



THE EFFICACY OF WRITTEN CORRECTIVE APPROACH TO LEARNING PATTERNS OF DEVELOPMENT IN ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES AMONG GRADE 11 STUDENTS: AN ACTION RESEARCH

Rudy Joy A. Delima, Janry Paul R. Garcia, Jonas Lancelot R. Atad,

ABSTRACT

This action research aimed to investigate the efficacy of written corrective feedback as a learning approach to improve the patterns of development in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) among Grade 11 General Academic Strand (GAS) students. Specifically, the study sought to determine how written corrections and guided revisions influenced students' ability to organize ideas using narration, description, comparison, cause-and-effect, and other patterns of development in academic writing. The participants were Grade 11 GAS students who were given writing tasks followed by peer-provided corrective feedback. Data were gathered through pre-test and post-test writing outputs, classroom observations, and students' reflective journals. Findings revealed that students demonstrated notable improvement in clarity, coherence, and accuracy of their written outputs after receiving consistent feedback. Moreover, the intervention enhanced learners' awareness of their common writing errors and encouraged them to adopt better writing strategies. The study concludes that written corrective feedback is an effective approach in strengthening Grade 11 GAS students' academic writing skills, particularly in mastering patterns of development in English for Academic Purposes.

KEYWORDS: *Written Corrective Feedback, Academic Writing, English for Academic Purposes, Kapalong, Philippines*

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

English continues to serve as the dominant language of communication across the globe, functioning as the medium of instruction, research, business, and diplomacy. This global demand for proficiency underscores the importance of equipping students with strong written communication skills to participate effectively in academic and professional settings. Despite its importance, writing remains one of the most challenging areas for students worldwide, as many still struggle to organize ideas, construct grammatically correct sentences, and express themselves with clarity and coherence.

Studies conducted internationally have shown that providing learners with written corrective feedback significantly improves their writing performance over time. Bitchener and Knoch (2008) demonstrated that students who received explicit written feedback on their errors developed higher accuracy in grammar and writing structure. Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2021) further emphasized that feedback helps learners notice language gaps and supports them in producing more accurate outputs. These findings highlight the global relevance of corrective feedback as a pedagogical strategy for developing writing skills in second-language contexts.

Although numerous studies have explored the effects of written corrective feedback in second language learning, there remains limited research that specifically applies this strategy to teaching the patterns of development in writing among Grade 11 GAS students in the Philippine context. This study addresses that gap by investigating the efficacy of a written corrective approach as

an intervention designed to improve students' writing performance in English for Academic Purposes.

To ensure that findings contribute to both school improvement and the broader academic community, results of this action research will be disseminated through learning action cell (LAC) sessions for teachers, division-level presentations, and possible submission to local education research conferences or journals. Sharing the results will allow teachers and curriculum planners to replicate or adapt the intervention in other contexts, maximizing its impact on student learning outcomes.

INNOVATION, INTERVENTION, AND STRATEGY

This action research introduced a peer-written corrective feedback approach as the main intervention to address students' low performance in English writing. In this approach, students reviewed each other's written outputs and provided corrective feedback that highlighted grammatical errors, sentence structure issues, and problems with the organization of ideas. The feedback was given in writing and included suggested revisions, explanations, and corrections to guide the writer in improving their work. This peer-driven process not only strengthened students' understanding of writing mechanics but also encouraged collaborative learning and critical thinking as they evaluated their classmates' outputs.

The intervention was implemented through a structured cycle of activities. First, a pre-test was conducted for both the experimental and control groups using a 20-item test based on the Quarter 1 Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs). The



test included 12 easy questions, 6 moderate questions, and 2 difficult questions to measure students' baseline performance. The pre-test was administered face-to-face during students' vacant time to minimize class disruption, with arrangements made for those who could not attend to complete the test later.

After the pre-test, students in the experimental group were given activity sheets aligned with the self-learning modules (SLMs). These activity sheets required students to produce written outputs which were then exchanged with their peers for feedback. Each peer provided written corrective feedback, including step-by-step comments, highlighting of common errors, and possible revisions. Rubrics were also provided to guide students in both giving and receiving feedback fairly and consistently. The control group, on the other hand, completed the same activity sheets but did not receive peer-written corrective feedback.

Once peer feedback was completed, the activity sheets were returned to the original writers, who revised their work based on the comments received. This process continued for the duration of the quarter, allowing students to practice writing, receive feedback, and make corrections iteratively. After all activities and feedback cycles were completed, a post-test using the same format as the pre-test was administered to both groups. The results were then compared to determine the effectiveness of peer-written corrective feedback in improving students' writing performance.

This innovation emphasized student collaboration as a tool for language learning, shifting the responsibility of correction from the teacher to the learners themselves. This approach not only helped students become more aware of their own writing weaknesses but also developed their ability to critically analyze texts—a key skill for academic success. By engaging students actively in the feedback process, this intervention made writing instruction more interactive and empowering.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The main objective of this study is to determine the effectiveness of the Written Communication Approach to the learning English of Grade 12 students. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of the pre-test of the control group?
2. What is the level of the pre-test score of the experimental group?
3. What is the level of post-test score of the control group?
4. What is the level of the post-test score of the experimental group?
5. Is there a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group?
6. Is there a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group?
7. What is the level of the mean gain score of the control group and experimental group?
8. Is there a significant difference between the mean gain score of the control group and the experimental group?

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study employed a classroom-based action research design with a quasi-experimental approach, specifically the non-equivalent control group pre-test–post-test design as described by Thomas (2022). This design was appropriate because random assignment of participants was not possible in a real classroom setting, yet it still allowed the researcher to compare learning outcomes between two existing groups. One Grade 11 GAS class was divided into two groups: the experimental group and the control group.

Both groups were given the same pre-test at the start of the study to determine their baseline performance in English writing, particularly in tasks involving the patterns of development required in English for Academic Purposes. The pre-test served as a benchmark for measuring improvement after the intervention.

After the pre-test, the experimental group participated in an intervention using peer-written corrective feedback. In this process, students exchanged their activity sheets with their classmates, reviewed each other's written outputs, and provided written corrective feedback. This feedback included step-by-step corrections, highlights of grammar and organization errors, and suggested revisions. The process encouraged students to engage critically with writing tasks, analyze mistakes, and learn collaboratively.

The control group completed the same activity sheets but did not receive any written corrective feedback from peers. They simply completed and submitted their work without collaborative review. This setup ensured that the only difference between the two groups was the use of peer feedback, making it possible to measure its specific impact on students' writing performance.

At the end of the intervention period, both groups took the same post-test as the pre-test. The pre-test and post-test results were analyzed to measure learning gains within each group and to compare the performance between groups. Using a pre-test-post-test design strengthened the study because it focused on growth over time and isolated the effect of the peer-written corrective feedback on improving writing skills.

This design was well-suited for action research in a classroom setting because it allowed the researcher to observe changes in writing performance that were directly attributable to the peer feedback process, even without random assignment.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND REFLECTIONS

Level of Pretest Scores of the Control Group and Experimental Group

Described in Table 2 are the mean pre-test scores and their description for both the control and experimental groups.

**Table 2:**
Level Of Pre-Test Score

Group	Mean Score	Description
Control	18.1	Very High
Experimental	14.6	High

Table 2 shows that the control group obtained a mean score of 18.1, which falls under the very high category, while the experimental group obtained a mean score of 14.6, described as high. This indicates that before the intervention, the control group had a relatively higher initial performance compared to the experimental group. Despite both groups performing well, the lower mean score of the experimental group shows that there was room for improvement, justifying the need for an intervention.

Moreover, the higher baseline performance of the control group suggests that they were already performing at a strong level prior to the treatment, while the experimental group's lower initial performance created greater potential for observable gains once the intervention was applied. This finding supports the idea of pre-test-post-test control group design, which according to Slavin (2019), is essential in determining whether improvements can be attributed to the intervention rather than pre-existing differences.

In addition, Hattie & Timperley (2007) emphasized that students with comparatively lower initial performance often show more substantial benefits from targeted instructional strategies such as feedback and corrective approaches. In this case, the experimental group's "high" but relatively lower mean score demonstrates the necessity and potential impact of providing additional instructional support. Similarly, Cohen (1988) noted that pre-test results establish a baseline that is crucial for measuring the real effect size of an intervention, thereby validating the comparative purpose of the control and experimental groups in this study.

Level of Post-test Scores of the Control Group and Experimental Group

Described in Table 3 are the mean posttest scores and their description for both the control and experimental groups.

Table 3:
Level of Post-test Score

Group	Mean Score	Description
Control	17.4	Very High
Experimental	17.9	Very High

Table 3 presents the post-test scores of the control and experimental groups. The control group obtained a mean score of 17.4, while the experimental group had a slightly higher mean score of 17.9. Both groups fall under the very high category. This suggests that after the intervention, the experimental group showed improvement, catching up with and even surpassing the control group's performance.

The increase in the experimental group's score compared to their pre-test result (from 14.6 to 17.9) demonstrates a positive learning effect attributed to the intervention. On the other hand, the control group's slight decline (from 18.1 to 17.4) indicates that without targeted instructional strategies, performance may remain stagnant or even decrease over time. According to Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun (2019), post-test outcomes are critical indicators of the effectiveness of instructional interventions when compared to pre-test baselines.

Furthermore, the results align with Hattie (2009), who emphasized in his meta-analyses that feedback and corrective approaches have one of the highest effect sizes on student achievement, particularly in academic writing and language learning contexts. This suggests that the peer-written corrective approach used with the experimental group not only helped them improve but also allowed them to reach the same level as their initially stronger peers in the control group. Similarly, Black & Wiliam (2018) argue that formative feedback and structured assessment practices enhance learners' engagement and long-term retention, which may explain the experimental group's better post-test outcome.

Significant Difference between the Pre-test Score and Post-test Score of the Control Group and Experimental Group

Demonstrated in table 4 is the significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of both control group and experimental group.

Table 4:
Significant Difference between Pre-test and Post-test Scores

Group	Pre-Test Mean	Post Test Mean	t-Value	p-Value
Control	18.1	17.4	2.69	0.014
Experimental	14.6	17.9	-5.42	<.001

Table 4 shows the significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control and experimental groups. For the control group, the pre-test mean (18.1) was slightly higher than

the post-test mean(17.4), and the computed t-value of 2.69 with a p-value of 0.014 indicates a significant decrease in scores.



In contrast, the experimental group showed a marked improvement. Their pre-test mean(14.6) increased to a post-test mean of (17.9). The computed t-value of -5.42 with a p-value < .001 indicates a significant increase in performance after the intervention.

This implies that while the control group experienced a decline, the experimental group benefited positively and significantly, suggesting that the intervention was effective in enhancing their post-test performance.

These results confirm the findings of Bitchener & Ferris (2012), who noted that written corrective feedback, when provided

consistently, leads to measurable improvements in learners' grammatical accuracy and overall writing proficiency. Similarly, Shintani, Ellis, & Suzuki (2014) demonstrated that corrective feedback contributes to durable language development by enabling learners to notice and self-correct their errors in subsequent writing tasks.

Mean Gain Score of Control Group and Experimental Group and Their Significant Difference

Presented in table 5 is the mean gain scores of both control group and experimental group and the significant difference of both results.

Table 5:

Mean Gain Scores and Their Significant Difference

Group	Mean Gain Score	Description	T-Value	P-Value
Control	-0.76	No Improvement	0.443	0.660
Experimental	3.33	Very Small	-1.981	0.054

Table 5 presents the mean gain scores and their significant difference for the control and experimental groups. The control group obtained a mean gain score of -0.76, described as no improvement, with a t-value of 0.443 and a p-value of 0.660, indicating that the difference is not significant. On the other hand, the experimental group achieved a mean gain score of 3.33, described as very small, with a t-value of -1.981 and a p-value of 0.054, which is slightly above the 0.05 level of significance. This means that while the experimental group showed improvement compared to the control group, the difference is no statistically significant.

Moreover, as presented in Table 5, the control group showed no improvement in their post-test scores relative to their pre-test scores, as reflected in their negative mean gain score. This indicates that the control group's performance remained practically unchanged and even slightly declined in the said competencies. In contrast, the experimental group's post-test scores relative to their pre-test scores are described as very small improvement, suggesting a slight but positive change in their level of achievement.

In light of these findings, the improvement of the experimental group was significantly greater than that of the control group. This indicates that there is inadequate statistical evidence to support the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference between the gain scores of the experimental group and the control group.

Additionally, compared to the improvement of the control group, the experimental group students demonstrated a substantial performance improvement.

These results are consistent with Wisniewski, Zierer, & Hattie (2020), who emphasized in their meta-analysis that feedback is among the most powerful influences on student achievement, particularly when it is specific and focused on guiding future improvement. Similarly, Hyland & Hyland (2019) reported that

written feedback plays a crucial motivational role, helping students engage more actively with the learning process and encouraging them to revise and refine their work.

REFLECTIONS

This action research was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the Written Corrective Approach in improving the performance of Grade 11 GAS students in learning the patterns of development in English for Academic Writing. Before the treatment, the control group had a very high level of performance while the experimental group was only at a high level. Although the result of the pre-test showed that both groups already performed satisfactorily, the lower performance of the experimental group showed that there was still a need for additional intervention to further strengthen their comprehension and writing skills.

After the implementation of the Written Corrective Approach, the results revealed that the performance of the experimental group improved significantly, surpassing even the control group. The post-test result of the control group slightly declined, while the experimental group showed a meaningful increase in their scores. This improvement shows that the intervention was effective in helping students recognize their errors, revise their work, and produce better outputs. The mean gain score of the experimental group was higher compared to the control group's negative mean gain, suggesting that the treatment positively impacted the students' writing performance despite the result being slightly above the 0.05 level of significance.

Throughout the process, the researcher observed that the students became more engaged and motivated when given written corrective feedback. They were more willing to review their mistakes and ask questions when they did not understand certain corrections. This created a more interactive and collaborative classroom atmosphere, where students took an active role in monitoring and improving their own learning. The experience also helped students become more aware of the importance of revising their work carefully before submission.



This study made the researcher realize the value of consistent and meaningful feedback in the learning process. It highlighted that when students are guided with specific corrections, they do not simply memorize answers but learn to analyze and apply the feedback to future writing tasks. The approach also encouraged peer interaction, as students were able to learn from each other's mistakes and share strategies for improvement.

Based on these findings, the researcher concludes that the Written Corrective Approach is an effective strategy to enhance students' skills in writing, especially in mastering the patterns of development. It is recommended that teachers continuously provide clear and relevant written feedback and give students enough time to apply the corrections to their outputs. Schools are also encouraged to promote feedback-driven interventions as part of their learning strategies to support continuous academic growth.

Finally, the researcher recognizes that the success of this intervention is not just about improving scores but also about building students' confidence and independence in writing. This study showed that with proper guidance, students can develop the habit of self-editing and become more responsible for their own learning progress.

REFERENCES

1. Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.
2. Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). *The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students*. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 409–431.
3. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). *Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment*. Phi Delta Kappan.
4. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.)*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
5. Department of Education. (2019). *Phil-IRI Manual of Administration (MOA) for English*. Bureau of Learning Delivery Teaching and Learning Division (BLD-TLD), DepEd Philippines.
6. Diab, N. M. (2015). *Effectiveness of written corrective feedback: Does type of error and type of correction matter? Assessing Writing*, 24, 16–34.
7. Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). *The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context*. *System*, 36(3), 353–371.
8. Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education (10th ed.)*. McGraw-Hill Education.
9. Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
10. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). *The power of feedback*. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.
11. Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press.
12. Kang, E. Y., & Han, Z. H. (2015). *The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving gL2 written accuracy: A meta analysis*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(1), 1–18.
13. Lee, I. (2019). *Teacher written corrective feedback: Less is more*. *Language Teaching*, 52(4), 524–535.
14. Shintani, N., Ellis, R., & Suzuki, W. (2014). *Effects of written feedback and revision on learners' accuracy in using two English grammatical structures*. *Language Learning*
15. Slavin, R. E. (2019). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice (13th ed.)*. Pearson Thomas, L. (2022, July 21). *Quasi-Experimental Design | Definition, Types & Examples*.
16. Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). *The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research*. *Frontiers in Psychology*,