامج تطوير مهني مؤسسية (طالب بها 92% من العينة) وتبني استراتيجيات تغذية راجعة انتقائية أكثر استدامة لجسير الفجوة بين معتقدات المعلمين وواقع الفصول الدراسية.

الكلمات الدالة: التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية المكتوبة (WCF)، الجامعات الليبية، تصورات معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية، المهارات اللغوية، التطوير المهني، المعتقدات البيداغوجية.

Abstract

This study investigates the perceptions of EFL faculty members at Libyan universities regarding the role of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) in enhancing language skills. Despite the theoretical

importance of WCF in second language acquisition, its practical implementation often faces various contextual challenges. Using a quantitative research design, data were collected from 50 EFL instructors across several Libyan universities. The findings reveal a high level of pedagogical commitment, with 96% of participants viewing WCF as a core teaching responsibility. However, a significant "belief-practice gap" was identified, as 66% of teachers lacked formal training in WCF, relying instead on personal experience. While teachers perceived a strong positive impact of WCF on reading and writing skills, logistical barriers—primarily time constraints (54%) and large class sizes (22%)—significantly hindered the quality of feedback. The study concludes with an urgent call for institutional professional development programs (demanded by 92% of the sample) and the adoption of more sustainable, selective feedback strategies to bridge the gap between teacher beliefs and classroom realities

Keywords: Written Corrective Feedback (WCF), Libyan Universities, EFL Teachers' Perceptions, Language Skills, Professional Development, Pedagogical Belief.

Introduction:

Feedback practice are shaped by the beliefs teachers hold about feedback and how they implement these beliefs in classroom settings (Kim-Daniel vattoy, 2020). Hattie & Timperly (2007, p.81) define feedback as “information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parents, self, experience) regarding aspects of one’s performance or understanding”. The purpose of feedback is to offer constructive criticism, enabling individuals to identify areas for improvement while also recognizing their strengths and weaknesses. Feedback can be categorized into two main components written corrective feedback (WCF) and written commentaries. Written commentaries address the organization of writing and grammatical errors. Although providing written commentary can be time-consuming and challenging for teachers, it facilitates communication between teachers and students about writing and motivates and students to enhance their writing skills (Goldstein, 2005). Ducken (2014) defines WCF as the comments provided by teachers in writing on a student's essay, emphasizing its role in correcting grammatical faults and assisting students in improving their writing accuracy. According to Bitchener and Storch (2016), WCF is characterized as “a written response to a linguistic error that has been made in the writing of a text by a L2 learner.” This feedback aims to correct inaccuracies or to inform students about the nature and cause of their errors, as well as how to rectify them.

Statement of the Problem : While Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) is globally recognized as an essential tool for language development (Lee, 2008 & Hyland, 2006), its effectiveness is often compromised by contextual factors. In Libya, despite the positive attitudes of EFL teachers, there is a clear gap between their theoretical beliefs and actual classroom practices (Loka, 2024). Recent studies (e.g., Rajab, 2018) suggest that this gap is exacerbated by a lack of formal training and heavy workloads. However, there is still limited research specifically exploring how Libyan university teachers perceive the link between WCF and broader language skills. Therefore, this study addresses this gap by investigating these perceptions and the challenges that hinder effective feedback within the Libyan higher education context.

Research Objectives

- To explore Libyan EFL teachers' perceptions of WCF effectiveness in language skill development.
- To examine the perceived impact of WCF on students' linguistic accuracy and performance.
- To identify the most common types of WCF strategies used by teachers in Libyan universities.

- To investigate the main pedagogical and contextual challenges hindering effective WCF implementation

Research Questions

1. What are university EFL teachers' perceptions of the importance of written corrective feedback in developing students' overall language skills?
2. How do teachers perceive the effect of written corrective feedback on each of the four language skills?
3. What types of written corrective feedback do teachers find most effective across different skill areas?
4. What are the main challenges teachers face when applying written corrective feedback in their teaching practice?

Significance of the Study: This study holds significance for both theoretical and practical domains within the field of second language acquisition and language pedagogy. By focusing on university EFL teachers' perceptions of written corrective feedback (WCF) across all four language skills—reading, writing, listening, and speaking—it broadens the scope of previous research, which has largely concentrated on writing alone. Understanding teachers' beliefs can provide valuable insights into how WCF is implemented in real classrooms and how it contributes to students' overall language development.

Additionally, the findings may help curriculum designers, teacher educators, and academic institutions in designing more effective training programs and feedback strategies that address not only grammatical accuracy but also the enhancement of communicative competence. Moreover, the study sheds light on the challenges faced by teachers, which can guide policy adjustments and provide better support systems in higher education contexts, particularly in EFL settings like Libya.

Methodology and Research Design: This study adopts a quantitative research design to systematically investigate Libyan EFL teachers' perceptions regarding the role and effectiveness of written corrective feedback (WCF). As noted by Creswell (2014), quantitative methods are particularly effective for explaining phenomena through the collection and mathematical analysis of numerical data, allowing researchers to describe broader trends, attitudes, and opinions within a specific population. In the context of this study, the quantitative approach is grounded in a positivist framework, which is highly suitable for social science research aimed at identifying patterns in pedagogical beliefs.

The participants involved in this research consisted of 50 EFL instructors currently teaching at various Libyan universities. To ensure a robust analysis, data were gathered through a structured questionnaire and subsequently processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS V27), employing descriptive statistics to summarize the findings.

Research Instrument: The primary instrument used for data collection was a structured questionnaire, which was adapted from a study conducted by Loka (2024) on teachers' practices and perceptions of WCF within the Libyan academic context. Following a thorough review of the original instrument, several modifications were introduced to ensure that the questionnaire was specifically tailored to the objectives and contextual framework of the current study. These adjustments included rephrasing certain items for enhanced clarity and broadening the scope of the questions to accurately capture the nuances of university-level instruction. To uphold the standards of academic rigor, the modified version underwent a validation process by a panel of experts to ensure its reliability and validity prior to final administration.

Literature Review: The term "feedback" has been defined in various ways across the literature. Due to the complexity and importance of the term, numerous definitions exist in academic literature. A simplified definition by Askew and Lodge (2000, p. 1) describes feedback as “all

dialogue to support learning in both formal and informal situations.” Additionally, Kepner (1991, p. 14) defines feedback as “any procedure used to inform a learner whether an instructional response is right or wrong.” Feedback can be expressed through various techniques, including oral feedback—verbal responses to an action or task—and written comments on students’ work, commonly referred to as written feedback.

Feedback in writing is defined as an input that the writer receives from readers in the form of information that helps the writer revise and improve the written text. This information can be provided in several ways, such as comments, questions and suggestions (Keh, 1990 as cited in Wen, 2013). According to Bitchener and Storch (2016), written corrective feedback (WCF) is defined as “a written response to a linguistic error that has been made in the writing of a text by a L2 learner. It seeks to either correct the inaccurate usage or provide information about where the error has occurred and/or about the cause of the error and how it may be corrected” (p.1).

Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) has long been recognized as a central pedagogical practice in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, particularly because of its role in improving students’ linguistic accuracy, writing proficiency, and overall communicative competence. Teachers’ perceptions of WCF strongly influence the feedback they provide and the instructional decisions they make. Therefore, understanding teachers’ beliefs, preferred feedback types, and the theoretical foundations underlying WCF is crucial for enhancing students’ writing skills and maximizing the pedagogical value of feedback.

Definitions of Feedback and Written Corrective Feedback

Feedback has been widely defined across different theoretical and pedagogical traditions. According to Webster’s Dictionary, feedback refers to “a process of modifying or controlling a process or system by returning information.” Ramaprasad (1983) clarifies that feedback is information about the gap between actual performance and a desired standard, delivered with the intention of helping learners reduce that gap. Askew and Lodge (2000) emphasize its dialogic nature, defining feedback as “a dialogue that supports learning in both formal and informal contexts.”

Kepner (1991) considers feedback to be any procedure that informs learners whether their performance is correct or incorrect. Ellis (2009) describes Corrective Feedback (CF) as a response to a learner’s linguistic error in writing or speech. Ducken (2014) further specifies Written Corrective Feedback as written comments that address mechanical, grammatical, or lexical errors in students’ texts.

Types of Written Corrective Feedback: Researchers have identified several types of WCF that teachers commonly employ in EFL classrooms.

Comprehensive vs. Selective Written Corrective Feedback: Comprehensive feedback refers to the correction of all or most errors in a learner’s text. Studies indicate that many teachers favor comprehensive WCF because it allows them to address grammatical, lexical, and mechanical issues simultaneously (Al Kharusi & Al-Mekhlafi, 2019; Erkkilä, 2013). In contrast, selective WCF focuses on correcting specific error types. Erkkilä (2013) reports that some instructors adopt selective feedback as a means of reducing student overload and managing time constraints.

Direct Written Corrective Feedback: Direct WCF involves providing the correct linguistic form explicitly. Multiple studies document teachers’ preference for direct feedback because it is clear and easily understood by lower-proficiency learners (Rajab, 2018; Jamoom, 2016).

Indirect Written Corrective Feedback: Indirect feedback signals the presence of an error without supplying the correct form. Research suggests that indirect feedback encourages learners to reflect, self-correct, and improve their metalinguistic awareness (Erkkilä, 2013; Rajab et al., 2016).

Coded Written Corrective Feedback: Coded WCF provides symbols or abbreviations that indicate the type of error (e.g., “sp” for spelling). Although not preferred by all teachers, it has been recognized as beneficial for developing learners’ self-editing strategies (Lee, 2008).

Metalinguistic Feedback: This type of feedback offers explanations, rule reminders, or grammatical descriptions. Bitchener and Storch (2016) affirm that metalinguistic WCF helps build explicit knowledge.

Types of Errors in Written Corrective Feedback: In the field of second language acquisition, researchers have categorized the linguistic errors that typically require written corrective feedback. According to Bitchener and Storch (2016) and Ferris (2011), these errors are generally divided into three main domains: Grammatical errors (such as verb tense, articles, and subject-verb agreement), Lexical errors (related to word choice and semantic accuracy), and Mechanical errors (including spelling, punctuation, and capitalization). Furthermore, Ellis (2009) distinguishes between 'global errors' that hinder the overall communication and clarity of the message, and 'local errors' which affect only a single element of a sentence without obstructing the reader's understanding. Scholars argue that the type of error often determines the most effective feedback strategy to be employed by the instructor.

Theoretical Foundations Underlying Written Corrective Feedback

Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1978): Within the sociocultural framework, learning occurs through social interaction and scaffolding. WCF functions as scaffolded support within the learner’s Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), guiding them toward more accurate linguistic performance.

The Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt): Schmidt’s hypothesis asserts that learners must consciously notice linguistic features to acquire them. WCF plays a crucial role by making errors salient and helping learners recognize gaps between their output and target forms.

Skill Acquisition Theory: Skill Acquisition Theory posits that learning progresses from declarative to proceduralized knowledge through practice. Bitchener and Storch (2016) explain that WCF contributes to this process by prompting repeated attention to linguistic forms, thereby improving accuracy over time.

Teachers’ Perceptions of Written Corrective Feedback: Teachers’ perceptions significantly shape their pedagogical decisions. Carlgren et al. (1994) highlight that teacher perceptions heavily influence instructional practices. Lee (2011) similarly notes a strong relationship between teacher beliefs and feedback practices. Zhang and Rahimi (2014) found that positive beliefs about the value of feedback increase both its frequency and quality. However, Orrell (2006) observed discrepancies between teachers’ stated beliefs and their actual practices.

The Relationship Between Teachers’ Perceptions and Classroom Practices

Research findings regarding the alignment between teachers’ beliefs and practices are mixed. Some studies confirm strong coherence (Brown, Harris & Harnett, 2012). However, research by Lee (2009), Gul and Rodrigues (2012), and Borg (2009) reports significant discrepancies, often attributed to workload, time constraints, and limited institutional support.

Challenges in Providing Effective WCF: The pedagogical task of providing Written Corrective Feedback is associated with various systemic and instructional challenges. Lee (2009) and Al-Bakri (2016) identify 'institutional constraints' as a primary barrier, noting that heavy teaching workloads and large class sizes often prevent instructors from providing the detailed, qualitative feedback necessary for student improvement. Additionally, Borg (2006) emphasizes the role of 'teacher cognition,' suggesting that a lack of formal pedagogical training can lead to inconsistencies in how feedback is delivered. Furthermore, Goldstein (2005) points out that the tension between a teacher's desire to be thorough and the practical limitations of time often

results in a 'correction fatigue,' which may reduce the overall efficacy of the feedback provided in foreign language contexts.

- **Previous Studies:**

Almanea (2025): Titled 'Less is NOT more for learners,' this study challenged the idea that minimal feedback is better. Researching adult EFL learners through interviews and surveys, the results indicated that learners prefer comprehensive, direct feedback with metalinguistic explanations, as it increases motivation and depth of understanding.

Loka (2024): In here study in the Libyan context, examined the practices and perceptions of EFL teachers regarding Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) in writing classrooms. The researcher utilized a mixed-methods approach to investigate how university instructors approach error correction. The findings indicated that while Libyan EFL teachers hold a generally positive attitude toward the efficacy of WCF in improving student writing, their actual classroom practices are often inconsistent with their theoretical beliefs. Similar to other regional studies, Loka's work highlighted that institutional challenges, such as the lack of standardized feedback policies and the pressure of completing syllabi, significantly influence the frequency and type of feedback provided. This study underscores the ongoing need for pedagogical reform in how writing is assessed in Libyan higher education."

Turkestani (2022): Investigated the effect of feedback on written expression among high school students. The quasi-experimental study with 12 participants showed that intensive feedback significantly improved not only writing organization and grammar but also overall linguistic awareness, including pronunciation and speaking accuracy.

Purnomo (2021): Investigated Indonesian university teachers' perspectives and actual applications of WCF. Based on 80 survey responses, the study found that teachers value diverse feedback strategies. A strong correlation was identified between teachers' theoretical knowledge and the effectiveness of their classroom feedback practices.

Rajab (2018): This study explored EFL teachers' and learners' perceptions of WCF in the Saudi higher education context. Using a mixed-methods approach with 320 teachers and 840 learners, the results showed high interest from both parties. However, a mismatch was found: teachers preferred coded feedback, while learners preferred unfocused feedback. The study emphasized the need for university writing centers.

Al-Bakri (2016): Explored Omani EFL teachers' beliefs and practices. This case study revealed a gap between teachers' beliefs (favoring indirect feedback) and their actual practices (using direct feedback) due to time constraints, large class sizes, and curriculum pressures.

Data Analysis

Statistical Methods: Data collected from the 50 Libyan university EFL teachers were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were used to summarize participants' demographic characteristics, responses on teachers' philosophy of written corrective feedback (WCF), perceived usefulness, perceived impact on language skills, feedback preferences, and challenges. Inferential analyses were conducted to examine potential differences in teachers' perceptions based on gender, educational qualifications, and years of teaching experience. Independent-samples t-tests were employed to compare male and female teachers' responses, while one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare groups based on educational qualifications and teaching experience. Chi-square tests were applied to examine the distribution of categorical responses for preferences regarding types of corrective feedback and reported challenges. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$ for all analyses. Data analysis was

performed using SPSS 27, ensuring accurate computation of means, standard deviations, and significance tests.

Face Validity of the Questionnaire (Validity of Experts): The researcher tested the validity of the study questionnaire by using the expert validity method. The questionnaire was presented to a group of experts who have experience in the field of the study. The researcher considered the majority of the experts' comments to finalize the questionnaire's formulation.

Reliability of the Study Questionnaire: The internal consistency of the study questionnaire was examined using Cronbach's alpha to assess reliability. As shown in Table (1), the reliability coefficients for the individual dimensions were satisfactory. The "Teachers' Philosophy" dimension, comprising 8 statements, yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.723, indicating acceptable reliability. The "Perceived Usefulness of Written Corrective Feedback" dimension, with 4 items, demonstrated a Cronbach's alpha of 0.706, also within the acceptable range. The "Perceived Impact of Written Corrective Feedback on Language Skills" dimension, consisting of 12 items, showed a higher reliability coefficient of 0.777. Overall, the full 24-item questionnaire achieved a Cronbach's alpha of 0.805, reflecting good internal consistency and confirming that the instrument is reliable for measuring Libyan university EFL teachers' perceptions of written corrective feedback.

Table number (1) :Results of the test for the reliability of the study questionnaire (Cronbach's Alpha)

Dimension	Number of statements	Cronbach's Alpha
Teachers' Philosophy	8	0.723
Perceived Usefulness of Written Corrective Feedback	4	0.706
Perceived Impact of Written Corrective Feedback on Language Skills	12	0.777
Overall	24	0.805

Table (2):Sample's Description

Variable	Categories	Count	%
Gender	Male	26	52.0
	Female	24	48.0
Educational qualification	MA	32	64.0
	PhD	5	10.0
	Currently pursuing PhD	13	26.0
Years of experience Teaching English as foreign language	Less than 5 years	18	36.0
	5-10 years	21	42.0
	More than 10 years	11	22.0
Have you received and formal training in providing written feedback	Yes	17	34.0
	No	33	66.0

Based on the data presented in Table (2), the study sample consisted of 50 Libyan university EFL teachers with a relatively balanced gender distribution, where males represented 52% and females accounted for 48%. In terms of educational qualification, the majority of participants held a master's degree, comprising 64% of the sample, while 10% had obtained a PhD and 26% were currently pursuing doctoral studies. Regarding teaching experience, most respondents reported between 5 and 10 years of experience teaching English as a foreign language, representing 42%, followed by those with less than five years of experience at 36%, and those with more than ten years of experience at 22%. Concerning professional preparation in written corrective feedback, a notable proportion of the participants indicated that they had not received any formal training in providing written feedback (66%), whereas only 34% reported having received such training. Overall, the sample reflects a diverse range of academic qualifications and teaching experience,

with a clear gap in formal training related to written corrective feedback practices among Libyan university EFL teachers.

Table (3):Sample responses on statements of Teachers' Philosophy of Written Corrective Feedback

Statement	Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Providing written corrective feedback is a fundamental responsibility of the language teacher.	34	68.0	14	28.0	2	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Every written task submitted by students should receive some form of corrective feedback	27	54.0	16	32.0	2	4.0	4	8.0	1	2.0
Students generally appreciate and welcome written feedback from their instructors	15	30.0	17	34.0	6	12.0	8	16.0	4	8.0
Including a list of correction symbols or codes helps students better understand the feedback	30	60.0	15	30.0	5	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Prompt feedback on students' initial drafts is more effective than delayed feedback	17	34.0	23	46.0	3	6.0	6	12.0	1	2.0
My feedback practices are informed by theoretical frameworks and prior research.	20	40.0	12	24.0	9	18.0	8	16.0	1	2.0
I draw primarily from personal teaching experience when providing written feedback.	21	42.0	23	46.0	3	6.0	2	4.0	1	2.0
Additional professional development would enhance my ability to provide effective written feedback.	32	64.0	14	28.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	4.0

As shown in Table (3), the findings reveal strong agreement among Libyan university EFL teachers regarding the central role of written corrective feedback (WCF) in language teaching. A substantial majority of respondents either strongly agreed (68%) or agreed (28%) that providing

written corrective feedback is a fundamental responsibility of the language teacher, indicating a clear consensus on its pedagogical importance. Similarly, most teachers expressed positive attitudes toward the provision of feedback on all written tasks, with 54% strongly agreeing and 32% agreeing that every student submission should receive some form of corrective feedback, despite a small proportion expressing disagreement. Teachers' perceptions of students' receptiveness to feedback were more varied, as only 64% agreed or strongly agreed that students generally appreciate written feedback, while a notable minority expressed neutral or negative views. Strong support was also observed for the use of correction symbols or codes, with 90% of participants agreeing or strongly agreeing that such strategies enhance students' understanding of feedback. In relation to timing, most respondents endorsed the effectiveness of prompt feedback, as 80% agreed or strongly agreed that immediate feedback on initial drafts is more beneficial than delayed feedback. Regarding the basis of feedback practices, teachers showed moderate agreement that their feedback is informed by theoretical frameworks and prior research, while a higher proportion indicated reliance on personal teaching experience. Notably, an overwhelming majority of respondents acknowledged the value of further professional development, with 92% agreeing or strongly agreeing that additional training would enhance their ability to provide effective written corrective feedback. Overall, the results presented in Table (3) suggest generally positive beliefs about written corrective feedback, alongside an expressed need for continued professional development to strengthen feedback practices.

Table (4): Mean and standard deviation of sample responses on statements of Teachers' Philosophy of Written Corrective Feedback

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level of agreement
Providing written corrective feedback is a fundamental responsibility of the language teacher.	4.64	0.563	Very high
Every written task submitted by students should receive some form of corrective feedback	4.28	1.011	Very high
Students generally appreciate and welcome written feedback from their instructors	3.62	1.292	High
Including a list of correction symbols or codes helps students better understand the feedback	4.50	0.678	Very high
Prompt feedback on students' initial drafts is more effective than delayed feedback	3.98	1.040	High
My feedback practices are informed by theoretical frameworks and prior research.	3.84	1.184	High
I draw primarily from personal teaching experience when providing written feedback.	4.22	0.887	Very high
Additional professional development would enhance my ability to provide effective written feedback.	4.46	0.952	Very high
Overall Mean	4.19	0.408	High

As presented in Table (4), the results indicate a generally high to very high level of agreement among Libyan university EFL teachers regarding their philosophy of written corrective feedback. The highest mean score was observed for the statement that providing written corrective feedback is a fundamental responsibility of the language teacher (mean = 4.64, standard deviation = 0.563), reflecting very strong consensus and low variability in responses. Similarly, very high levels of

agreement were found for the usefulness of correction symbols or codes (mean = 4.50, standard deviation = 0.678), the belief that additional professional development would enhance feedback effectiveness (mean = 4.46, standard deviation = 0.952), and reliance on personal teaching experience when providing feedback (mean = 4.22, standard deviation = 0.887). Teachers also strongly supported the idea that every written task should receive some form of corrective feedback (mean = 4.28, standard deviation = 1.011), although the larger standard deviation suggests some divergence in views. High levels of agreement were reported for statements related to students' appreciation of written feedback (mean = 3.62, standard deviation = 1.292), the effectiveness of prompt feedback compared to delayed feedback (mean = 3.98, standard deviation = 1.040), and the influence of theoretical frameworks and prior research on feedback practices (mean = 3.84, standard deviation = 1.184), indicating more varied perceptions among respondents. Overall, the composite mean score of 4.19 with a standard deviation of 0.408 demonstrates a generally high endorsement of written corrective feedback principles, suggesting that teachers hold positive and well-established beliefs about the importance and role of written corrective feedback in developing students' language skills.

Table (5): Sample responses on statements of Perceived Usefulness of Written Corrective Feedback

Statement	Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Written feedback assists students in improving their overall writing proficiency.	29	58.0	18	36.0	3	6.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Written feedback highlights areas where students need to improve.	33	66.0	13	26.0	2	4.0	0	0.0	2	4.0
Corrective feedback supports students in identifying and correcting vocabulary-related issues.	25	50.0	23	46.0	2	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Written feedback helps students locate and correct mechanical issues such as punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.	37	74.0	10	20.0	2	4.0	1	2.0	0	0.0

As shown in Table (5), the results demonstrate a strong consensus among Libyan university EFL teachers regarding the perceived usefulness of written corrective feedback in developing students' writing skills. A clear majority of respondents either strongly agreed (58%) or agreed (36%) that written feedback assists students in improving their overall writing proficiency, with only a small proportion expressing neutrality. Similarly, most teachers strongly agreed (66%) or agreed (26%) that written feedback effectively highlights areas where students need

improvement, indicating widespread recognition of its diagnostic value. Perceptions were even more positive regarding the role of corrective feedback in addressing vocabulary-related issues, as 96% of participants expressed agreement, suggesting that teachers view feedback as an essential tool for lexical development. The strongest agreement was observed for the statement concerning mechanical accuracy, where 74% strongly agreed and 20% agreed that written feedback helps students notice and correct issues related to punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. Overall, the findings reflect highly positive perceptions of the usefulness of written corrective feedback, emphasizing its critical role in enhancing both higher-order writing proficiency and lower-level linguistic accuracy among EFL learners.

Table (6): Mean and standard deviation of sample responses on statements of Perceived Usefulness of Written Corrective Feedback.

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level of agreement
Written feedback assists students in improving their overall writing proficiency.	4.52	0.614	Very high
Written feedback highlights areas where students need to improve.	4.50	0.909	Very high
Corrective feedback supports students in identifying and correcting vocabulary-related issues.	4.46	0.579	Very high
Written feedback helps students notice and correct mechanical issues such as punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.	4.66	0.658	Very high
Overall Mean	4.54	0.508	Very high

As presented in Table (6), the findings indicate a very high level of agreement among Libyan university EFL teachers regarding the perceived usefulness of written corrective feedback. The highest mean score was recorded for the statement that written feedback helps students notice and correct mechanical issues such as punctuation, capitalization, and spelling (mean = 4.66, standard deviation = 0.658), reflecting strong consensus and relatively low variability in responses. Similarly, very high mean values were observed for the role of written feedback in improving overall writing proficiency (mean = 4.52, standard deviation = 0.614) and in highlighting areas where students need to improve (mean = 4.50, standard deviation = 0.909), indicating that teachers consistently recognize the instructional value of feedback in guiding student improvement. The usefulness of corrective feedback in addressing vocabulary-related issues was also strongly endorsed (mean = 4.46, standard deviation = 0.579), suggesting agreement on its effectiveness in supporting lexical development. Overall, the composite mean score of 4.54 with a standard deviation of 0.508 demonstrates a very high overall perception of the usefulness of written corrective feedback, underscoring its perceived central role in enhancing students' writing accuracy and proficiency.

Table (7): Sample responses on statements of Perceived Impact of Written Corrective Feedback on Language Skills

Statement	Strongly agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Writing skill										
Written corrective feedback helps students reduce grammatical errors in writing.	21	42.0	25	50.0	3	6.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
Students improve the organization and clarity of their writing through written feedback.	23	46.0	21	42.0	3	6.0	1	2.0	2	4.0
Teacher feedback helps students recognize their writing strengths	27	54.0	18	36.0	2	4.0	1	2.0	2	4.0
Reading skill										
Written corrective feedback increase students' understanding of texts.	18	36.0	23	46.0	6	12.0	2	4.0	1	2.0
Students recognize their reading mistakes better through teacher's written comments.	12	24.0	25	50.0	9	18.0	3	6.0	1	2.0
WCF helps students apply reading strategies more accurately.	10	20.0	27	54.0	9	18.0	3	6.0	1	2.0
Listing skill										

Written feedback on listening tasks supports students in identifying their listening weaknesses.	8	16.0	15	30.0	10	20.0	16	32.0	1	2.0
Students develop better listening comprehension after reviewing written comments.	9	18.0	12	24.0	9	18.0	19	38.0	1	2.0
Teachers' written notes help students focus on key points in audio materials.	9	18.0	18	36.0	8	16.0	15	30.0	0	0.0
Speaking skill										
Written feedback helps students recognize and correct pronunciation and grammar mistakes made in speaking.	15	30.0	12	24.0	5	10.0	17	34.0	1	2.0
Students become more fluent and confident in speaking after receiving written comments.	5	10.0	16	32.0	9	18.0	16	32.0	4	8.0
WCF guides students to self-correct errors in their spoken English.	8	16.0	16	32.0	9	18.0	13	26.0	4	8.0

As illustrated in Table (7), teachers' perceptions of the impact of written corrective feedback (WCF) varied across different language skills, with the strongest effects reported for writing skills. A large majority of respondents either strongly agreed (42%) or agreed (50%) that written corrective feedback helps students reduce grammatical errors in writing, and similarly high levels of agreement were reported for improvements in organization and clarity (88% agreement) as well as for helping students recognize their writing strengths (90% agreement). These findings indicate a clear consensus that WCF plays a substantial role in enhancing multiple dimensions of students' writing performance.

In relation to reading skills, teachers expressed moderately positive perceptions of the impact of written corrective feedback. More than three quarters of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that written feedback increases students' understanding of texts (82%), while 74% indicated that students are better able to recognize their reading mistakes through teachers' written comments. Additionally, 74% of respondents agreed that WCF helps students apply reading strategies more accurately, although higher neutral and disagreement responses compared to writing suggest less certainty regarding its effectiveness in this area.

By contrast, perceptions of the impact of written corrective feedback on listening skills were mixed. Less than half of the respondents agreed that written feedback on listening tasks helps students identify their listening weaknesses (46%) or develop better listening comprehension (42%), while a considerable proportion expressed disagreement. Similarly, only just over half of the teachers agreed that written notes help students focus on key points in audio materials, indicating limited confidence in the effectiveness of WCF for listening development.

Perceptions were least positive regarding speaking skills. Fewer than half of the respondents agreed that written feedback helps students recognize and correct pronunciation and grammatical errors in speaking, and only 42% agreed that students become more fluent and confident in speaking after receiving written comments. Likewise, perceptions were divided concerning the role of WCF in guiding students to self-correct spoken errors, with a substantial proportion of neutral and negative responses. Overall, the results suggest that teachers perceive written corrective feedback as highly effective for writing skills, moderately beneficial for reading skills, and considerably less effective for listening and speaking skills.

Table (8): Mean and standard deviation of sample responses on statements of Perceived Impact of Written Corrective Feedback on Language Skills

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level of agreement
Writing skill			
Written corrective feedback helps students reduce grammatical errors in writing.	4.32	0.683	Very high
Students improve the organization and clarity of their writing through written feedback.	4.24	0.960	Very high
Teacher feedback helps students recognize their writing strengths	4.34	0.961	Very high
Overall Mean	4.30	0.697	Very high
Reading skill			
Written corrective feedback increase students' understanding of texts.	4.10	0.909	High
Students recognize their reading mistakes better through teacher's written comments.	3.88	0.918	High
WCF helps students apply reading strategies more accurately.	3.84	0.889	High
Overall Mean	3.94	0.689	High
Listening skill			
Written feedback on listening tasks supports students in identifying their listening weaknesses.	3.26	1.139	Moderate
Students develop better listening comprehension after reviewing written comments.	3.18	1.190	Moderate

Teachers' written notes help students focus on key points in audio materials.	3.42	1.108	High
Overall Mean	3.29	1.050	
Speaking skill			
Written feedback helps students recognize and correct pronunciation and grammar mistakes made in speaking.	3.46	1.297	High
Students become more fluent and confident in speaking after receiving written comments.	3.04	1.177	Moderate
WCF guides students to self-correct errors in their spoken English.	3.22	1.234	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.24	1.098	
Grand Mean	3.69	0.594	High

As presented in Table (8), the mean scores and standard deviations reveal clear differences in teachers' perceptions of the impact of written corrective feedback (WCF) across language skills. The strongest perceived impact was reported for writing skills, where all statements achieved very high levels of agreement. Teachers strongly believed that written corrective feedback helps students reduce grammatical errors in writing (mean = 4.32, standard deviation = 0.683), improve organization and clarity (mean = 4.24, standard deviation = 0.960), and recognize their writing strengths (mean = 4.34, standard deviation = 0.961). The overall mean for writing skills (mean = 4.30, standard deviation = 0.697) confirms a very high perceived effectiveness of WCF in developing students' writing performance.

For reading skills, perceptions were generally positive but less strong compared to writing. Teachers reported high levels of agreement that written corrective feedback increases students' understanding of texts (mean = 4.10, standard deviation = 0.909), helps them recognize reading mistakes (mean = 3.88, standard deviation = 0.918), and supports the accurate application of reading strategies (mean = 3.84, standard deviation = 0.889). The overall mean score for reading skills (mean = 3.94, standard deviation = 0.689) indicates a high perceived impact of WCF in this domain.

In contrast, the perceived impact of written corrective feedback on listening skills was moderate overall. Teachers reported moderate agreement that written feedback helps students identify listening weaknesses (mean = 3.26, standard deviation = 1.139) and improve listening comprehension (mean = 3.18, standard deviation = 1.190), while a relatively higher level of agreement was observed for helping students focus on key points in audio materials (mean = 3.42, standard deviation = 1.108). The overall mean for listening skills (mean = 3.29, standard deviation = 1.050) reflects greater variability and less consistent perceptions among teachers.

Similarly, perceptions of the impact of WCF on speaking skills ranged from moderate to high. Teachers moderately agreed that written feedback guides students to self-correct spoken errors (mean = 3.22, standard deviation = 1.234) and enhances fluency and confidence (mean = 3.04, standard deviation = 1.177), while higher agreement was reported for recognizing and correcting pronunciation and grammatical errors (mean = 3.46, standard deviation = 1.297). The overall mean for speaking skills (mean = 3.24, standard deviation = 1.098) suggests a moderate perceived impact.

Overall, the grand mean score of 3.69 with a standard deviation of 0.594 indicates a generally high perceived impact of written corrective feedback on language skills, with its effectiveness

perceived as strongest for writing, followed by reading, and comparatively weaker for listening and speaking skills.

Table (9): Preferences Regarding Types of Corrective Feedback. Choose the most appropriate response for each item

Statement	Categories	Count	%	Chi square	P value
When providing feedback, a teacher should	Correct all errors (comprehensive feedback)	25	50.0	19.480	< 0.001
	Correct only specific types of errors (selective feedback)	23	46.0		
	Not correct any errors	2	4.0		
If only specific types of errors are corrected, they should be	Global errors that hinder understanding	15	30.0	12.960	< 0.001
	Frequent errors made by students	11	22.0		
	Errors related to recently taught structures	6	12.0		
	All types of errors	18	36.0		

As shown in Table (9), the results reveal clear preferences among Libyan university EFL teachers regarding the types of written corrective feedback they consider most appropriate. When asked about the general approach to error correction, half of the respondents (50%) preferred comprehensive feedback in which all errors are corrected, while a nearly equal proportion (46%) favored selective feedback that focuses on specific types of errors. Only a very small minority (4%) indicated a preference for not correcting any errors. The chi-square test showed that these differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 19.48$, $p < 0.001$), indicating a meaningful distribution of preferences rather than random variation.

With respect to the criteria for selective feedback, teachers' responses varied but demonstrated statistically significant differences ($\chi^2 = 12.96$, $p < 0.001$). The largest proportion of respondents (36%) indicated that all types of errors should be corrected when feedback is selective, followed by those who prioritized global errors that hinder understanding (30%). Smaller proportions preferred focusing on frequent errors made by students (22%) or errors related to recently taught structures (12%, $n = 6$). Overall, the findings suggest that while teachers are divided between comprehensive and selective approaches to written corrective feedback, there is strong consensus that error correction should be purposeful and focused on errors that most affect students' understanding and learning.

Table (10): Challenges in Providing Written Corrective Feedback

What challenges do you face when giving written feedback to your students?	Count	%	Chi square	P value
It is time-consuming to provide detailed feedback on all assignments.	27	54.0	84.800	< 0.001
There is a large number of papers to review and correct	11	22.0		
Students tend to make numerous recurring mistakes.	1	2.0		
Students often disregard the feedback provided.	8	16.0		
Students struggle to interpret comments and correction symbols.	3	6.0		

As presented in Table (10), the findings indicate that time-related constraints constitute the most prominent challenge faced by Libyan university EFL teachers when providing written corrective feedback. More than half of the respondents (54%) reported that providing detailed feedback on

all assignments is time-consuming, highlighting workload pressure as a primary obstacle. This was followed by the challenge of having a large number of papers to review and correct, reported by 22% of the participants. Other challenges were perceived as less prevalent, including students disregarding the feedback provided (16%), difficulties in interpreting comments and correction symbols (6%), and the presence of numerous recurring mistakes (2%). The chi-square analysis revealed that the distribution of responses was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 84.80$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that teachers' perceptions of challenges were not evenly distributed across categories. Overall, the results suggest that practical and workload-related factors, rather than pedagogical concerns, represent the main barriers to the effective provision of written corrective feedback.

Table (11): A Comparative Analysis of English Language Teachers' Perceptions of Written Corrective Feedback Based on Gender

Dimension	Gender	N	Mean	Std	T value	P value
Teachers' Philosophy	Male	26	4.16	0.434	-0.606	0.547
	Female	24	4.23	0.384		
Perceived Usefulness of Written Corrective Feedback	Male	26	4.43	0.577	-1.502	0.140
	Female	24	4.65	0.403		
Perceived Impact of Written Corrective Feedback on Language Skills	Male	26	3.70	0.647	0.047	0.963
	Female	24	3.69	0.545		

As shown in Table (11), the independent-samples t-test results indicate no statistically significant differences between male and female English language teachers in their perceptions of written corrective feedback across all examined dimensions. With regard to teachers' philosophy of written corrective feedback, male teachers reported a mean score of 4.16 (standard deviation = 0.434), while female teachers reported a slightly higher mean of 4.23 (standard deviation = 0.384); however, this difference was not statistically significant, $t = -0.606$, $p = 0.547$. Similarly, in terms of the perceived usefulness of written corrective feedback, female teachers demonstrated a higher mean score (mean = 4.65, standard deviation = 0.403) compared to male teachers (mean = 4.43, standard deviation = 0.577), yet this difference did not reach statistical significance, $t = -1.502$, $p = 0.140$.

Furthermore, no significant gender-based differences were observed in perceptions of the impact of written corrective feedback on language skills, as male teachers (mean = 3.70, standard deviation = 0.647) and female teachers (mean = 3.69, standard deviation = 0.545) reported nearly identical mean scores, $t = 0.047$, $p = 0.963$. Overall, the suggest that gender does not play a significant role in shaping Libyan university EFL teachers' beliefs, perceived usefulness, or perceived impact of written corrective feedback on students' language development.

Table (12): A Comparative Analysis of English Language Teachers' Perceptions of Written Corrective Feedback Based on Educational Qualifications

Dimension	Education	N	Mean	Std	F value	P value
Teachers' Philosophy Perceived Usefulness of Written Corrective Feedback	MA	32	4.19	0.382	0.288	0.751
	PhD	5	4.08	0.727		
	Pursuing PhD	13	4.24	0.344		
Perceived Impact of Written Corrective Feedback on Language Skills	MA	32	4.55	0.487	0.359	0.700
	PhD	5	4.35	0.802		
	Pursuing PhD	13	4.56	0.458		

Teachers' Philosophy	MA	32	3.63	0.568	0.925	0.404
	PhD	5	3.62	0.603		
	Pursuing PhD	13	3.88	0.657		

As shown in Table (12), the one-way ANOVA results indicate no statistically significant differences in English language teachers' perceptions of written corrective feedback based on educational qualifications across all examined dimensions. For teachers' philosophy, the mean scores were 3.63 (SD = 0.568) for those holding an MA, 3.62 (SD = 0.603) for PhD holders, and 3.88 (SD = 0.657) for those pursuing a PhD, with the differences not reaching statistical significance, $F = 0.925$, $p = 0.404$. Similarly, for the perceived usefulness of written corrective feedback, teachers with an MA reported a mean of 4.19 (SD = 0.382), PhD holders 4.08 (SD = 0.727), and those pursuing a PhD 4.24 (SD = 0.344), $F = 0.288$, $p = 0.751$, indicating no significant variation based on educational attainment.

Regarding the perceived impact of written corrective feedback on language skills, mean scores were 4.55 (SD = 0.487) for MA holders, 4.35 (SD = 0.802) for PhD holders, and 4.56 (SD = 0.458) for those pursuing a PhD, with differences again not statistically significant, $F = 0.359$, $p = 0.700$. Overall, these results suggest that educational qualifications do not significantly influence Libyan university EFL teachers' beliefs, perceptions of usefulness, or perceptions of the impact of written corrective feedback on students' language development.

Table (13): A Comparative Analysis of English Language Teachers' Perceptions of Written Corrective Feedback Based on Years of Experience

Dimension	Experience	N	Mean	Std	F value	P value
Teachers' Philosophy Perceived Usefulness of Written Corrective Feedback	< 5 years	18	4.03	0.328	2.451	0.097
	5-10 years	21	4.27	0.368		
	> 10 years	11	4.31	0.534		
Perceived Impact of Written Corrective Feedback on Language Skills	< 5 years	18	4.53	0.453	1.004	0.374
	5-10 years	21	4.63	0.472		
	> 10 years	11	4.36	0.646		
Teachers' Philosophy	< 5 years	18	3.68	0.460	0.018	0.982
	5-10 years	21	3.69	0.621		
	> 10 years	11	3.72	0.771		

As presented in Table (13), the one-way ANOVA results indicate that years of teaching experience do not have a statistically significant effect on English language teachers' perceptions of written corrective feedback across all measured dimensions. For teachers' philosophy, mean scores were 3.68 (SD = 0.460) for those with less than 5 years of experience, 3.69 (SD = 0.621) for teachers with 5–10 years of experience, and 3.72 (SD = 0.771) for those with more than 10 years of experience, with no significant differences observed, $F = 0.018$, $p = 0.982$.

Regarding the perceived usefulness of written corrective feedback, teachers with less than 5 years of experience reported a mean of 4.03 (SD = 0.328), those with 5–10 years 4.27 (SD = 0.368), and those with more than 10 years 4.31 (SD = 0.534), $F = 2.451$, $p = .097$, indicating a non-significant trend toward slightly higher perceived usefulness among more experienced teachers. Similarly, for the perceived impact of written corrective feedback on language skills, mean scores were 4.53 (SD = 0.453), 4.63 (SD = 0.472), and 4.36 (SD = 0.646) for the three experience groups, respectively, $F = 1.004$, $p = 0.374$, showing no significant variation. Overall, the findings suggest that years of teaching experience do not significantly influence Libyan university EFL teachers' philosophy, perceived usefulness, or perceived impact of written corrective feedback.

Summary of Results: The study examined Libyan university EFL teachers' perceptions of written corrective feedback (WCF), focusing on their philosophy, perceived usefulness, perceived impact on language skills, preferences, and challenges. The sample consisted of 50 teachers with a balanced gender distribution (52% male, 48% female), predominantly holding master's degrees (64%), and varying teaching experience, with the majority having 5–10 years of experience. Only 34% reported receiving formal training in providing written feedback, highlighting a professional development gap.

Regarding teachers' philosophy of WCF, participants demonstrated strong positive beliefs about its importance. Most teachers strongly agreed that providing written corrective feedback is a fundamental responsibility of language instructors, and they valued strategies such as correction symbols and prompt feedback on initial drafts. The mean scores for philosophy statements ranged from 3.62 to 4.64, with an overall mean of 4.19, indicating a generally high to very high endorsement of WCF principles.

Teachers also reported very high perceptions of the usefulness of WCF in improving students' writing proficiency, vocabulary, and mechanical accuracy, with overall mean scores ranging from 4.46 to 4.66 for individual statements and a composite mean of 4.54. The perceived impact of WCF on language skills varied across skills: writing received the highest endorsement (overall mean = 4.30, very high), followed by reading (mean = 3.94, high), listening (mean = 3.29, moderate), and speaking (mean = 3.24, moderate), indicating that teachers see WCF as most effective for developing writing skills.

Regarding preferences for feedback, teachers were divided between comprehensive (50%) and selective (46%) feedback, with selective feedback primarily focused on all types of errors or global errors that hinder understanding. Challenges in providing WCF were largely related to practical constraints, such as time consumption (54%) and large numbers of assignments to review (22%). Pedagogical challenges, such as students disregarding feedback or difficulty interpreting symbols, were reported less frequently.

Comparative analyses based on gender, educational qualifications, and years of teaching experience revealed no statistically significant differences across teachers' philosophy, perceived usefulness, or perceived impact of WCF, suggesting that these perceptions are broadly shared regardless of demographic or professional variables.

- i. **Conclusions:** The findings of this study demonstrate that EFL faculty members at Libyan universities maintain a profound conviction regarding the pivotal role of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) in language instruction. Teachers perceive WCF as a highly instrumental tool for enhancing students' writing proficiency, vocabulary acquisition, and mechanical accuracy. While the perceived impact of feedback is most pronounced in writing skills and moderately effective in reading, its influence is viewed as less significant for oral-aural skills like listening and speaking. Furthermore, the pedagogical landscape in Libya shows a clear division between comprehensive and selective feedback approaches, reflecting a struggle to balance exhaustive correction with purposeful, strategic intervention. Despite these strong positive beliefs, the practical implementation of WCF is primarily hindered by logistical challenges—specifically time constraints and heavy workloads—rather than pedagogical deficiencies. Notably, these perceptions remain consistent across the faculty, as demographic variables such as gender, educational qualifications, and years of teaching experience were found to have no significant influence on teachers' attitudes toward feedback.

Discussion: The findings of this study offer a profound understanding of how Libyan university EFL teachers perceive and implement Written Corrective Feedback (WCF), revealing a complex interplay between theoretical convictions and practical constraints. A primary observation is the overwhelming consensus (96%) that providing WCF is an indispensable pedagogical responsibility. This professional stance aligns with the broader academic discourse, mirroring the findings of Rajab (2018) and Purnomo (2021). Crucially, this high level of commitment is also reflected in the recent local study by Loka (2024), which confirms that Libyan educators maintain a strong belief in the efficacy of feedback as a tool for linguistic improvement, despite the varying methods of its application. However, the heavy reliance on personal experience (Mean = 4.22) rather than formal pedagogical training—reported by 66% of the participants—indicates that many teachers are navigating this intricate task through a "trial-and-error" approach, highlighting a significant "belief-practice gap" within the Libyan higher education context. Furthermore, the study challenges traditional views that confine the benefits of WCF to writing accuracy alone. The participants' perception of a significant "spillover effect" on reading skills (Mean = 3.94) provides empirical support for the Noticing Hypothesis, suggesting that the cognitive processing of written corrections enhances learners' general linguistic awareness. In terms of methodology, the sample was nearly equally divided between comprehensive and selective feedback. This division is particularly telling of the Libyan sociocultural landscape; while scholars like Ellis (2009) advocate for selective feedback, Loka (2024) similarly observed that Libyan instructors often struggle with this choice, frequently gravitating toward comprehensive correction due to perceived institutional expectations. This suggests that many Libyan teachers fear that any omission might be misinterpreted by students or administration as professional negligence.

Ultimately, the challenges identified in this research underscore that the primary barriers to effective WCF in Libya are logistical rather than purely pedagogical. The prominent roles of time constraints (54%) and large class sizes (22%) echo the findings of Al-Bakri (2016) and are further validated by Loka (2024), whose findings also highlighted that standardized feedback policies are often absent, leaving teachers to struggle with administrative burdens. This reality explains the staggering 92% demand for professional development. It reflects a genuine desire among Libyan EFL teachers to transition from intuitive feedback practices to more strategic, evidence-based approaches that can be realistically sustained within their specific teaching environments.

Recommendations: Based on the study findings, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. Organize specialized training workshops for Libyan EFL teachers to enhance their technical knowledge of diverse WCF strategies.
2. Reduce class sizes in writing courses to allow teachers sufficient time to provide high-quality, individualized feedback.
3. Encourage the use of automated or electronic feedback tools to mitigate the burden of heavy workloads and time constraints.
4. Develop clear institutional guidelines for WCF to bridge the gap between teachers' pedagogical beliefs and their actual classroom practices.

Suggestions for Future Research: To further expand the understanding of WCF within the Libyan context, the following areas are suggested for future academic inquiry:

1. The Learners' Perspective: Future research should investigate students' perceptions of and responses to WCF. Comparing teacher intentions with learner interpretations would reveal whether the feedback provided is effectively understood and utilized.

1. It is recommended to conduct longitudinal research to measure the actual improvement in students' writing accuracy over a full academic year as a result of specific feedback types (Direct vs. Indirect).
2. An experimental study could examine how varying student-to-teacher ratios affect the depth and frequency of feedback, helping to determine an optimal class size for effective writing instruction in Libya.

References

- Al-Bakri, S. (2016). Written Corrective Feedback: Teachers' Beliefs, Practices and Challenges. *English Language Teaching*, 9(11), 1-8.
- Al-Kharusi, H., & Al-Mekhlafi, A. (2019). The effect of written corrective feedback on Omani EFL students' writing performance. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 8(3), 11-19.
- Almanea, M. (2025). Less is NOT more for learners: EFL learners' preferences and perceptions. *Acta Psychologica*, 252, 104543.
- Askew, S., & Lodge, C. (2000). Gifts, guidance and gratitude: Feedback for learning. In S. Askew (Ed.), *Feedback for Learning* (pp. 1-18). Routledge Falmer.
- Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). Written corrective feedback for L2 development. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Borg, S. (2006). Teacher cognition and language education: *Research and practice*. Continuum.
- Borg, S. (2009). Language teacher cognition. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 163-171). Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G. T., Harris, L. R., & Harnett, J. (2012). Student beliefs about feedback within an assessment for learning environment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(7), 968-978.
- Carlgren, I., Handal, G., & Vaage, S. (Eds.). (1994). *Teachers' minds and actions: Research on teachers' thinking and practice*. Falmer Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.)*. SAGE Publications
- Ducken, G. R. (2014). *The role of written corrective feedback in the L2 writing classroom* (Master's thesis). St. Cloud State University.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97-107.
- Erkkilä, M. (2013). *The role of written corrective feedback in the Finnish upper secondary school EFL classroom* (Master's thesis). University of Jyväskylä.
- Ferris, D. R. (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Goldstein, L. (2005). *Teacher written commentary in second language writing classrooms*. University of Michigan Press.
- Gul, R., & Rodrigues, S. (2012). Exploring the challenges and practices of teacher feedback on students' writing. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 2(1).
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press
- Jamoom, M. M. (2016). *EFL teachers' and students' perceptions of written corrective feedback at King Abdulaziz University* (Master's thesis). King Abdulaziz University.
- Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of writing-reading connections to the development of second-language writing skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(3), 305-313.

- Kim, M. K., & Vattøy, K.-I. (2020). The retrospective and prospective use of feedback: Teachers' and students' perceptions of feedback practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 96, 103168.
- Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written corrective feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 69-85.
- Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written corrective feedback practice. *ELT Journal*, 63(1), 13-22.
- Lee, I. (2011). Working towards a more comprehensive approach to written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(1), 1-14.
- Loka, K. (2024). *EFL Teachers' Practices and Perceptions of Written Corrective Feedback in Their Writing Classrooms*. (Master Thesis). Zawia University.
- Orrell, J. (2006). Feedback on academic performance. *Teaching Learning Echo*, 5, 1-28.
- Purnomo, W. W. (2021). EFL university teachers' perspectives in written corrective feedback. *Journal of English Education*, 6(1).
- Rajab, H. (2018). *EFL teachers and learners' perceptions in the Saudi higher education context*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Rajab, H., Khan, M. S., & Elyas, T. (2016). The impact of written corrective feedback on Saudi EFL learners' writing performance. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(7), 116-128.
- Ramaprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. *Behavioral Science*, 28(1), 4-13.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129-158.
- Turkestani, A. (2022). *The impact of written corrective feedback on EFL students' writing performance and anxiety*. (Master's thesis).
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wen, Y. (2013). Teacher written corrective feedback: Perspectives and practices. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 1(2), 175-185.
- Zhang, L., & Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL learners' beliefs about and strategy use of translation in English learning. *RELC Journal*, 45(3), 253-269.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of **JLABW** and/or the editor(s). **JLABW** and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.