

Exploring the Intensity of Corrective Feedback in Online English Instruction: A Study of Synchronous and Asynchronous Modes

Maemuna Muhayyang*

maemarasyid@unm.ac.id

Universitas Negeri Makassar

*corresponding author

Lely Novia

lelynovia@unm.ac.id

Universitas Negeri Makassar

Abstract

This research examines the degree of intensity in the delivery of corrective feedback (CF) by EFL lecturers within online English language instruction, with particular attention to synchronous and asynchronous communication modes. Adopting a descriptive qualitative framework, the study gathered data through classroom observations and in-depth interviews with eight lecturers teaching various English courses at Universitas Negeri Makassar. The analysis centered on three principal dimensions of feedback intensity: attention, duration, and frequency. The results indicated that CF provided via synchronous platforms—such as video conferencing or real-time chat—was generally more immediate, intensive, and frequent. This mode enabled lecturers to address student errors dynamically and offer direct feedback that fostered metacognitive engagement and timely revisions. Conversely, CF delivered asynchronously through tools such as email, discussion forums, and learning management systems was found to be less intensive, broader in scope, and delayed, often influenced by limited student engagement and the self-directed nature of asynchronous interaction. Despite these differences, asynchronous feedback facilitated more deliberate and structured responses. The study underscores that CF intensity is influenced by technological capabilities, the nature of the course content, and the frequency of lecturer-student interaction. It concludes that a strategic integration of both synchronous and asynchronous feedback modalities can significantly improve the effectiveness of online English language instruction.

Keywords: *Corrective feedback, intensity, synchronous learning, asynchronous learning, online EFL instruction.*

INTRODUCTION

The digital transformation of education, particularly accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, has dramatically altered the way English as a Foreign Language (EFL) is taught and learned. The shift from face-to-face to online instruction introduced a new dynamic in which educators had to adapt not only pedagogical strategies but also communication practices. Among these adaptations, the use of corrective feedback (CF) in virtual environments has become a focal point in the effort to ensure quality language instruction. CF, broadly defined as a teacher's response to learner errors aimed at helping students recognize and correct mistakes, is a well-established component of effective language teaching (Ellis, 2006; Loewen & Sheen, 2007). It

functions not only as a cognitive scaffold but also as an effective tool that influences learners' motivation, confidence, and engagement. In online settings—whether synchronous (real-time communication via platforms like Zoom) or asynchronous (delayed interaction via email, discussion boards, or LMS)—the delivery, intensity, and perception of CF becomes more complex and multifaceted.

Recent studies have underscored the significance of CF in online learning. For instance, Papin and Michaud (2023) examined learners' perceptions of synchronous written CF in video conferenced collaborative writing tasks. Their findings indicated that learners valued immediate feedback during the writing process, reporting improvements in their accuracy and awareness of language use. Real-time interaction also allowed students to ask for clarification and implement corrections promptly, contributing to a deeper engagement with the material. On the other hand, asynchronous CF has also demonstrated substantial pedagogical value. Ugaldo, R (2023) found that structured, individualized asynchronous feedback could significantly improve EFL learners' oral performance in virtual speaking courses. The delayed nature of asynchronous feedback gave students time to reflect, process, and integrate the corrections more thoughtfully, which in turn contributed to long-term retention and language development.

The modality of feedback—whether synchronous or asynchronous—does not only influence timing but also affects the quality and depth of student learning. Synchronous feedback tends to support immediate correction and dynamic interaction, which is particularly useful in speaking-focused classes where pronunciation and grammar issues arise in real time. Asynchronous feedback, however, offers the advantage of depth and personalization, as instructors can provide detailed explanations without time constraints. Beyond the mode of delivery, another critical dimension of CF is its intensity. Feedback intensity refers to the frequency, duration, and level of attention given to learner errors. According to Chaudron (1988), effective feedback should be sufficiently frequent and informative to guide learners, but not so overwhelming that it creates cognitive overload. In a virtual classroom, where non-verbal cues are limited, the intensity of feedback may serve as a proxy for instructor presence and attentiveness, which in turn shapes students' emotional responses and academic behaviors. A study by German and Mahmud (2021) highlighted that students in online writing courses responded positively to CF when it was consistent and detailed. However, their preferences varied: some learners appreciated direct corrections, while others preferred hints or metalinguistic comments that encouraged self-correction. The study emphasized the importance of feedback personalization, suggesting that uniform feedback strategies may not be equally effective for all learners.

In Indonesia, the landscape of CF in online EFL classrooms is still evolving. Meilani et al. (2022) investigated learners' beliefs about online pronunciation feedback and found that students valued individualized feedback over general comments. Learners perceived personalized CF as more relevant to their specific needs and reported higher motivation to act upon such feedback. This supports the notion that contextual relevance and individual learner factors must be considered when designing CF strategies. Furthermore, research has shown that effective CF contributes not only to linguistic competence but also to self-confidence and self-expression—two crucial affective outcomes in language learning (Munir et al, 2023). Students who receive clear and constructive feedback tend to develop a stronger belief in their ability to perform language tasks, participate in discussions, and take linguistic risks. This is particularly relevant in

online settings, where students may feel isolated or hesitant to engage without adequate support (Black & Wiliam in Shute, 2007).

Despite the growing body of literature on CF, there is still a scarcity of research examining how feedback intensity provided by lecturers in online contexts, especially in the Indonesian higher education system. To address this gap, the present study investigates the intensity of corrective feedback provided by EFL lecturers during online English instruction. By integrating pedagogical, technological, and psychological perspectives, the study aims to offer a more comprehensive understanding of CF in digital learning ecosystems. Ultimately, the findings are expected to provide practical recommendations for improving CF practices in online EFL classrooms, enhancing the quality of interaction between lecturers and learners, and supporting more inclusive and learner-centred pedagogies in the post-pandemic educational landscape.

LITERATURE REVIEW

How is corrective feedback defined?

Corrective feedback has already defined by some outstanding experts described as follows:

- a. Ellis (2006) defines corrective feedback as a response to students' speech that contains errors, intended to inform them about their mistakes and the results of their performance on the work or tasks they have completed.
- b. Loewe & Sheen (2007) state that corrective feedback is information given to students regarding linguistic errors. However, corrective feedback should be an ideal dimension indicating that all lecturers must make theoretical decisions about what, how, and when to correct students' mistakes.
- c. Tatawy (2002) defines corrective feedback as an indication to students that the use of the target language is incorrect. Therefore, the feedback given must be positive so as not to lead or force students to rely on their own language knowledge rather than the language they are currently learning.
- d. Russel and Spada (2006) state that corrective feedback is the lecturer's response to students' errors in the target language, intended to inform them about the mistakes they make in learning activities or assigned tasks.

Based on the definitions above, the researcher concludes that corrective feedback is information in the form of corrections or correct answers given by the lecturer to students regarding mistakes in the worksheets or assignments that the students have completed.

Types of Corrective Feedback

Lyster and Ranta (1997) classified corrective feedback into six (6) types based on the intensity of its use by lecturers in responding to students' mistakes, described as follows:

- a. Explicit correction: explicit correction is a correction that refers to the explicit rules of the correct form and clearly indicates the presence of an error in the student's performance by writing a phrase like "Oh, you mean," "You should say," and other similar phrases.
- b. Reformulation: correction given by the lecturer by reformulating all or part of the

student's speech, which can be interpreted as a repetition of the student's speech with changes and emphasis on the error implicitly. Additionally, repetition is also understood as a response or translation of the student's use of their first language.

- c. Clarification: a correction used to request clarification regarding a student's speech by using phrases such as "Excuse me" or "What do you mean by X?".
- d. Metalinguistic: a correction that includes comments, information, or questions related to the correct form of the student's speech that indicates an error, such as grammatical or lexical mistakes.
- e. Elicitation: correction given directly by stopping the student's speech containing the error, asking for the correct form, or asking the student to reformulate the correct speech.
- f. Repetition: correction that refers to the lecturer's repetition by emphasizing the incorrect part of the student's speech with intonation.

Regarding the use of corrective feedback, Muhayyang et al (2020) state that there are two (2) methods, namely direct and indirect use, which are described as follows.

- a. Direct corrective feedback means that the lecturer provides direct corrections to the mistakes made or committed by crossing out or deleting words, phrases, or morphemes. In other words, students do not find out or identify their own mistakes and how to correct them, but the lecturer with direct corrective feedback states or writes what is wrong and corrects those mistakes. Direct corrective feedback can be done in three (3) forms, namely (1) cross-out: the lecturer removes each error; (2) rewriting: the lecturer rewrites the correct word, phrase, or sentence, correct spelling, structure, or form; and (3) addition: the lecturer adds any missing items such as prefixes, suffixes, articles, prepositions, or words.
- b. Indirect corrective feedback is defined as a response given by the lecturer to draw students' attention to their mistakes without providing corrections by underlining, circling, or highlighting the errors for them to learn and correct on their own (Ferris, 2012). In other words, the lecturer with indirect corrective feedback does not directly correct the students' mistakes but guides them to find and correct their own errors.

The Benefits of Corrective Feedback

In the context of teaching and learning, feedback has three (3) main functions as follows:

- a. Information: feedback serves to inform students about their performance, which can help them understand what they have done. According to Chaudron (1988), the role of the information available in the feedback provided allows students to confirm, disconfirm, and possibly modify hypothetical grammatical transition rules they may develop if they pay attention to the information.
- b. Reinforcement: feedback plays a role in reinforcement that is positive (reward) and negative (punishment) which can strengthen or weaken student behavior. Positive when the feedback motivates them to revise the mistakes shown, whether directly or indirectly, and conversely negative when they are unable to act accompanied by punishment that does not educate them.
- c. Motivation: When feedback plays a motivational role, it means that it serves as an

incentive that encourages students to correct the indicated mistakes.

Regarding the aforementioned functions of feedback, it is assumed that feedback has beneficial effects for lecturers in performing various roles in the teaching and learning process. Feedback can be used by lecturers to make decisions, such as whether a course that has been conducted needs to be improved or continued (Cooper in Winarsih, 2016:24). Next, according to Suherman in Winarsih (2016:24), there are four (4) benefits of feedback, namely (a) encouraging students to continue practicing, (b) reflecting the effective behavior of lecturers, indicating that feedback is obtained when lecturers actively participate during learning activities and always pay attention to every movement and learning activity of students, (c) helping students assess their performance as a representation of abilities they cannot evaluate themselves, and (d) encouraging lecturers to assess the relevance between learning aspects and the level of students' ability to master the presented teaching materials.

Online Learning Approach

In online learning, lecturers can combine two approaches, namely synchronous and asynchronous. Synchronous is the learning interaction between lecturers and students that takes place simultaneously using video conference technology or chatting. Conversely, asynchronous learning is an interaction between lecturers and students that can be conducted flexibly and does not have to occur at the same time through discussion forums, self-study, or student assignments on materials that have been provided in advance by the lecturer.

Synchronous and asynchronous learning each have their own advantages and disadvantages. The advantages of synchronous include (a) learning interactions that occur at a predetermined time and are attended by both lecturers and students simultaneously, allowing for closeness between lecturers and students or among students, thereby avoiding feelings of isolation, and (b) the presence of direct communication that can minimize misunderstandings. Its' drawbacks cover (a) the difficulty in scheduling because both the lecturer and students must be present at the same time, and (b) the possibility of internet access difficulties. While the advantages of asynchronous deal with (a) the presence of time flexibility for lecturers and students that can be adjusted to their respective conditions, and (b) the presence of cognitive engagement that encourages lecturers and students to think more critically and express their opinions through discussion forums. In addition, its disadvantages include (a) time flexibility allows for less interaction between lecturers and students, which can lead to a lack of closeness between them in the learning process, and (b) differences in understanding of the material are very likely to occur due to the lack of direct interaction between lecturers and students.

METHOD

This research uses descriptive qualitative research to have a descriptive account of the intensity of corrective feedback given by the lecturers both through synchronous and asynchronous communication modes in the process of teaching and learning English in EFL classrooms. Eight lecturers teaching both productive and receptive skills courses and some theoretical English courses with approximately possess teaching qualifications and experiences in the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Languages and Literature, Universitas Negeri Makassar, were taken purposively as the subject of this research. The observations were

conducted during the online classroom interactions to see the intensity of corrective feedback provisions and the interviews with those lecturers were done to strengthen the data gained through the online classroom observations. The attainment of all required data was analyzed using four steps, namely data selection, transcription, interpretation, and reporting (Mahmud, 2017).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results of this study are described based on the research question, “How is the intensity of corrective feedback given by the lecturers through synchronous and asynchronous communication modes in English language learning? The interview results show that lecturers teaching both English productive and receptive skills courses and English concept courses provide corrective feedback with varying intensities. The intensity of providing corrective feedback The intensity of providing corrective feedback, which refers to three (3) aspects: attention, duration, and frequency from the lecturer on the work or tasks given to students through synchronous communication media, tends to be higher, more intensive, faster, more frequent, often, and adjusted to the needs and learning abilities of the students. Meanwhile, the intensity of providing corrective feedback through asynchronous communication media is adjusted according to the intensity of interaction between students and lecturers, which is less intensive, general, frequent, and passive. These findings can be seen in the following description.

The intensity of providing corrective feedback in synchronous communication modes

The actualization of intensity in the form of attention, duration, and frequency of corrective feedback given by lecturers on assignments or tasks provided to students during the teaching and learning process through synchronous communication media varies from one another, namely higher, more intensive, faster, more frequent, often, and adjusted to the needs and learning abilities of students as seen in the following interview extracts.

Extract 1 (L1, 9 August 2023)

“Dalam pembelajaran daring sinkronus, intensitas pemberian CF cenderung lebih tinggi karena interaksi langsung memungkinkan saya untuk memberikan umpan balik segera saat kesalahan terjadi (In synchronous online learning, the intensity of providing CF tends to be higher because direct interaction allows me to give immediate feedback when mistakes occur).

Extract 2 (L2, 15 July 2023)

Saya lebih intens memberikan CF pada pembelajaran sinkronus. Saya memperlihatkan kepada mahasiswa secara bertahap dan detail bagaimana struktur, flow, grammar, dll tulisan yg ideal dan akademik. Dengan memodelkan saya ingin menyentuh aspek metakognisi students agar mereka bisa mengembangkan individualised strategy mereka dalam menulis. (I provide more intensive CF during synchronous learning. I show the students step by step and in detail how the structure, flow, grammar, etc., of ideal and academic writing should be. By modelling, I want to touch on the metacognitive aspects of students so that they can develop their individualized strategies in writing).

Extract 3 (L3, 14 August 2023)

Intensitas feedback yang diberikan ke mahasiswa dari ketiga aspek di atas itu dilakukan setiap pertemuan baik secara sinkronus maupun asinkronus, biasanya feedback yg diberikan secara asinkronus akan diulangi kembali pada saat sesi sinkronus. (The intensity of feedback given to students from the three aspects mentioned above is conducted in every meeting, both synchronously and asynchronously. Usually, the feedback given asynchronously will be repeated during the synchronous session).

Extract 4 (L4, 17 August 2023)

Dalam proses pembelajaran sinkronus, intensitas corrective feedback dari dosen cenderung lebih cepat karena interaksi langsung memungkinkan respons instan. Dosen dapat memberikan umpan balik segera setelah mahasiswa mengerjakan tugas atau berpartisipasi dalam diskusi. (In the synchronous learning process, the intensity of corrective feedback from the lecturer tends to be faster because direct interaction allows for instant responses. The lecturer can provide feedback immediately after the students complete assignments or participate in discussions).

Extract 5 (L5, 11 August 2023)

Pada mata kuliah saya, intensitas corrective feedback lebih sering diberikan melalui media sinkronus ketimbang asinkronus. Corrective feedback via media sinkronus lebih dimungkinkan oleh ketersediaan waktu dan direct access dengan mahasiswa yang tugasnya diberikan corrective feedback. (In my course, the intensity of corrective feedback is more often provided through synchronous media rather than asynchronous. Corrective feedback via synchronous media is more feasible due to the availability of time and direct access to students whose assignments are given corrective feedback).

Extract 6 (L6, 28 August 2023)

Untuk mata kuliah tertentu seperti mata kuliah Basic English Grammar, Intensive Listening, dan Critical Listening saya sering memberikan corrective feedback utamanya jika perkuliahan dilaksanakan secara sinkron biasanya saya akan memberikan feedback diakhir pertemuan atau jika ada presentasi maka feedback diberikan setelah presentasi... (For certain courses such as Basic English Grammar, Intensive Listening, and Critical Listening, I often provide corrective feedback, especially if the class is conducted synchronously. Usually, I give feedback at the end of the session, or if there is a presentation, feedback is given after the presentation...)

Extract 7 (L7, 14 July 2023)

...sering untuk kelas sinkronus dan asinkronus. (... often for synchronous and asynchronous classes)

Extract 8 (L8, 13 August 2023)

Intensitas corrective feedback yang diberikan kepada mahasiswa sebaiknya disesuaikan dengan kebutuhan individual dan kemampuan belajar masing-masing mahasiswa. (The intensity of corrective feedback given to students should be adjusted according to the individual needs and learning abilities of each student).

The extracts above indicate that the lecturers teaching productive and receptive skills courses and English concept courses provide corrective feedback on the assignments given to students by utilizing synchronous learning communication media with varying intensities from one to another. The intensity is indicated by the attention given as an actualization of the lecturer's interest in responding to the tasks assigned, with durations and frequencies that can be adjusted or conditioned by utilizing technology as a communication medium in the learning and teaching process, such as video conferencing or chatting. This means that the presence of technology provides a space for interaction between lecturers and students at scheduled times (real-time) to jointly monitor the completion of assigned tasks by giving responses or feedback in the form of direct corrections to the mistakes made or committed by students.

The direct communication that occurs as described above is very beneficial, especially for students, because the intensive feedback corrections they receive with maximum duration and frequency serve as a basis for making corrections or revisions to the assigned tasks and can minimize misunderstandings among them when completing the given tasks. Regarding the provision of direct corrective feedback, Muhayyng et al. (2020) state that students do not seek to find or identify their own mistakes or correct them, but rather the lecturer provides direct corrective feedback by stating or writing what is wrong and correcting those mistakes. This means that the correction feedback from the lecturer through synchronous communication media becomes input in the form of meaningful knowledge or skills for them.

The above description shows that learning through synchronous communication media provides sufficient space for lecturers to correct any mistakes or errors that may be present in the tasks that students have completed or are currently working on. Furthermore, a learning environment like this, despite its weaknesses such as the absence or disruption of internet connectivity, can trigger and foster emotional closeness between lecturers and students or among students, and can also prevent feelings of isolation for students, especially those with lower proficiency in learning English as a foreign language.

The intensity of providing corrective feedback through asynchronous communication modes

The interview results show that the lecturers teaching productive and receptive skills courses and English concept courses provide corrective feedback with varying intensities in terms of attention, duration, and frequency, namely focused intensity, general, frequent, less, slow, passive, appropriate to the interaction intensity between lecturers and students, and tailored to the students' needs. The differences in intensity can be seen in the following excerpts from the interview results.

Extract 1 (L1, 9 August 2023)

...dalam pembelajaran daring asinkronus, umpan balik bisa lebih terfokus karena saya memiliki waktu untuk merumuskan/memikirkan pesan korektif dengan lebih baik. (In asynchronous online learning, feedback can be more focused because I have time to formulate/think through corrective messages better).

Extract 2 (L2, 15 July 2023)

Pembelajaran asinkronus biasanya CF yang saya berikan agak general. (Asynchronous learning usually has a somewhat general CF that I provide).

Extract 3 (L3, 6 August 2023)

...untuk forum discussion dalam LMS, CF kurang intens sebab setelah mengisi kolom diskusi, mahasiswa hampir tidak pernah membuka kembali untuk melihat respon dari diskusinya. (for the discussion forum in the LMS, CF is less intense because after filling in the discussion column, students almost never come back to see the responses to their discussions).

Extract 4 (L4, 17 August 2023)

...dalam pembelajaran asinkronus, intensitas corrective feedback mungkin lebih lambat karena dosen harus meninjau pekerjaan mahasiswa terlebih dahulu sebelum memberikan tanggapan.(... In asynchronous learning, the intensity of corrective feedback might be slower because the lecturer has to review the students' work first before providing a response).

Extract 5 (L5, 11 August 2023)

...corrective feedback via media asinkronous, dosen membutuhkan waktu yang tidak sedikit, sangat pasif, dan bisa membuat dosen bosan karena harus memberikan corrective feedback tertulis pada setiap tugas yang dikoreksinya.(... corrective feedback via asynchronous media requires a significant amount of time from the lecturer, is very passive, and can make the lecturer bored because they have to provide written corrective feedback on every assignment they grade).

Extract 6 (L6, 28 August 2023)

... untuk mata kuliah seperti Introduction to Literature atau Language Assessment biasanya saya memberikan corrective feedback secara asinkron setelah mereka mengumpulkan tugas, jadi feedbacknya biasanya saya berikan pada pertemuan berikutnya. (...for courses like Introduction to Literature or Language Assessment, I usually provide corrective feedback asynchronously after they submit their assignments, so the feedback is typically given in the next meeting).

Extract 7 (L7, 17 August 2023)

Pemberian CF dalam keduanya tergantung pada seberapa sering saya berinteraksi dengan mahasiswa dan jenis aktivitas pembelajaran yang dilakukan. (The provision of CF in both cases depends on how often I interact with students and the type of learning activities conducted).

Extract 8 (L8, 13 August 2023)

Sebaiknya intensitas corrective feedback yang diberikan harus disesuaikan dengan kebutuhan setiap mahasiswa agar bisa memperoleh manfaat yang maksimal dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris. (The intensity of corrective feedback given should ideally be adjusted to meet the needs of each student in order to maximize the benefits in learning English).

The extracts above show that the intensity of providing corrective feedback by lecturers in charge of productive and receptive skills courses and English concept courses is carried out well in terms of attention, duration, and frequency in the asynchronous learning process. This means that the aforementioned lecturers continue to perform their primary duties and roles as correctors

or main sources of input for the work or assignments given to students. Asynchronous online learning that provides space for students to learn without limits by quickly accessing learning materials in various forms, such as recorded video presentations by lecturers, video demonstrations, and chatting, is not an excuse for lecturers not to communicate with each other. Through this asynchronous learning, communication between lecturers and students can take place in various forms, such as emails, chatting, and discussion forums to provide feedback to be more immediate and intensive on the work or assignments given, including corrections for improvements that should be used as a reference for making improvisations or revisions on tasks that students have completed or are currently working on. feedback tends Lecturers are able to address errors as they occur, allowing students to correct mistakes promptly. This aligns with the findings of Papin and Michaud (2023), who highlight the effectiveness of real-time feedback in enhancing students' accuracy and engagement during collaborative tasks. The immediate nature of synchronous feedback is beneficial in addressing real-time language production errors, particularly in speaking tasks where pronunciation and grammar issues arise frequently (Chaudron, 1988). This type of direct interaction not only helps prevent the reinforcement of mistakes but also fosters metacognitive engagement, encouraging students to reflect on their learning strategies (Munir et al., 2023).

Conversely, asynchronous feedback, typically provided through emails, discussion forums, or learning management systems (LMS), presents different challenges and advantages. The feedback in this mode is often less frequent and delayed, which can reduce its immediacy. However, it allows lecturers more time to reflect and craft detailed, personalized responses (Ugaldo Ramos, 2023). This thoughtful feedback can lead to deeper learning, as students have the opportunity to process and internalize corrections at their own pace. This supports the view of German and Mahmud (2021), who note that more structured, individualized asynchronous feedback can lead to significant improvements in learners' language skills, especially in writing and other receptive tasks.

Through this asynchronous learning, communication between lecturers and students can take place in various mentioned above forms to provide feedback on assignments or tasks given, including corrections for improvements that should be used as a reference for making improvisations or revisions on tasks that students have completed or are currently working on. The difference in the intensity of corrective feedback provided by lecturers through asynchronous learning is a normal occurrence. This is due to the learning system that provides space for interaction between lecturers and students to be conducted flexibly and not necessarily at the same time. With this flexibility, lecturers are very likely to provide corrective feedback indirectly on the work or assignments given. This means that the lecturer is likely to give students the opportunity to identify their own mistakes as part of the realization of independent learning with all the available materials in the learning media. On one hand, students may also be late in checking the corrective feedback from the lecturer available in their emails or discussion forums used by the lecturer to respond to their work or assignments due to various factors. In this regard, James (2002) stated that one of the three weaknesses of online learning is the limitation of assessment and feedback for students, indicating that there is a complexity for lecturers in conducting assessments because students sometimes do not provide the desired feedback, and some students are unable to actively participate during the teaching and learning process. Thus, the provision of corrective feedback indirectly through asynchronous learning greatly increases

the possibility of misunderstandings occurring among students due to the lack of direct interaction between them.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the intensity of corrective feedback (CF) provided by EFL lecturers during online instruction, particularly comparing synchronous and asynchronous modes of communication. The findings revealed that the intensity of CF—reflected in attention, duration, and frequency—varies significantly depending on the mode of interaction used in online learning environments. In synchronous settings, such as live video conferencing or chat-based platforms, lecturers tend to offer more immediate, detailed, and frequent corrective feedback. Real-time interaction enables direct response to students' errors, allowing lecturers to model correct language use and clarify misunderstandings promptly. This higher intensity of feedback supports active engagement and provides opportunities for scaffolding, especially in courses that focus on productive language skills like speaking and writing. Conversely, asynchronous communication—carried out via emails, discussion forums, and other delayed-response platforms—shows a different pattern. While it provides lecturers with more time to construct thoughtful feedback, the intensity is generally lower in immediacy and frequency. Feedback in asynchronous contexts tends to be more generalized, delayed, and less interactive, often depending on students' initiative to revisit and reflect on the comments provided.

Overall, the intensity of corrective feedback in online EFL instruction is shaped by the nature of the communication mode used. Synchronous modes favour more intensive and dynamic CF delivery, while asynchronous modes allow for reflective but often less frequent feedback. To enhance instructional effectiveness, it is recommended that lecturers strategically integrate both communication modes, balancing immediacy with depth, and tailoring feedback to students' needs and course objectives. Further studies are encouraged to quantify feedback patterns and explore their impact on student learning outcomes across different disciplines and digital platforms.

REFERENCES

- Al, Kafri, & B. Qassim. (2003). Teacher Written Feedback and Students' Writing: Focus and Nature. In a Thesis in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages: American University of Sharjah.
- Ariyani, A., Muhayyang, M., Munir, M., & Sakkir, G. (2023). Students' voices: Poster session as an alternative way of teaching writing. *ARRUS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(2), 97-103.
- Astia, M. (2018). Corrective Feedback in English Class. In *IJO T L - TL*, 3(3), 111-122.
- Bitchener, J & Dana R. Ferris. (2012). *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>

- Castañeda, M. E. (2005). Corrective feedback in online asynchronous and synchronous environments in Spanish as a foreign language (SFL) classes. Unpublished Dissertation: University of South Florida]. Scholar Commons. <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd/2814/>
- Chaudron, C. (1988). Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning. Cambridge University Press.
- Cooper, J. M. (2006). Classroom teaching skills (8th ed.). Houghton Mifflin.
- Danali, F., Modjanggo, V. K., & Mamudi, S. F. (2024). EFL students' perceptions and preferences towards written corrective feedback at Sintuwu Maroso University. Proceeding of Undergraduate Conference on Literature, Linguistic, and Cultural Studies, 3(1), 573–586. <https://doi.org/10.30996/uncollcs.v3i1.4651U>
- Ducken, D. (2014). Written Corrective Feedback in the L2 Writing Classroom. Unpublished Theses: Eastern Washington University.
- Ellis, R. (2006). The study of second language acquisition (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2012). Treatment of error in second language student writing (2nd ed.). University of Michigan Press
- German, E., & Mahmud, Y. S. (2021). Students' perception and preference on corrective feedback in online writing classes. TESOL International Journal, 16(8), 54–70. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357339542>
- Hidayati, S., Aminuddin, M., & Yudhiantara, R. A. (2023). EFL college students' perceptions on synchronous and asynchronous communication tool usage in e-language learning. Journal of Breakthrough English Language Teaching in Islamic Context, 1(1), 1–15. <https://www.journal.uinsgd.ac.id/index.php/belticjournal/article/view/>
- James, W. (2002). Evaluation of online teaching and learning: Challenges and strategies. Educational Technology Publications
- Kahraman, A. (2013). Affective and Cognitive Effects of Coded Teacher Feedback on Foreign Language Writing Students. Theses Research: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi.
- Karim, K. (2013). The Effects of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback (CF) on English-As-a-Second-Language (ESL) Students' Revision Accuracy and Writing Skills. Unpublished Theses: University of Victoria.
- Keshavarzi, A & Hengameh, A. (2016). The Effect of Teachers' Personality and Corrective Feedback on EFL Learners' Motivation". In Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research Volume 3(5) 118-129. <http://www.jallr.com/index.php/JALLR/article/viewFile/367/pdf367>
- Leyla, A. (2016). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback on Motivation to Improve Students Writing Performance. Unpublished Dissertation: Biskra University.
- Lipnevich, A. A. & Jeffrey, K. S. (2008). Response to Assessment Feedback: The Effects of Grades, Praise, and Source of Information. Unpublished Research Report.

- Loewen, S., & Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback in second language grammar instruction: A meta-analysis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition* (pp. 301–322). Oxford University Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Maghdalena, A. H., Faridi, A., & Hartono, R. (2022). The effectiveness of synchronous and asynchronous e-learning environments in teaching writing to different personalities. *English Education Journal*, 12(3), 333–346. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v12i3.57801>
- Mahmud, M. (2017). *Doing Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Yogyakarta: Phoenix Publisher.
- Meilani, F., Sukiyadi, D., & Purnawarman, P. (2022). Online individual corrective feedback: English language learners' beliefs in pronunciation learning. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 626, 1–6.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357708237>
- Munir, Muhayyung, M., Hasriani, G. (2023). Intensitas Penggunaan Corrective Feedback terhadap Perkembangan Kepercayaan dan Ekspresi Diri Mahasiswa. *Research Report: Universitas Negeri Makassar*.
- Papin, K., & Michaud, G. (2023). Learners' perceptions of synchronous written corrective feedback in videoconferenced collaborative writing. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 49(3). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1431338.pdf>
- Razali, R & Rohaiza, J. (2014). Exploring Teacher Written Feedback and Student Revisions on ESL Students' Writing. *OSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* Volume 19(5), 63-70.
- Rido, A., Kuswoyo, H., Mandasari, B., Prakoso, B. H., Purba, M., & Siswanto, H. W. (2023). Synchronous and asynchronous online learning in university English language classrooms: Findings from Indonesia. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 13(5), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i5.30125IJERE>
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133–164). John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Salima, A. R. (2014). Teachers' Oral Feedback Impact on EFL Students' Oral Proficiency: Case of Undergraduate Classes of the English Branch at Mku-Biskra. In research report in Department of Letters and Foreign Languages, English Branch: Mohamed Khider University, Biskra.
- Shute, V. J. (2007). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 153–189. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Spivey, K. (2014). *Written Corrective Feedback in ESL: Strategies, Approaches, Influences, and Factors*. Unpublished Thesis: The University of Toledo.

- Susan, M. B & Connie, M. M. (2009). How to Give Feedback. In *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 3(1)103, April 2010.
- Tatawy, M. E. (2002). The effect of teacher's feedback on the writing of second year students of English in a foreign language. Unpublished Thesis. American University in Cairo.
- Tatsanajamsuk, P., & Saengboon, S. (2022). The roles of indirect asynchronous electronic feedback and direct corrective feedback in improving students' L2 writing: A multiple case study of Thai undergraduate students. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 15(2), 1–24.
- Ugalde, R, Ó. A. (2023). The implementation of effective online asynchronous corrective feedback on the oral production of English as a foreign language learner in university virtual speaking classes. *Revista Innovaciones Educativas*, 25(39), 1–20.
<https://doi.org/10.22458/ie.v25i39.4580AmeliCA>
- Winarsih, M. (2016). *Evaluasi Pembelajaran: Konsep, Prinsip dan Implementasi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Yulitriana. (2021). Synchronous or asynchronous: Students' perceptions on online learning during the pandemic. *EBONY: Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, 1(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.37304/ebony.v1i1.3101>