

Corrective Feedback and Writing Skills of Humanities and Social Science Senior High School Students in Creative Writing

Shaiben T. Bassal*, Ana Marie J. Matalines, John Vincent C. Valles
Davao del Sur State College, Brgy. Matti, Digos City, Davao del Sur, Philippines

*Corresponding Author Email: bassalshaiben@gmail.com

Date received: May 28, 2025

Date revised: June 21, 2025

Date accepted: July 15, 2025

Originality: 99%

Grammarly Score: 99%

Similarity: 1%

Recommended citation:

Bassal, S., Matalines, A.M., & Valles, J.V. (2025). Corrective feedback and writing skills of Humanities and Social Science Senior High School students in Creative Writing. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(8), 555-566. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.460>

Abstract. It was a fundamental factor when students' writing errors in the Creative Writing subject were addressed through constructive corrective feedback, as writing was recognized as one of the enduring macro-skills being taught within the classroom environment. Henceforth, the researchers were eager to ascertain the significant correlation between corrective feedback and the writing skills of Humanities and Social Science (HUMSS) students in the Creative Writing subject. The study employed a non-experimental quantitative research design, and modified questions from Aridah et al. (2017) on the effect of corrective feedback on writing skills were utilized. Additionally, students' performance task scores in the Creative Writing subject were taken into account. The overall respondents was 153, coming from Grade 12 HUMSS students, which was statistically determined employing Slovin's formula. This study was conducted on May 09, 2023 at Santa Cruz Senior High School, Santa Cruz, Davao del Sur. Results disclosed that the teacher's corrective feedback was verbally described as High, with a mean of 3.59, while the Grade 12 HUMSS students' writing skills were verbally described as Fairly Satisfactory, with a mean of 3.27. Additionally, there was no substantial relationship among the study's variables. Nonetheless, despite having no relationship between the two variables, direct feedback, as one of the predictors of corrective feedback, was found to be substantially correlated, as indicated by its p-value of 0.02. Holistically, this indeed revealed that corrective feedback did not affect students' writing skills. Furthermore, this suggests that direct feedback must be highlighted and utilized by teachers to enhance students' writing skills. It might have insignificant relationship between corrective feedback and writing skills, there was still a need to provide corrections to students' writing activity which would serve as their basis to develop their second language, which had also supported the theory of noticing hypothesis, particularly in producing significant and final output that reflected their second language enhancement.

Keywords: Corrective feedback; Creative writing; Direct feedback; Performance task score; Writing skills.

1.0 Introduction

Corrective feedback is undeniably crucial in managing second language knowledge, where teachers should provide feedback to students. It is worth noting that students may commit mistakes or errors in their writing activities; therefore, it would be helpful if teachers could provide corrections to help them improve. In fact, according to Yunus (2020), correcting students' errors or mistakes should become a norm to explore students' potential. Upon making corrections, students would be more likely to be aware of their writing errors and improve their writing performance. Similarly, in some schools, colleges, and universities, corrective feedback is used as a

positive approach to enhance students' academic writing. This idea is supported by Guinness et al. (2020), which corroborates that corrective feedback, as a form of performance feedback, is used to enhance students' writing skills. According to Lim and Renandya (2020), they said that direct feedback strategies in the integration of the students' writing showed slightly more effectiveness than indirect feedback. In a similar context, Shute (2020) firmly explained that corrective feedback is the most powerful tool for developing students' writing skills. However, Truscott (2022) criticizes Lim and Renandya's study, indicating that the general effect size is modest and that various studies with strong findings are narrow and biased or methodologically flawed.

Additionally, according to a study conducted by Nawaz et al. (2023) on 200 Grade 9-10 students in Karachi, it was explained that comprehensive and focused written corrective feedback was highly employed in developing students' writing, similarly to Ali's (2024) study, which found that corrective feedback enhanced the writing activity, increased confidence, critical thinking, and cognitive ability in students. Moreover, the study by Solhi and Iginli (2020) revealed that respondents' teachers preferred corrective feedback, which included oral and written direct feedback, such as individual conferences, written remarks, thorough edits, peer editing, or tutoring.

The theory that anchors this study is the Noticing Hypothesis, in which Wang & Jiang (2015) suggest that students are likely to analyze the discrepancy between the corrected structure and their revised or final output, thereby enhancing their second language. This is especially true of feedback that comes when errors are shown as evidence. In other words, corrective feedback helps them by highlighting their weaknesses upon learning the language and bringing their target form to their conscious attention, both of which, in accordance with this hypothesis, are necessary for learning to occur.

The researcher is interested in the idea of how corrective feedback is helpful to students' writing skills, especially since there is a lack of information on this topic in the local study, as mentioned earlier. As they experienced the hypothetical benefits of employing corrective feedback on writing activities, they saw a significant improvement in their writing performance in class. There are numerous studies that can be found; however, they are primarily focused on corrective feedback without determining its influence on students' writing skills. Several related studies were conducted, including Laguna (2022), which examined the corrective feedback and writing skills of students using a mixed-method approach, and Nawaz et al. (2023), which investigated the relationship between corrective feedback, specifically focused feedback, and academic performance. However, these cited studies support this proposal, as it is crucial to point out that corrective feedback is significantly correlated with students' writing skills in the Creative Writing subject, which many researchers have failed to investigate. In addition, it is worth noting here how students prefer to be corrected, which serves as a goal to dig deeper into the study. Therefore, the researchers would specifically employ the Creative Writing subject performance task score of Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) Senior High students to determine the relationship between corrective feedback and writing skills.

Various studies have been conducted regarding the writing skills of HUMSS students, but this proposed study aims to examine relevant literary works on corrective feedback towards HUMSS students' writing activities in the course subject Creative Writing. Thus, the study aims to investigate the significant relationship between corrective feedback and writing skills of HUMSS students in their Creative Writing subject.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

The study employed a non-experimental, quantitative research design using a correlational approach. To gain an overview of the definition of correlational design, according to Bhandari (2021), it examines the relationships between variables without the researcher influencing or modifying any of them. The researchers could employ a score on one variable to predict if there is a relationship between the variables. More specifically, this method can be used to quantify the degree and direction of the correlation between two variables. (Senthilnathan, 2019).

2.2 Research Participants

The study selected Grade 12 Humanities and Social Science students from Santa Cruz National High School as respondents, comprising a total of 247 enrollees. Specifically, a total of 153 respondents were used, employing stratified random sampling (Slovin's formula). The selected Grade 12 HUMSS students' writing skills, as enrolled in the subject Creative Writing, and the corrective feedback provided were the unit of analysis for this study.

Table 1. *Sample Size Distribution of HUMSS in SCNHS of the Academic Year 2022-2023*

Section	Population	Percentage	Sample Size
Compassion	49	19.84	30
Fidelity	47	19.03	29
Integrity	50	20.24	31
Humility	52	21.05	32
Prudence	49	19.84	30
Total	247	100.00	153

Specifically, in selecting respondents, some criteria must be followed: Firstly, must be a Grade 12 Humanities and Social Science student; Secondly, a bona-fide student of Santa Cruz National High School; and lastly, must be enrolled in the first quarter of the academic year 2022-2023 in the subject Creative Writing. The presented criteria were supported by the idea of Vocci (2020), which suggests that selecting the perfect respondents is closely tied to understanding the study's objectives.

2.3 Research Instrument

The study utilized an adapted survey questionnaire based on the study by Aridah et al. (2017) on the Written Corrective Feedback Scale to collect relevant data from the respondents. Generally, the questionnaire contained questions about the effects of teachers' corrective feedback to students' writing skills. The researchers administered a 5-point Likert scale, which spans from 1 (Very Low) to 5 (Very High), as shown in Table 2. This questionnaire contained four (4) variables under the corrective feedback, such as Direct Feedback with only nine (9) items, Indirect Feedback with six (6) items, Unfocused Feedback with seven (7) items, and Focused Feedback with four (4) items. A total of twenty-six (26) items were modified to fit the context of Creative Writing to examine the effectiveness of corrective feedback.

Table 2. *Range of Mean, Descriptive Level, and Interpretation of Corrective Feedback.*

Range of Mean	Descriptive Level	Interpretation
4.20-5.00	Very High	This asserts that the stated situation is always experienced by the respondents.
3.40-4.19	High	This asserts that the stated situation is oftentimes experienced by the respondents.
2.60-3.39	Moderate	This asserts that the stated situation is sometimes experienced by the respondents.
1.80-2.59	Low	This asserts that the stated situation is seldom experienced by the respondents.
1.00-1.79	Very Low	This asserts that the stated situation is never experienced by the respondents.

Furthermore, this study focused on the writing skills of Grade 12 Humanities and Social Science students. The student's performance task score for the 1st quarter of the academic year 2022-2023 in Creative Writing was used as the basis for their scores, serving as the dependent variable for the study. The performance task score was composed of all of the writing activities of Grade 12 HUMSS students in Creative Writing with 45 points as the highest possible score that students should obtain, which was regarded as outstanding/passed, whereas, below 34 points as the lowest possible score was considered as did not meet expectations/failed which were shown in Table 3.

Table 3. *Score Scale, Description, and Remarks of Performance Score*

Score Scale	Description	Remarks
45-41	Outstanding	Passed
40-38	Very Satisfactory	Passed
37-36	Satisfactory	Passed
35-34	Fairly Satisfactory	Passed
Below 34	Did No Meet Expectations	Failed

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

This correlational study followed specific steps to gather data from respondents. The steps include: Firstly, asking permission to conduct the study, like a permit to perform, and permission letter were sent out to inform the institution of Santa Cruz National High School-Senior High School (SCNHS-SHS) regarding the conduct of study, and a letter of consent was crafted to gain respondents' permission in participating in this study; Secondly, distributing the survey questionnaire per section through face-to-face, where Grade 12 students had voluntarily

answered and responded to the scale above; Thirdly, once the respondents already responded the questionnaire, then the researchers collated the data based from the result of respondents' answers. For the dependent variable data, the researchers informed the students that a performance task score would be taken. A request letter for the raw score was crafted and sent to the secondary principal and Creative Writing advisers for approval. Additionally, data were analyzed and interpreted using a correlational design to investigate the results with the help of a statistician.

2.5 Data Analysis Procedure

When the data were collected, the researchers then statistically examined the gathered data. According to Bhandari (2021), employing a correlation analysis, this can be briefly explained by the correlation coefficient. Therefore, it will now quantify the level of correlation between the variables. Henceforth, the following statistical tools were employed to analyze the data according to the research objectives.

First and foremost, the mean was used to determine the teacher's level of corrective feedback and the Grade 12 HUMSS students' level of writing skills. Additionally, standard deviation was also used to determine the dispersion of data between each quantity, which indicates how a set of data is spread out from the mean. Furthermore, Pearson's r was used to determine the significant relationship between the two variables: corrective feedback and writing skills.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Teacher's Corrective Feedback in Creative Writing

The study's first objective was to determine the level of teachers' corrective feedback in Creative Writing, as this feedback was an essential factor in assessing students' writing activities. It greatly emphasized the importance of meaningful feedback that would undoubtedly help students' writing performance in the classroom. Corrective feedback, according to Guinness et al. (2020), was defined as a helpful approach that allows students' writing performance. This was to redirect students, along with their expectations, and to facilitate their errors during the writing test. According to Yunus (2020), correcting students' errors or mistakes should become a norm to explore students' potential. By doing so, students are more likely to be cautious of their mistakes and improve their writing performance.

The aforesaid independent variable contained four (4) domains, such as direct feedback, indirect feedback, unfocused feedback, and focused feedback, wherein they were statistically determined according to their mean level. Below are emphasized the descriptive statistics, which were carefully analyzed:

Table 4. *Level of Teacher's Corrective Feedback in Creative Writing*

Corrective Feedback Predictors	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Direct Feedback	4.21	0.90	Very High
Indirect Feedback	3.10	0.99	Moderate
Unfocused Feedback	3.99	1.09	High
Focused Feedback	3.05	0.99	Moderate

Table 4 shows an overall mean score of 3.59, obtained from the responses of Grade 12 HUMSS students, which were accurately described as High. Generally, this established that teachers' corrective feedback was consistently observed and considered by the students as they improved their writing skills in Creative Writing. The result was supported by Sabarun (2020), who stated that 90% reported feeling satisfied when they received feedback, indicating that it helped develop their writing and enhanced their self-esteem in creating final revisions. In addition, Shute (2020) also firmly explained that corrective feedback was the most powerful tool for developing students' writing.

Nevertheless, the majority of students from Santa Cruz National High School-Senior High School highly preferred that teachers correct their writing activities to enhance their writing skills further. Additionally, among the four domains, direct feedback was the mere predictor that received a Very High verbal description, given that the mean score is 4.21. This explicitly emphasized that Grade 12 HUMSS students were always likely to be corrected when teachers provided them with the correct sentence structures, because in this way, they could easily revise their papers.

Students believed that it consistently supported the improvement of their writing skills, mainly because the teacher ensured that they provided the necessary corrections, allowing students to easily identify where the mistakes were. They always preferred direct feedback because they found it easier to revise their own work when it was supplemented with the correct ones, which were less of a hassle and more convenient for them. This was in line with Rouhi et al. (2020), who asserted that direct feedback was being conquered when students were given the correct structure. When students revised their text, they needed to transcribe the corrections to create a final version. Additionally, Sabarun's (2020) study noted that 75% of the respondents agreed that it was significant for students to receive direct feedback, particularly on language, content, and organization. According to their findings, direct feedback was most valued. This meant that the necessary corrections provided by the teachers, particularly in supplying correct structures to the incorrect ones, were beneficial in revising students' papers. Students found it essential to adopt focused feedback, as it allowed them to anticipate corrections comprehensively; therefore, it would be beneficial to revise the paper independently.

Additionally, for unfocused feedback, which has a mean score of 3.99, it could be explained that the students often consider a variety of errors. This suggests that a teacher should adopt a specific approach when providing students with corrections, one that students usually prefer, in which various areas of grammar are corrected rather than pointing out specific errors. Incontestably, unfocused feedback offers a significant role, even if it might divide student attention across a broader range of errors (Kim, 2019). Likewise, Yunus (2020) supported the idea by stating that unfocused feedback is explained as comprehensive because it addresses a variety of errors. This suggested that some students would often prefer to receive a variety of corrections on their paper rather than too many or specific ones. Some students did not desire to receive major corrections or specific ones; otherwise, they often preferred that the teacher go over various areas of writing errors so they could be sure about what to revise and what not to.

In general analysis, the researcher can conclude that direct feedback is a powerful tool to employ in the classroom for students' writing activities to improve, given that students are likely to prefer receiving corrections by having teachers jot down the correct forms of incorrect ones. On the other hand, unfocused feedback was often helpful in correcting students' writing mistakes, particularly in addressing a variety of errors. Therefore, the results were vital for both teachers and students, as they comprehensively identified students' preferences for teachers' corrective feedback. This was a meaningful and valuable insight for teachers to assess their students' writing skills, as they were allowed to employ one of the predictors of corrective feedback.

3.2 Teacher's Corrective Feedback in Creative Writing in terms of Direct Feedback

The first predictor of the independent variable was direct feedback, which was highly beneficial in correcting students' writing mistakes, as it was direct and more comprehensive than other forms of feedback. The teacher used this type of corrective feedback to address all linguistic errors committed by the students, pointing out the mistakes and writing the correct ones, which allowed students to realize how beneficial and crucial it was to enhance their writing skills.

Table 5. *Level of Teacher's Corrective Feedback in Creative Writing in terms of Direct Feedback*

	Item	Mean	Interpretation
1	I like it when my teacher provides the correct structure on my writing error in creative writing.	4.29	Very High
2	I like it when my teacher crosses out the errors in my writing errors and provide the correct forms.	4.22	Very High
3	I like it when my teacher inserts the missing words, or phrases with the correct forms.	4.26	Very High
4	I like it when my teacher writes the correct form above or near the writing errors and provide a short explanation why it is wrong.	4.30	Very High
5	I like it when my teacher underlines the writing errors or uses arrows to show omissions in the text.	4.21	Very High
6	I like it when my teacher crosses out the errors of words or phrases in my writing activity and supply them the correct one.	4.17	High
7	I like it when my teacher explicitly shows the errors and uses error codes to indicate the types of error	4.07	High
8	I like it when my teacher uses question marks for the unclear expressions in my writing activity in creative writing.	4.50	Very High
9	I like it when my teacher corrects my errors to improve my writing skills in creative writing.	4.29	Very High
	Overall Mean	4.21	Very High

Table 5 showcased nine (9) items with their corresponding mean scores and descriptive level. These items indicate as Very High and High. Generally, direct feedback obtained a mean score of 4.21, which is described as Very High. This emphasized that Grade 12 Humanities and Social Science students would always prefer to receive direct feedback, which allowed the teacher to provide the correct structure from the incorrect ones, enabling them to edit

or revise the paper on their own easily.

Specifically, statement 9: “I like it when my teacher corrects my errors to improve my writing skills in creative writing,” which has a mean score of 4.50, verbally described as Very High. This study asserted that students generally appreciated it when the teacher corrected their writing errors to improve their writing performance in the Creative Writing subject. This statement vehemently emphasized, through direct feedback, students always viewed it vital and has a positive impact on developing their writing performance, for a fact that they would receive a comprehensive correction through changing the errors with correct structures, as well as, comments to emphasize mistakes, either writing it above or below the incorrect sentences. Bakker and Voogt (2022) underscored in their findings that teachers often miss important learning opportunities by not helping students understand the cause and location of errors. They also found that teachers must determine both what the error was and what happened, for instance, by explicitly marking and diagnosing errors in students' writing activities. Nevertheless, Rashtchi and Bakar (2019) also asserted that students prefer clear feedback (about direct feedback) and want teachers to rectify as many mistakes as possible. This assuredly upheld the vitality of direct feedback, especially on treating students' writing errors in a direct and specific manner. Consequently, students always preferred that teachers point out where the mistakes lay so that they could develop their performance in Creative Writing; hence, they could effectively rewrite or revise it on their own.

On the other hand, statement 8: “I like it when my teacher uses question marks for the unclear expressions in my writing activity in Creative Writing,” which has a mean score of 3.87, is verbally described as High. This stated that students often liked it when the teacher used a question mark to emphasize unclear expressions in their writing activities. Students believed that it would often help them think of a better idea rather than the previous ones they had come up with in their writing activity. Ergo, they oftentimes liked it when the teacher used a question mark to suggest a change in the structure. The statement was reflected in Ratih and Abidah's (2022) work, who have expounded that students strongly preferred direct feedback, as it explicitly provided corrections, such as stating the correct form, which offered more clarity. Similarly, Zhang et al. (2021) have revealed that students demonstrated a preference for more explicit feedback, such as direct feedback, that helped them rewrite their writing activity. Additionally, they explained that direct feedback promotes a clear tone of corrections among the types of corrective feedback. This corroborated that students often appreciated it when the teacher pointed out their writing mistakes, so they would be directed upon revising their paper. Particularly, noting where the mistakes were or leaving a question mark to clearly emphasize them, which was oftentimes helpful for students to follow and correct themselves.

3.3 Teacher's Corrective Feedback in Creative Writing in terms of Indirect Feedback

The second domain of the independent variable was to examine the level of indirect feedback, which was also beneficial in aiding students' writing skills. Indirect feedback allowed students to grasp their writing errors through symbols and hints. These expressions were sometimes vital to emphasize mistakes and contribute meaningfully to students' writing skills as a whole.

Table 6. *Level of Teacher's Corrective Feedback in Creative Writing in terms of Indirect Feedback*

	Item	Mean	Interpretation
1	I like it when my teacher implicitly signals the errors in my writing and lets me do the correction myself.	3.53	High
2	I like it when my teacher identifies the writing mistakes without giving the proper form.	2.98	Moderate
3	I like it when my teacher comments on grammatical errors only.	3.31	Moderate
4	I like it when my teacher focuses on the organization alone.	2.89	Moderate
5	I like it when my teacher places a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error in my writing activity but not supplying them the correct forms.	3.01	Moderate
6	I like it when my teacher focuses on a single error type (e.g. for tenses only).	2.88	Moderate
	Overall Mean	3.10	Moderate

Table 6 discloses six (6) statements with their corresponding mean score and descriptive level in order to deepen the context on indirect feedback. The overall mean score for indirect feedback was 3.10, which is considered moderate. This mainly explained that students sometimes wanted to be corrected by employing indirect feedback. Indirect feedback was defined earlier as a type of corrective feedback, wherein the teacher used symbols or hints to emphasize errors or mistakes on students' papers.

Among six (6) statements, only statement 1: “I like it when my teacher implicitly signals the errors in my writing and lets me do the correction myself” was described as High with a mean score of 3.53. This suggests that students

often prefer it when the teacher implicitly signals errors in their writing and allows them to make the corrections on their own. In this case, students would often prefer the teacher to point out mistakes by providing them with an indication, so they feel comfortable revising their work. This was in line with Sherpa's (2021) mention that indirect feedback could guide students' attention by linking underlined errors to a particular error, which was essential for revising the writing activity. According to Sommanotchai and Meesri (2018), providing the correct structure from the students' writing tests was not part of the teacher's job. Indeed, students often liked it when the teacher employed indirect feedback to address their writing mistakes, thereby promoting better learning development in their writing skills, as it reinforced signals and other necessary hints to correct students' writing errors rather than restructuring them to create a final one. Consequently, students often found it meaningful and effective when they were being signaled, as it helped them become aware of their own mistakes so they could correct themselves later on.

Significantly, it was also crucial to point out statement 6, which stated: "I like it when my teacher focuses on a single error type (e.g., for tenses only)," with a mean of 2.88, which was verbally described as Moderate. This explained that students sometimes liked it when the teacher focused on a single error type, such as tenses only. This was anchored in the study by Sherpa (2021), where she clearly emphasized that indirect feedback was limited to treating linguistic errors. Nonetheless, Setiani (2019) stated that it made students more reflective and analytical about their mistakes and helped them attain lifelong learning. This meant that it was not always beneficial when students were merely provided with corrections of their linguistic or grammatical errors, because they would not know what other mistakes they should also be aware of, as that indirect approach pertains to treating specific errors. Consequently, the teacher would only be restricted to correcting students' writing mistakes. They may have excluded pointing out other errors that were also necessary to be treated and corrected.

Generally, students sometimes preferred being corrected using indirect feedback, as it focused on correcting only one grammatical error rather than all linguistic errors, which sometimes made them feel more confident upon rewriting or revising their paper.

3.4 Teacher's Corrective Feedback in Creative Writing in terms of Unfocused Feedback

The third predictor of the independent variable was to investigate the level of unfocused feedback, which allowed students to view a variety of errors being corrected by the teacher. Sometimes, this type of corrective feedback was helpful and vital when it came to treating students' writing mistakes, as it was concerned with addressing the overall writing issues. Below are emphasized unfocused feedback statements with their corresponding mean score and descriptive level:

Table 7. *Level of Teacher's Corrective Feedback in Creative Writing in terms of Unfocused Feedback*

	Item	Mean	Interpretation
1	I like it when my teacher comments on and correct all the committed writing errors in creative writing.	4.03	High
2	I like it when my teacher randomly comments on and fixes all my writing problems in creative writing.	4.08	High
3	I like it when my teacher corrects all major writing errors in creative writing.	4.00	High
4	I like it when my teacher corrects all the types of error, including mechanical errors.	3.84	High
5	I like it when my teacher comments on what I did both right and wrong sentences in my writing activity in creative writing.	4.13	High
6	I like it when my teacher corrects both minor and major writing errors in creative writing.	3.79	High
	Overall Mean	3.99	High

Looking closely at the result collated from the third predictor, unfocused feedback was determined to have an overall mean of 3.99, which is generally described as High. Unfocused feedback was often viewed as effective since all writing mistakes from students' papers were properly corrected by the teacher. All statements seen above were regarded as High, which explains that students would oftentimes prefer to use unfocused feedback to improve their writing skills in Creative Writing.

Pertinently, statement 5: "I like it when my teacher comments on what I did both right and wrong sentences in my writing activity in creative writing," with a mean score of 4.13, was verbally described as High. This clarified that students often preferred that the teacher provide comments on students' right or wrong sentences in their writing activity tasks. The aforementioned statement emphasized that it would evoke an overwhelming emotional response from the students. They often appreciated receiving comments on the proper sentences they made, which allowed them to identify where they went right, and comments on the incorrect sentences to pinpoint why they turned out to be wrong. According to Li and Vuono (2024), teachers should explicitly mark targeted errors, such

as underlining or coding incorrect structures, and provide students with both correct and incorrect forms to develop their noticing and self-editing skills. Consequently, when students were provided with comments that referred to the mistakes they made and included the proper sentences they wrote, this is where their attention was directed. Therefore, they often like it when a variety of errors are treated, most particularly pointing out both wrong and right sentences in the writing activity.

Additionally, statement 6, “I like it when my teacher provides general comments on a separate sheet of paper,” with a mean score of 3.79, is verbally described as “High.” This confirmed that students often liked it when the teacher provided general comments on a separate sheet of paper. This merely emphasized that instead of providing students with the correct structures, the teacher then provided general comments on a separate paper for students to track where the mistakes were. According to Khadawardi (2020), it has been found that students’ linguistic errors were corrected and left with comments on a separate paper or near or above the sentence. Berkantal et al. (2020) have also reported that unfocused feedback, particularly underlined feedback, is found to be the most effective in reducing errors. The further highlighted that the coded version was rated most useful, because students could receive explanations as to where they went wrong in their academic writing.

Therefore, unfocused feedback was regarded as High, given that students often view it as a beneficial factor, most especially because all mistakes in their writing activity could be addressed, which meant that no single error was ignored.

3.5 Teacher’s Corrective Feedback in Creative Writing in terms of Focused Feedback

The fourth and last predictor was to ascertain the level of focused feedback. This predictor was sometimes valuable for addressing students’ writing errors, particularly in that it sometimes improved their writing skills, given that focused feedback was more specific, but not comprehensive, as it only addressed individual writing errors rather than the entire piece, which was why students responded that focused feedback was sometimes beneficial in supporting them to improve their writing skills in Creative Writing. Table 8 clearly shows focused feedback’s statements with their corresponding mean score and descriptive level:

Table 8. *Level of Teacher’s Corrective Feedback in Creative Writing in terms of Focused Feedback*

	Item	Mean	Interpretation
1	I like it when my teacher corrects some of my writing errors, not all of them.	3.20	Moderate
2	I like it when my teacher uses a set of correction symbols without providing the correct forms.	3.02	Moderate
3	I like it when my teacher comments on the minor writing errors in creative writing.	3.58	High
4	I like it when my teacher ignores the writing errors in grammar, punctuation, and etc. and only pay attention to the ideas expressed (e.g content and organization).	2.40	Low
	Overall Mean	3.05	Moderate

Table 8 revealed the overall mean score for focused feedback, which was 3.05. This is determined as Moderate according to its descriptive level. This suggests that students sometimes prefer to be corrected using focused feedback as a predictor of corrective feedback. The teacher used focused feedback to correct specific writing mistakes of the students in Creative Writing.

Among all four (4) statements, only statement 3: “I like it when my teacher comments on the minor writing errors in creative writing” obtained a High descriptive level based on its mean score of 3.58. This meant that students often appreciated it when the teacher provided feedback on their minor writing errors. This person often felt confident when only specific mistakes were corrected or pointed out. It could be argued that when a specific mistake is corrected, students would find it easier to follow rather than receiving overall corrections, which makes it harder to comprehend and learn. This has undoubtedly been corroborated by Yunus (2020), who noted that it is valuable to point out and correct inevitable writing mistakes committed by students. Taheri and Heidar (2019) have claimed that it could be beneficial, particularly in assessing their writing accuracy, as it allows them to anticipate their errors and be accountable for correcting them themselves. It could be surmised that focused feedback also facilitated the correction of major or minor writing errors, in that it helped promote awareness of errors while being responsible for addressing them themselves. Therefore, students often appreciated it when even minor writing errors could be corrected.

Unfortunately, statement 4: “I like it when my teacher ignores the writing errors in grammar, punctuation, etc., and only pays attention to the ideas expressed (e.g, content and organization)” received a Low descriptive level

with a mean score of 2.40. This justified that students seldom liked it when the teacher ignored their grammatical writing errors, including punctuation, etc, while only paying attention to the ideas expressed. This was connected to Barrot's (2023) study, which found that correcting accuracy in grammar, such as punctuation, spelling, and tenses, helps improve writing skills. This merely emphasized that students saw it as ineffective when the teacher would not point out students' writing errors, which could make it difficult for them to improve their writing skills. Furthermore, they did not find it beneficial when the teacher focused solely on the ideas expressed in the writing activity.

3.6 Grade 12 HUMSS Students' Writing Skills in Creative Writing

Writing skills were one of the key factors in excelling in the Creative Writing course, given that this subject involved numerous writing activities. It was one of the macro-skills necessary in the field of Creative Writing. Hence, according to Larasatay (2020), writing skills have made a significant contribution, especially in the academic setting, given that they are one of the most complex macro skills that students should learn in the classroom. He then added that writing was a written-based form of expressing ideas, which were packed and delivered through linguistic elements such as words, sentences, and paragraphs.

Writing skills, as the study's dependent variable, referred to the performance task scores in Creative Writing for the first quarter of A.Y. 2022-2023. Pardito (2022) explained that the Creative Writing course in Senior High School aims to enhance realism and creativity in both writing and reading, and informs learners about the necessary style of writing non-fiction, including technical or academic writing. He further added that critiquing the students' work, leading to revision, is necessary for the final output. Henceforth, the table below displayed the analysis of Grade 12 students' writing skills according to their performance task score in Creative Writing:

Table 9. *Level of Grade 12 HUMSS Students' Writing Skills in terms of Performance Task Score*

Descriptive Statistics (n=153)		Verbal Description
Mean	33.27	Fairly Satisfactory
Standard Deviation	7.34	

The second objective aimed to determine the level of HUMSS students' writing skills in Creative Writing, wherein statistics showed that Grade 12 HUMSS students' writing skills, as measured by the performance task score in Creative Writing, were verbally described as Fairly Satisfactory, with an overall mean score of 33.27. Take note that the performance task score in Creative Writing was 45 points. This certainly explained that students' scores should be at least 34 points and above to pass the aforementioned course subject.

This specifically concluded that students' performance in Creative Writing was not well grasped, attended to, and learned, despite receiving "passed" remarks. The result was a justification that Creative Writing, as a specialized course subject, was enormously complex for students to take, given that the course dealt with numerous writing events, which made it more challenging to learn. This was in line with Larasatay's (2020) assertion that writing was vindicated as one of the unrelenting macro-skills that were learned inside the classroom environment. Henceforth, a student's writing performance is related to how they engaged, attended, and participated in the subject. This suggested that teachers should create a meaningful, efficient, and progressive learning environment, as writing was perceived to be a difficult task. Consequently, students' focus on the subject could be addressed.

Additionally, according to Bhandari (2024), writing practices have often been necessary to develop students' creativity in writing. This could be taken into consideration, as the very reason why students received a Fairly Satisfactory remark was due to a lack of writing practices in Creative Writing. Despite receiving feedback from teachers on students' writing mistakes, they should also understand the importance of practicing what they have learned to develop their writing skills further. It could be surmised that students only relied on teachers' corrections without grasping and attending to the errors, which made it harder for them to improve because they were confident enough that there was always a teacher who could correct them, so practicing to write was not a priority for them.

Henceforth, Fitria (2024) has pointed out that in teaching Creative Writing, teachers should encourage students to write by allowing them to expand their imagination and engage in other creative processes, thereby developing their knowledge across all writing components. On the other hand, Pupah et al. (2019) have explained that Creative Writing should not be applied as an activity confined to a restricted classroom area. When students

experienced difficulty learning the subject, given that the subject itself was also challenging, they struggled to perform well on the writing test. Therefore, this occurrence was tantamount to failure or having failing remarks. Meaningfully, students must ensure that they are guided on how to improve their writing skills after receiving corrective feedback, which includes practicing writing more and being knowledgeable about writing strategies to develop themselves in the subject.

3.7 Significant Correlation Between Teachers' Corrective Feedback and HUMSS Students' Writing Skills

The third objective aimed to ascertain the level of significant correlation between corrective feedback and Grade 12 HUMSS students' writing skills in the Creative Writing subject, which many studies have proven that there was a substantial correlation between the study's variables, given that corrective feedback was beneficial for students' writing performance in the classroom. Nevertheless, some studies demonstrated no correlation between the two variables. Therefore, Table 10 showcased whether or not the corrected feedback affected the writing skills in Creative Writing of Grade 12 HUMSS students through employing a survey questionnaire and performance task score:

Table 10. *Level of Significant Correlation between Teachers' Corrective Feedback and Grade 12 HUMSS Students' Writing Skills*

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Pearson <i>r</i>	Strength of the Relationship	<i>P</i> -value	Interpretation
Direct Feedback	Performance Task Score	0.13	Very Weak	0.04	Significant
Indirect Feedback		-0.06		0.40	Not Significant
Unfocused Feedback		0.10		0.20	Not Significant
Focused Feedback		-0.06		0.46	Not Significant
Corrective Feedback		0.02		0.27	Not Significant

This indicates that corrective feedback has an insignificant effect on the writing skills of Grade 12 HUMSS students in Creative Writing, with a *p*-value of 0.27, which is greater than the *p*-value of 0.05. This suggests that the writing skills in Creative Writing have nothing to do with corrective feedback, given the contemptible relationship between them. In addition, it could also emphasize that whether or not students receive teachers' corrective feedback on their writing errors does not always result in a positive outcome for their writing performance in Creative Writing.

Moreover, this revealed no relationship between variables because students did not always take corrections seriously and attentively. Whenever their Creative Writing teacher provided them with corrective feedback on their writing activity, they would leave it unlearned and not bother to see if they had understood the written corrective feedback. Thus, this study aimed to debunk Nawaz et al. (2023), who explained that comprehensive and focused written corrective feedback is highly employed in developing students' writing. Similarly, Ali's (2024) study found that corrective feedback has developed the writing activity, enhanced confidence, critical thinking, and cognitive ability of students. Additionally, Elumalai (2019) stated that corrective feedback was effective in enhancing students' writing skills. They then added that it facilitated students' writing skills by helping them identify writing errors and addressing them in a comprehensive manner. These studies were among many that demonstrated the effectiveness of corrective feedback in improving students' writing skills.

On the other hand, it was ascertained that students, whether or not they received corrective feedback, confirmed having underperformed in Creative Writing. This finding aligns with Alahmadi and Schreiber (2023), who statistically concluded that there is no discernible relationship between corrective feedback and writing skills in terms of employing scores. Additionally, Straus and Porath (2022) claimed that despite teachers' efforts in providing corrective feedback to students' writing activities, there was no assurance that they would perform better academically. This meant that teachers' efforts in providing students with constructive corrective feedback were not equivalent to performing better on writing tests. The "passing remarks" score that the students received reflected their failure to comprehend the corrective feedback given by the teachers.

In general, the degree of analysis showed that the corrective feedback did not significantly affect students' writing skills. Even though, Santa Cruz National High School Senior High School had been providing corrective feedback to students' writing activities, this did not suffice the means of receiving higher writing performance in Creative Writing course subject in the classroom, for a fact that despite receiving constant corrective feedback, grade 12 HUMSS students' performance task score was still reasonably satisfactory.

Therefore, the study's null hypothesis was accepted since it was statistically proven that there was no significant

relationship between corrective feedback and the writing skills of Grade 12 HUMSS students in Creative Writing. Although the overall result was not significant, it was indicated that, among the four domains of the corrective feedback as the study's independent variable, only direct feedback was significant at the p-value of 0.04. This merely meant that direct feedback has a very weak relationship, with a Pearson r value of 0.13, which confirmed that it has a positive contribution to the progress of students in terms of their performance on writing tests. This suggests that direct feedback had a moderate effect on the writing skills of grade 12 HUMSS students in Creative Writing, despite a Weak relationship.

Henceforth, this was in line with Elumalai's (2019) claim that direct feedback is effective to be employed in the classroom, as it has been shown to have a long-term impact on writing. It also helps students focus on more exact revision to produce a new writing output. Additionally, students preferred clear feedback and straightforward feedback and wanted teachers to rectify as many mistakes as possible (Rashtchi & Bakar, 2019). Moreover, Rouhi et al. (2020) asserted that direct feedback was being conquered when students were given the correct structure, and when they revised their text, there was a need to transcribe the corrections to create a final one.

Holistically, direct feedback was the domain that significantly influenced Grade 12 HUMSS students' writing skills. It was perceived that students consistently preferred to have this type of feedback employed in the subject of Creative Writing, as it consistently affected their writing performance in the classroom. As a result, direct feedback obtained a significant value, given that for students to truly improve their writing skills, they often preferred their teacher to point out errors and correct them by providing the correct structure. Nonetheless, the invaluable presence of direct feedback to students, particularly in addressing their writing errors, which has been statistically proven to be effective in enhancing their writing skills in Creative Writing, was incomparable. This suggests that teachers of the Creative Writing subject should employ direct feedback whenever they aim to address students' writing errors.

4.0 Conclusion

Subsequently, the deliberations of the results were effectively and comprehensively explained and discussed. Ergo, the researcher encapsulated everything that had been discussed, and conclusions were drawn with conviction. Results disclosed that the level of teachers' corrective feedback in Creative Writing was High. However, the level of Corrective Feedback's predictors revealed its results, with direct feedback being Very High, indirect feedback Moderate, unfocused feedback High, and focused feedback Moderate.

Additionally, the study revealed that the level of writing skills of Grade 12 Humanities and Social Science students, as measured by their performance task scores in Creative Writing, was Fairly Satisfactory. Moreover, it was found that there was no significant relationship between corrective feedback and the writing skills of Grade 12 HUMSS students in Creative Writing. Furthermore, it was predicted that direct feedback would be significantly related to the writing skills of Grade 12 HUMSS students in Creative Writing.

Therefore, the results were beneficial and impactful to teachers, students, Department of Education (DepEd), as well as, to the Curriculum Designer, given the fact that it would open an opportunity to address the concerns on constructive corrective feedback, certainly direct feedback as a response to the needs of the students towards developing more their knowledge about writing techniques and improve their writing skills in Creative Writing. Furthermore, this study makes a meaningful contribution to the development of students' writing skills, particularly in Creative Writing, where portions of corrective feedback, such as direct feedback, are most preferred to be used in developing their confidence, cognitive, and creative abilities. The researchers also challenge future researchers to explore the effectiveness of corrective feedback in the classroom, using a qualitative study to determine its impact on learning a second language.

5.0 Contribution of Authors

The authors affirm that they have contributed solely to the conception, design, execution, and writing of this study.

6.0 Funding

The authors declare that no external fundings were received from any agency for this study.

7.0 Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

8.0 Acknowledgment

The authors would like to extend their sincere gratitude to the individuals who contributed to the completion of this study. They also extend their appreciation and recognition to the Almighty Creator, their family, loved ones, friends, and, most especially, to the DSSC and the Institute of Teacher Education. Alhamdulillah!

9.0 References

- Alahmadi, N. A., & Schreiber, B. (2023). Exploring the effects of written corrective feedback types on L2 students' writing accuracy. *SAGE Open*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241274331>
- Ali, E. (2024). The effect of corrective feedback on developing academic writing skills: Pakistani ESL students' perspective. *Social Science Review Archives*, 2(2), 450–459. <https://policyjournalofms.com/index.php/6/article/view/89>
- Bakker, A., & Voogt, J. (2022). Teachers' perspectives on dealing with students' errors. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, Article 868729. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.868729>
- Barrot, J. S. (2023). Effects of Grammarly-based automated written corrective feedback on EFL learners' writing accuracy and autonomy. *Computers & Education*, 195, 104770. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104770>
- Berkant, H. G., Derer, N. B., & Derer, Ö. K. (2020). The effects of different types of written corrective feedback on students' texting mistakes. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 3(3), 174–187. <https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v3i3.3136>
- Bhandari, B. L. (2024). Increasing secondary school students' creativity in writing skills: An action research. *Butwal Campus Journal*, 7(2), 70–80. <https://doi.org/10.3126/bcj.v7i2.73179>
- Bhandari, P. (2020). Correlational research | When & how to use. Scribbr. <https://bit.ly/43vUDhO>
- Castro, M.C.S. (2017). Errors and corrective feedback in writing: Implications to our classroom practices. *Language and Language Teaching Journal*, 20(59). <https://ejournal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT/article/view/743>
- Carcueva, C. (2018). Corrective feedback: Probing the preferences of ESL learners. In the 1st International Conference on ELT (CONELT), 1(1). <https://bit.ly/4dD6uiS>
- Daska, A., & Krekeler, C. (2013). Does grading undermine feedback? The influence of grades on the effectiveness of corrective feedback on L2 writing. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(2), 185–201. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2013.848226>
- Elumalai, K. V. (2019). Teacher constructed corrective feedback enhancing students writing skills in EFL classroom. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 10(5), 103–106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aialc.alls.v.10n.5p.103>
- Guinness, K., Detrich, R., Keyworth, R., & States, J. (2020). Overview of corrective feedback. The Wing Institute. <https://www.winginstitute.org/instructional-delivery-feedback>
- Fitria, T. N. (2024). Creative writing skills in English: Developing students' potential and creativity. *EBONY: Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, 4(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.37304/ebony.v4i1.10908>
- Laguna, J. F. C. (2022). The impact of corrective feedback on English writing skills. *Research Gate*. <https://tinyurl.com/4749vpef>
- Larasatay, G. (2020). The university students' perception of creative writing in relation to writing skills. *EJI English Journal of Indragiri Studies in Education, Literature, and Linguistics*, 4(2), 253–263. <https://doi.org/10.32520/eji.v4i2.1096>
- Kim, J. H. (2019). Relative effects of direct focused and unfocused written corrective feedback on the accuracy development of two language forms. *English Teaching*, 74(4), 29–50. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.74.4.201912.29>
- Khadawardi, H. A. (2020). The effect of implicit corrective feedback on English writing of international second language learners. *English Language Teaching*, 14(1), 123–139. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n1p123>
- Li, P., & Vuono, A. (2024). Written corrective feedback in second language writing: A synthesis of naturalistic classroom studies. *Language Teaching*, 57(4), 449–477. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000393>
- Lim, S. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Efficacy of written corrective feedback in writing instruction: A meta-analysis. *TESL-EJ*, 24(3). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1275821>
- Marvell, A., Simm, D., Schaaf, R., & Harper, R. (2013). Students as scholars: Evaluating student-led learning and teaching during fieldwork. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 37(4), 547–566. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2013.811638>
- Nawaz, M., Hussain, S. A., & Bughi, F. A. (2023). Exploring the preferred corrective feedback and practiced corrective feedback among Pakistani ESL secondary school students and teachers in writing class: Matches and mismatches. *International Journal of Language, Literacy and Translation*, 6(1), 31–45. <https://doi.org/10.36777/ijollt2023.6.1.062>
- Pardito, R. (2022). Creative writing curriculum in the selected senior high school in the Philippines in the Division of Quezon. A groundwork for a teaching guide. *American Journal of Education and Technologies (AJET)*, 1(2), 62–71. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajet.v1i2.511>
- Pupah, E. M., Cahyono, Y. H., & Widiati, U. (2019). In or out of a classroom? An ecological understanding of foreign language creative writing. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(3), 181–196. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1212364.pdf>
- Ratih, E., & Abidah, K. H. (2022). Direct vs. indirect corrective feedback for writing improvement: Students' preferences. *Western English Journal*, 6(1), Article 151. <https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v6i1.151>
- Rashtchi, M., & Bakar, Z. A. (2019). Written corrective feedback: what do Malaysian learners prefer and why? *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 8(5), 1221–1225. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijeat.E1173.0585C19>
- Rouhi, A., Dibah, M., & Mohebbi, H. (2020). Assessing the effect of giving and receiving written corrective feedback on improving L2 writing accuracy: does giving and receiving feedback have fair mutual benefit? *Asian Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00093-z>
- Sabarun. (2020). Direct teacher corrective feedback in an EFL writing class at higher education: What students perceive. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 9(1), 17–32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21580/vjv9i1.4652>
- Setiani, R. (2019). Corrective feedback on accuracy students' writing paragraph. *Edukasi Lingua Sastra*, 17(2), 113–125. <https://doi.org/10.47637/elsa.v17i2.44>
- Senthilnathan, S. (2019, July 9). Usefulness of correlation analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3416918>
- Sherpa, N. Z. (2021). Effects of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on Bhutanese learners' grammatical accuracy and syntactic complexity. *LEARN Journal*, 14(1), 591–610. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1284550.pdf>
- Straus, S. E., & Porath, C. L. (2022). Is it worth the effort? How feedback influences students' subsequent submission of assessable work. *Research in Higher Education*, 63(5), 895–914. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-021-09648-3>
- Solhi, M., & Eginli, I. (2020). The effect of recorded oral feedback on EFL learners' writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.712628>
- Truscott, J. (2022). Efficacy of written corrective feedback in writing instruction: A critique of another meta-analysis [Preprint]. Retrieved from ResearchGate.
- Vocci. (2020). Finding the right respondents for research. Scribbr. <https://voccii.com/finding-respondents-research>
- Wang, T., & Jiang, L. (2015). Studies on written corrective feedback: Theoretical perspectives, empirical evidence, and future directions, 12(1), 172–183. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n1p110>
- Yunus, W. N. M. W. M. (2020). Written corrective feedback in English compositions: Teachers' practices and students' expectations. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 3(2), 95–107. <http://journal2.uad.ac.id/index.php/eltej/index>
- Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., & Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL students' preferences for written corrective feedback: Do error types, language proficiency, and foreign language enjoyment matter? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 660564. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660564>