



THE IMPACT OF TEACHER'S WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON EFL STUDENTS' PARAGRAPH WRITING PERFORMANCE

Lam Ky Nhanⁱ

MA, Nam Can Tho University,
Can Tho, Vietnam

Abstract:

Written Corrective Feedback (CF) is a contentious issue among L2 theorists and researchers. The current study intends to investigate the impact of written corrective feedback from teachers on the writing achievements of Vietnamese EFL university students. The current study's sample included 60 students chosen at random from Nam Can Tho University's Department of English. The students were split into two groups: experimental (n=30) and control (n=30). Data for comparable groups were collected over a 10-week period using a pre-/posttest method. The results showed that the students in the experiment group performed better on the measure than the students in the control group, demonstrating that the teacher's written CF had a substantial beneficial influence on participants' writing abilities. The study finishes with a discussion of the findings' limits and implications, as well as recommendations for further research.

Keywords: writing skill, teacher's written corrective feedback, written feedback, writing achievement

1. Introduction

Writing in English has been seen as a challenging ability for EFL students to learn since this group of students is seldom given the opportunity to do so (Kim & Kim, 2005; Kongsuebchart & Suppasetserree, 2015; Sermsook et al., 2017). Writing, moreover, is a vital ability for pupils studying English (e.g., Rintaro, 2012). However, teaching writing is one of the most difficult responsibilities for English as a foreign/second language (EFL/ESL) teachers since it contains various activities that necessitate writing teachers devoting a significant amount of time to supporting students to write better (Salem & Abu Al Dyiar, 2014). Other people's assistance in the writing process is referred to as feedback, while feedback provided by a teacher is referred to as teacher feedback. The overall goal of a teacher's feedback assignment is to lead and assist students in producing high-quality written work (Al-Sawalha, 2016; Al-Sawalha & Chow, 2013). Teacher

ⁱ Correspondence: nhanlam0203@gmail.com

feedback is the most traditional method of responding to students' writings and is frequently used in many English writing classes (Hyland & Hyland, 2006); this feedback is also one of the most helpful means available to students to improve their writing ability while revising a written assignment and producing subsequent drafts (Williams & Jasmine, 2003). Students like this feedback, which is most likely due to the teacher's degree of skill (Hong, 2006; Nugrahenny, 2007). Furthermore, in an EFL situation when the majority of students have poor competence, it is only logical that comments from the more skilled instructor be deemed appropriate. Teacher feedback has been proven in studies (e.g., Hyland, 1998; Liu, 2008) to increase the quality of students' writing. Hyland (1998), for example, did research on six student writers' answers to feedback and the utilization of written feedback from a teacher for modification in an English proficiency program course. According to Hyland's findings, students used the teacher's input to make some adjustments in order to improve the quality of their writing.

Writing is taught as one of the language skills courses at university English departments in Vietnam. Writing is taught at Nam Can Tho University in three courses: Writing I (paragraph writing), Writing II (revision of paragraph writing and introduction to essay writing), and Writing III (essay writing and summary). The current study looks at the influence of a teacher's feedback in the Writing I course, with the assumption that the teacher's written CF on students' writing can help students improve the quality of their writing and, as a result, their writing accomplishment. Many university writing teachers and professors worry about EFL students' failure to create well-organized paragraphs, reports, and short research papers, based on the researcher's own experience (as a writing teacher) and observation (as the chair of the English department). They are also unable to structure their ideas properly, which results in the majority of students receiving bad ratings on their writing tests. As a result, there is an urgent need to investigate this issue that affects both professors and English language teachers in order to find a solution.

Therefore, the current study seeks to examine the effect of a teacher's written CF on the writing achievement of Nam Can Tho University students. In particular, the current study tries to answer the following question:

- To what extent does the teacher's written feedback affect students' paragraph production?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Definitions of the Writing Skill

Writing may be described in its most basic and linguistic form as the use of visual symbols or the reproduction in written form of anything heard or read (Oxford Dictionary, 2005). Furthermore, in terms of pedagogy, writing is recognized as a pillar of the learning process through which learners gain knowledge on the one hand and are assessed by teachers on the other hand in order to evaluate their degree of competence.

According to Kress (1989), the issue of writing skills is not confined to the notion of gaining a set of mechanical orthographic skills, but it has been expanded to include new cognitive and social relationships. Miller (1989) agrees, stating that *"while writing creation is an expression of one's originality and personality. It is critical to remember that writing is an attempt, a means of interacting with others."* This productive talent is one of the communication tools that individuals use to send messages and express their various ways of thinking and believing.

"Writing is the transformation of the linguistic rules of language into usage" (Widdowson, 2001, p. 1). As a result, students must be competent and selective when producing any written speech that requires intentional intellectual effort from learners to compose cohesive and meaningful paragraphs. Similarly, Lado (1983) considers writing in a foreign language to be a skill in managing structures, terminology, and their conventional representations. He explained the concept as follows: *"We mean by writing in a foreign language the ability to use structures, the lexical items, and their conventional representation in ordinary matter-of-fact writing"* (p. 248).

2.2. Components of Writing

Students will not be able to obtain or even master writing skills unless they have the capacity to be competent in their language abilities. As a result, they should understand the fundamental components of writing. In other words, they understand how effectively their paragraphs are grammatically, semantically, and organizationally formed. One of the most concerned linguists on this subject is Heaton (1975). He contends that authors who are deemed proficient in writing are expected to master four major skills.

Writing, according to Raimes (1987), may be classified into six categories. One component pertains to material that must be objective, relevant, and intelligible. For cohesive paragraphs, the former must be effectively arranged. According to Raimes (1987), these two parts of content and structure are insufficient for transmitting the intended meaning of the message; what is required is the inclusion of some linguistic tools such as grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation.

Furthermore, and most importantly, learners must first establish their aims and purposes for writing their paragraphs, as well as to whom they are writing (audience or readers). They must also specify how they compose their paragraphs, including the elements of the process including *"planning, drafting, revising, and editing."* Similarly, Collins and Gentner (1983) illustrate restrictions that may prevent students from writing. They both propose four structural levels: overall text structure, paragraph structure, sentence structure, and word structure. To communicate their ideas, writers must examine at least these four levels.

2.3. Stages of Development of the Writing skill

The main concern that teachers are worried about is developing learners' competency in the learning process. Furthermore, learners cannot acquire writing competence unless

they are proficient in the five steps proposed by Rivers (1968): copying, replication, recombination and adaptation, guided writing, and ultimately creation.

2.3.1 Copying

Copying is a type of activity that allows students to differentiate between visual representations of sounds and their written counterparts. As a result of repetition, students are able to write down the hearing sounds that they have already read in the textbook and learnt with teachers, and then convert them into symbols (Harmer, 2004). Similarly, Rivers (1968) contends that learning to write necessitates particular levels of precision, which the copying stage may or may not include.

2.3.2 Reproduction

During this stage, which is defined as a second phase, students are expected to imitate and make some effort to write without reference to the original text. Furthermore, when learners are effectively educated in the stage of copying, it may pave the way for them to succeed and profit more in the stage of reproduction. Dictation is a broadly applicable exercise that fits this second stage of development, where students may improve their listening and writing abilities (Rivers, 1968).

2.3.3 Recombination and Adaptation

Students engage in many writing tasks throughout this stage of recombination and adaptation. As a result, various drills may be provided to learners to raise their writing correctness, i.e. a significant sequence of exercises ranging from vocabulary replacements to transformation of different types of sentences and to be developed through sentence expansion and contraction (Rivers, 1968).

During this stage, students can alter and replace nouns with their modifiers or synonyms, autonyms, and change phrases from active to passive voice. In addition, learners can broaden the meaning of sentences by using coordinating words and adverbs. Learners may be asked to reconstruct a scrambled discourse as part of some recombination activity (River, 1968). The mastery of the preceding exercises allows students to become increasingly accurate in their writing.

2.3.4 Guided Writing

Learners do not have complete freedom of participation throughout the fourth stage of growth, but they are nevertheless directed by teachers. As a result, they may select particular lexical elements and structural patterns to be employed. As an example, teachers may offer their students with any written sample; for example, a paragraph; what students are needed to do is produce a comparable paragraph, but in their own style. Learners may employ summarizing and paraphrasing (Rivers, 1968).

2.3.5 The Composition

The essential requirement for reaching this level is that learners have mastered the four previous stages and are correct in their writing. In the words of Rivers (1968), *"the final stage of composition involves individual selection of vocabulary and structure for the expression of personal meaning"* (p. 252). The main concept of this stage is to create clear, effective paragraphs.

2.4. Writing Performance

Richards and Schmidt (2010) describe performance as *"a person's actual use of language."* There is a distinction between a person's knowledge of a language (competence) and how that information is applied in making and interpreting sentences (performance). There is also a somewhat different interpretation of the term performance. People frequently make mistakes when utilizing language (such as speech errors). Their mistakes are given as examples of performance (p. 428). Writing performance is divided into three sections: accuracy, fluency, and complexity.

2.5. Written Corrective Feedback

Feedback, according to Richards and Schmidt (2010), is *"comments or other information that learners receive concerning their success on learning tasks or tests, either from the teacher or other persons"* (p. 217). Written corrective feedback is described as a teacher's contribution to a writer's writing in the form of revision information (Keh, 1990). It is also described by Nicole and Macfarlane (2006) as information offered by teachers to assist students in troubleshooting their performance. For centuries, numerous researchers have been interested in corrective feedback (e.g., Brookhart, 2008; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2004; Hyland, 2010; Kroll, 2003; Leki, 1991; Reid, 1998).

There is a fast increase in interest in several areas of study into feedback on writing, as well as a continual quest by teachers for methods to improve the effectiveness of their feedback practices. Over the last two decades, feedback has emerged as a critical topic in research writing. *"Recently much feedback research has centered on strengthening the links between feedback on writing and SLA theories and has sought to investigate whether feedback has an effect on language proficiency and development, with a focus on the potential role of written corrective feedback (CF)"* (Hyland, 2010, pp. 172-174).

Furthermore, feedback benefits both language education and writing skill development by offering clear, well-structured ideas, correctness, and meaningful paragraphs (Hyland, 2003). Dulay et al. (1982) state that *"feedback generally refers to the listener's or reader's response given to the learner's speech or writing."* In other words, any formula utilized to inform a student if an instruction answer is correct or incorrect, and learners are presented with data that illustrates and explains a number of options via feedback.

2.6. The Importance of the Written Feedback

In certain ways, the use of corrective feedback or any other type of feedback has a significant influence on language acquisition in general and writing competence in particular. Furthermore, a lot of research studies show that giving students written feedback plays an important function in their writing. Straub (1996), for example, has emphasized the significance of teacher-written feedback, stating that *"it is how we receive and respond to student writing that speaks loudest in our teaching"* (p. 246). Thus, in the absence of a face-to-face spoken writing conference, written responses are the only option for teachers to react to students' particular needs.

Students may *"identify their strengths and weaknesses, which in the case of the latter will make the students know how to go about improving themselves and becoming effective writers"* through comments on their writing (Penaflorida, 2002, p. 346). As a result, feedback is viewed as an educational tool that assists students in improving their paragraph writing skills.

Ressor (2002) points out that *"teacher feedback is believed to provide students with not only the incentive to improve but also the guidance on how to improve"*. Feedback in this context has another purpose, which is to stimulate and motivate pupils to write. Similarly, Ferris (2002) claims that *"if teacher feedback is addressed effectively, it can also contribute to students' overall second language acquisition."* According to the above statements, feedback is a multifunctional method in the learning and teaching process.

2.7. Related Studies

Several studies have found that most EFL/ESL students appreciate teachers' comments. According to research from two universities in the United States, for example, 94% of students believe that written feedback from a teacher is more beneficial than peer evaluation (Zhang, 1995). In addition, 11 ESL students at a university in the United States used 87% of their teachers' input to revise their work, but only 51% of their peers' feedback was used (Paulus, 1999).

In another setting, Chinese students revised their work more in reaction to their teacher input (74%), than in response to peer feedback (46%). The preference for teacher input may be attributed to the fact that it has a greater positive influence on writing quality than peer feedback. Students also stated that their teachers' comments on their writing were more absorbed in future versions than their classmates' remarks since the former assisted in improving the quality of their writing. Peer feedback was critical in increasing student writers' autonomy because it taught students to rely on themselves to rectify their mistakes, even when they were unsure of the accuracy of their peer input (Yang et al., 2006). Peer feedback had little effect on both high- and low-proficiency students' grammatical mistakes, while teacher feedback was critical for grammatical accuracy, especially for low-proficiency students (Jalalifarahani and Azizi, 2012).

3. Methods

3.1 Participants

The present study's population consisted of all Vietnam EFL undergraduate students. The study's sample consisted of two randomly selected groups of sixty 18- to 20-year-old students (an experiment group and a control group, each with 30 students) enrolled in the Writing I course as part of their bachelor's degree requirements at Nam Can Tho University's Department of English Language in the first semester of the 2023-2024 academic year. Everyone who took part was Vietnamese. The participants were assured that their comments would be kept private and would only be used for research reasons.

3.2 Research Instrument

To gather the data for the current study, the researcher employed a Writing test as an instruments

3.2.1 Description of the Pre-test and the Post-test

The researcher study's pre-test consisted of a writing activity in which the control and experiment groups received instructions to compose free subject paragraphs. The purpose of these free topics is to ensure that the difficulty is not due to the themes themselves. The sixty participants in the research study took an hour and a half to write their paragraphs in the pre-test. Following the treatment phase, which consisted of four sessions every two weeks in the C3-02 and D2-02 rooms, participants in both groups were post-tested by writing another paragraph, and the writing session lasted an hour and a half.

3.2.2 Method of Correcting the Content of the Students' Paragraphs

The researcher revised the paragraphs of the participants by focusing on three primary levels. First, consider the degree of vocabulary, which is regarded as one of the most important factors that the researcher considered while revising their written products. As a result, the researcher remarked on each minor component of the vocabulary level, such as spelling errors, word choice, and so on. The researcher then used the same method at both grammar and mechanical levels. Thus, in grammar, any errors in sentence structure, plural formation, and verb tenses should be rectified, but in mechanics, the researcher focused more on punctuation and capitalization. Furthermore, errors in each participant's text were graded by counting them on each level.

4. Results and Discussion

The current study aims to investigate the impact of a teacher's written CF on Nam Can Tho EFL students' writing achievement. This section presents the findings as guided by the question of the current study and provides some explanations for the findings.

4.1. Participants' Writing Ability within the Two Groups Before and After the Intervention

The General Linear Model exam was used to assess changes in students' writing abilities. The results of the control group's pre-test and post-test were first gathered and examined. With $p = 0.00$, it is acceptable to assume that the mean scores for the pre-test and post-test are different. The Descriptive Statistic Test was then used to determine the mean score of each test.

Table 1: Students' writing ability between the two groups before and after treatment

Tests	Conditions	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
Pre-test	Control	30	1.00	8.00	5.49	1.82
	Experiment	30	1.00	8.00	5.79	1.92
Post-test	Control	30	2.00	8.50	5.72	1.75
	Experiment	30	3.50	9.00	6.51	1.63

Table 1 shows how participants' writing abilities in the control group evolved after the study. The pre-test ($M_{pre} = 5.49$; $SD = 1.82$) and post-test ($M_{post} = 5.72$; $SD = 1.75$) means varied ($df = 37$, $p = 0.02$). The post-test mean score exceeded the pre-test mean score. After ten weeks of intervention, student writing abilities in the control group improved.

Following that, the General Linear Model test was used to determine the difference in mean score of the experimental group's pretest and posttest ($p = 0.00$), which led to the conclusion that the experimental group's ability was different at pretest and posttest.

The pretest's mean score differed from the posttest's mean score ($Df = 76$, $p = 0.00$) ($M_{pre} = 5.79$, $SD = 1.92$, $M_{post} = 6.51$, $SD = 1.63$). The result shows that the post-test mean was greater than the pre-test mean. Following the trial, the experimental group's writing ability improved noticeably.

4.2. Students' Writing Ability between the Two Groups Before the Intervention

The control group's mean score ($M = 5.49$) in the pre-test was somewhat lower than the experimental group's mean score ($M = 5.72$). An Independent Sample t-test was employed to evaluate whether there was a significant difference in writing skills between the control and experimental groups in the pre-test. In the pre-test, the difference in writing skills between the two groups was not significant ($t = -.92$, $df = 68$, $p = .359$). This shows that both groups of students remembered the same grammar during the pretest. The two groups were evenly distributed prior to the intervention.

4.3. Students' Writing Ability between the Two Groups After the Intervention

Table 1 further demonstrated that the students' writing ability differed between the two groups following the intervention. After ten weeks of intervention, both groups' post-test averages had significantly improved ($M_{post} = 5.72$ for the control group, $M_{post} = 6.51$ for the experimental group).

In conclusion, after ten weeks, there was an improvement in writing ability between the control and experimental groups' pretest/posttest. The results revealed that

there was a significant difference in writing ability between the two groups following the intervention. This fact leads to the conclusion that students who take corrective feedback in their learning are able to improve their writing abilities.

4.4 Discussion

The research also revealed that the students agree that the teacher's written CF is succinct and exact, less forgettable because they may access it anytime they want, and appropriately supplied for their written tasks. It assists them in improving their content and organization, writing good topic sentences and supporting sentences, developing the necessary critical thinking skills to effectively revise and examine their own writing, becoming cognitively engaged in the content under study as well as the context of learning, developing writing mechanics, and identifying problems they encountered.

Furthermore, it improves their grammar and vocabulary growth, offers students critical remarks that modify their wrong previous knowledge and ideas, and focuses on the surface level of writing, error identification, and discourse aspects. Furthermore, the data show that the students disagreed that the teacher's written CF was unintelligible or not precise, that it was not useful/beneficial at all since they couldn't comprehend it, that it disappointed them, and that it did not help them learn from their mistakes. As a result, they had no issues when exposed to the teacher's written CF.

5. Conclusion

The current study investigated the influence of a teacher's written CF on the writing achievement of Vietnamese EFL university students, as well as how those students viewed their teacher's written CF. The data revealed that the written CF of the instructor had a substantial favorable influence on students' writing performance. Although these findings are significant for the field of writing skills in general and written CF in particular, this study has certain limitations. The study's clear weakness is the small sample size. Another drawback is that the present study's data was gathered from only one institution in Vietnam, Nam Can Tho; no other universities were engaged in the study.

Writing teachers must be aware of the impact of their written CF methods on students' expectations. Teachers should also be aware that providing constructive comments on their students' writing is critical since it supports students in correcting their faults and becoming more autonomous writers, which will prepare them to generate high-quality writing. In conclusion, the current study's findings have contributed to the expanding body of research that has explored the influence of instructors' written CF on boosting EFL learners' writing ability.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

About the Author

Lam Ky Nhan earned his M.A. in English Education from Can Tho University in 2021. He is a lecturer of Department of English Language at Nam Can Tho University, Vietnam, currently pursuing his PhD, with anticipated graduation in 2026. His teaching interests include teaching grammar and academic writing, teacher and learner motivation, testing, and assessment.

References

- Al-Sawalha, A. M. (2016). EFL Jordanian students' reaction to written comments on their written work: A Case Study. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(1), 63-77.
- Al-Sawalha, A. M., & Chow, T. V. Foo (2013). Mother tongue influence on writing apprehension of Jordanian student studying English language: Case study. *International Journal of English and Education*, 2(1), 46-51.
- Collins, A. Gentner, D. (1983). *Multiple Models of Evaporating Processes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dulay, H., M. Burt, & S. D. Krashen (1982). *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Heaton, J. B. (1975). *Writing English Language Test*. London: Longman.
- Hong, F. (2006). Students' perceptions of peer response activity in English writing instruction. *CELEA Journal*, 29(4), 48-52
- Hyland, F. (1998). The Impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 255-286.
- Hyland, F. (2010). Future directions in feedback on second language writing: Overview and research agenda. *International Journal of English Studies*, 1-12
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39, 83-101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Jalalifarahani, M., & Azizi, H. (2012). The Efficacy of peer vs. teacher response in enhancing grammatical accuracy & general writing quality of advanced vs. elementary proficiency EFL learners. *IPEDR*, 33, 88-92.
- Keh, C. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: a model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44, 94-304.
- Kim, Y. & Kim, J. (2005). Teaching Korean university writing class: Balancing the process and their genre approach. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(2), 1-15.
- Kongsuebchart, J., & Suppasetsee, S. (2016). A weblog-based electronic portfolio to improve English writing skills of Thai EFL undergraduate students. Paper presented at the Seventh CLS International Conference, National University of Singapore, Singapore.

- Kress, G. (1989). *Linguistic Process in Socio-cultural Practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Lado, R. (1983). *Language Testing (Writing in a Foreign Language) – Language Pedagogy*.
- Liu, Y. (2008). The Effects of error feedback in second language writing. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching*, 15(1), 65-79. [Online] Available: <http://www.w3.coh.arizona.edu/awp/>
- Miller, W. C. (1989). *Role and Function of the Instructional Materials*. Minnesota: Berge Publication Company.
- Nicol, D. J., & D. Macfarlane-Dick (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218.
- Nugrahenny, T. Z. (2007). Teacher and students' attitudes toward teacher feedback *RELC Journal*, 38(1), 38-52.
- Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265-289.
- Penafiorida, A. H. (2002). *Non-traditional Forms of Assessment and Response to Student Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raimes, A. (1994). *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. (3rd ed.). Oxford: O.U.P.
- Ressor, M. (2002). *Issues in Written Feedback: a Critical Review*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234580809_Issues_in_Written_Teacher_Feedback_A_Critical_Review
- Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. (4th Ed). Pearson Education
- Rintaro, S. (2012). The Effects of written feedback in the form of recasts. *The Journal of Asian TEFL*, 9(4), 27-50.
- Rivers, W. M. (1968). *Teaching Foreign-Language Skills*. The University of Chicago Press: London.
- Salem, A. A., & Abu Al Dyiar, M. (2014). Writing Anxiety as a Predictor of Writing Self-Efficacy in English for Special Education Arab Learners. *International Education Studies*, 7(6), 128-134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n6p128>
- Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). An analysis of errors in written English sentences: A case study of Thai EFL students. *English Language Teaching*, 10(3), 101-110. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n3p101>
- Widdowson, H. G. (2001). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: OUP, Zamel, V. (1985). *Responding to Writing*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(1), 79–101.
- Williams, J., & Jasmine, G. (2003). Providing feedback on ESL students' written assignments. *TESL-EJ*, 10(4), 1-6. [Online] Available: <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Williams-Feedback.html>
- Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(3), 179-200.
- Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 209-222.

Lam Ky Nhan
THE IMPACT OF TEACHER'S WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK
ON EFL STUDENTS' PARAGRAPH WRITING PERFORMANCE

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions, and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of English Language Teaching shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).