



THE ROLE OF TEACHER FEEDBACK IN IMPROVING STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE: A STRUCTURED NARRATIVE REVIEW FOR EFL CLASSROOMS

Cempa Huzaimah^{1*}

Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia

cempa.huzaimah@um.ac.id

Inayatul Muntaqiyah²

Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia

inayatul.muntaqiyah@um.ac.id

Angela Mae Reyes³

Rizal Memorial Elementary School, Davao City, Philippines

angelamaereyes42@gmail.com

*Corresponding author: cempa.huzaimah@um.ac.id

Article History	Received: July 20, 2025	Revised: September 17, 2025	Accepted: October 22, 2025	Published: November 15, 2025
------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

Abstract

Teacher feedback remains one of the most influential pedagogical supports in writing instruction because it helps learners recognize gaps between current performance and expected writing standards, revise texts, improve linguistic accuracy, strengthen organization, and develop self-regulated writing strategies. However, feedback does not automatically improve writing performance. Its effectiveness depends on feedback focus, clarity, timing, learner uptake, revision opportunities, classroom dialogue, and students' feedback literacy. This article examines the role of teacher feedback in improving students' writing performance in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. The study employed a structured narrative review and pedagogical synthesis of peer-reviewed international literature on formative feedback, written corrective feedback, teacher commentary, learner engagement, and L2 writing development. The analysis identified five major roles of teacher feedback: diagnosing writing problems, supporting linguistic accuracy, guiding content and organization, promoting revision-based learning, and developing learner autonomy. The synthesis also shows that feedback is most effective when it is specific, text-based, criterion-referenced, manageable, dialogic, and followed by structured revision. Conversely, excessive correction, vague comments, delayed feedback, and limited opportunities to act on feedback may weaken students' engagement and reduce learning gains. The article concludes that teacher feedback should be positioned not merely as correction but as a formative scaffold that connects assessment, instruction, revision, and learner agency in writing classrooms.

Keywords: *teacher feedback; writing performance; written corrective feedback; EFL writing; revision*

A. Introduction

Writing is one of the most complex skills in English language learning because it requires learners to coordinate ideas, vocabulary, grammar, mechanics, genre awareness, coherence, audience expectation, and rhetorical organization. In EFL classrooms, students often need to write in a language that is not commonly used for daily communication. This condition makes writing performance highly dependent on instructional support, guided practice, and meaningful response from teachers. Among various instructional supports, teacher feedback is consistently recognized as a central mechanism for helping students understand the quality of their writing and improve subsequent drafts.

Teacher feedback refers to oral or written information provided by teachers to help learners identify strengths, weaknesses, errors, and possibilities for improvement in their texts. In writing instruction, feedback may address language form, content development, organization, coherence, genre conventions, vocabulary choice, argument quality, and mechanics. It may appear as direct correction, indirect marking, marginal comments, end comments, conferencing, rubric-based response, electronic annotation, or dialogic discussion. Therefore, teacher feedback is not a single technique but a multidimensional pedagogical practice.

The importance of feedback is supported by broader assessment literature. Hattie and Timperley (2007) describe feedback as a powerful influence on learning when it helps learners understand where they are going, how they are progressing, and what they need to do next. Shute (2008) also emphasizes that formative feedback should be information-rich, focused on the task, and usable for improvement. In writing classrooms, these principles are especially relevant because students need guidance not only to know that their writing is weak but also to understand why it is weak and how it can be revised.

Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) set out the principles most often cited in this literature, arguing that feedback improves learning only when it helps students close the gap between current and desired performance themselves, and Evans (2013) reviews the higher education evidence and finds that students and teachers frequently disagree about whether feedback has even been given. Hyland and Hyland (2006) make the parallel argument for second language writing, showing that feedback operates through the relationship between

reader and writer rather than as information transfer alone. Graham and Perin (2007) provide the wider instructional context in their meta-analysis, which places explicit strategy instruction ahead of correction as a lever on writing quality.

In second language writing research, teacher feedback has been discussed through several overlapping traditions. The first tradition focuses on written corrective feedback, particularly whether feedback on linguistic errors improves grammatical accuracy. Studies by Bitchener (2008), Ellis, Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, and Takashima (2008), Bitchener and Knoch (2010), and Van Beuningen, De Jong, and Kuiken (2012) show that corrective feedback can support L2 accuracy when feedback is sufficiently clear and learners are given opportunities to process it. The second tradition focuses on teacher commentary and revision. Ferris (1997) showed that teacher comments can influence student revision, especially when comments are text-specific and comprehensible. The third tradition focuses on feedback literacy and learner engagement, arguing that feedback improves learning only when students understand, value, and use it (Carless & Boud, 2018; Winstone et al., 2017).

Despite strong theoretical support, the role of teacher feedback remains complex and contested. Truscott (1996, 2007) questioned the value of grammar correction and argued that error correction may be ineffective or harmful when it overloads learners. In contrast, Ferris (2010) and Kang and Han (2015) argue that written corrective feedback can be useful when research design, learner variables, feedback type, and instructional context are considered carefully. This debate suggests that the key issue is not whether teacher feedback should be used, but how feedback should be designed, delivered, and integrated into writing instruction.

In many EFL classrooms, teacher feedback is still dominated by correction of grammar and mechanics. Students often receive marked papers with symbols, underlines, scores, or brief comments such as good, unclear, revise, or grammar problem. Such feedback may alert students to problems, but it may not help them revise effectively if the comments are too general, excessive, delayed, or disconnected from learning objectives. Students may also become passive recipients of feedback, waiting for teachers to correct their work instead of developing the ability to monitor and improve their own writing.

This article addresses the need to reconceptualize teacher feedback as a formative scaffold for writing development. Instead of treating feedback as the final stage after writing, feedback should be embedded in the writing cycle: planning, drafting, responding, revising, editing, and reflecting. The article aims to synthesize international research on

teacher feedback and explain how it contributes to students' writing performance in EFL classrooms. The guiding question is: What roles does teacher feedback play in improving students' writing performance, and what conditions make feedback pedagogically effective?

B. Method

This article employed a structured narrative review and pedagogical synthesis. This design was selected because the purpose of the study was not to calculate a pooled statistical effect, as in a meta-analysis, but to interpret and organize major theoretical and empirical findings on teacher feedback and students' writing performance. A narrative review is appropriate when the topic involves different research traditions, methodological designs, learner populations, and classroom contexts.

The review focused on peer-reviewed international publications related to teacher feedback, written corrective feedback, formative feedback, learner engagement, feedback literacy, revision, and L2 writing performance. The literature was selected using four inclusion criteria. First, the publication discussed feedback in writing or assessment contexts. Second, the study was relevant to EFL, ESL, L2 writing, or higher-level writing instruction. Third, the publication appeared in a reputable international journal or academic publisher. Fourth, the source contributed directly to the conceptual or pedagogical explanation of how feedback affects writing performance.

The main journals represented in the synthesis include *TESOL Quarterly*, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *Language Learning*, *System*, *Applied Linguistics*, *Language Teaching*, *ELT Journal*, *Modern Language Journal*, *Studies in Higher Education*, *Review of Educational Research*, *Educational Psychologist*, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, and *Assessing Writing*. These publication outlets were selected because they are widely used in international scholarship on language education, writing pedagogy, and educational assessment.

The analytical procedure involved three stages. First, studies were read to identify how teacher feedback was conceptualized, including feedback as correction, response, formative assessment, dialogue, scaffolding, and learner engagement. Second, findings were categorized according to the writing dimensions affected by feedback: linguistic accuracy, content development, organization, genre awareness, revision quality, and learner autonomy. Third, the categories were synthesized into pedagogical roles and implementation principles for EFL writing classrooms.

The trustworthiness of the synthesis was maintained through source triangulation across theoretical papers, empirical studies, review articles, and meta-analyses. The synthesis did not treat all feedback studies as having identical implications. Instead, it considered differences in learner proficiency, feedback type, instructional timing, genre, revision requirement, and classroom context. This approach allowed the article to present a balanced view of teacher feedback as a potentially powerful but context-sensitive support for writing development.

The review procedure was documented so that it can be audited. Searches were run in Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, and Google Scholar between April and June 2025 using combinations of the terms teacher feedback, written corrective feedback, feedback literacy, student engagement with feedback, and second language writing, with no lower date limit. The searches returned 356 records, reduced to 104 after duplicates were removed and abstracts screened, and to 41 after full-text assessment against the inclusion criteria. Two authors applied the criteria independently to a 30% sample, producing a Cohen's kappa of 0.85, and disagreements were resolved through discussion. Each included study was appraised for the clarity of its feedback description, the presence of a comparison condition, and the transparency of its outcome reporting, and studies reporting only learner preference without a writing outcome were retained for the discussion of perceptions but excluded from claims about writing development.

C. Finding and Discussion

1. Finding

The synthesis identified five major roles of teacher feedback in improving students' writing performance: diagnostic, corrective, developmental, dialogic, and self-regulatory roles. These roles are interrelated and should not be implemented separately. Effective feedback begins by diagnosing writing problems, continues by guiding revision, and gradually supports students to become more independent writers.

Table 1 Major Roles of Teacher Feedback in Writing Instruction

Role of Feedback	Main Function	Writing Dimension Supported
Diagnostic role	Identifies gaps between current writing and expected criteria	Task understanding, genre awareness, self-monitoring
Corrective role	Helps students notice and revise linguistic errors	Grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, accuracy
Developmenta	Guides improvement of ideas,	Content, paragraphing,

l role	organization, and coherence	cohesion, argument
Dialogic role	Creates interaction between teacher and student about writing choices	Revision reasoning, writer awareness, motivation
Self-regulatory role	Encourages students to use feedback for future writing independently	Autonomy, feedback literacy, strategy use

Source: Synthesized from reviewed literature.

The diagnostic role of teacher feedback is foundational because students cannot improve writing performance without understanding the nature of their problems. Feedback helps students see the distance between their current draft and the expected standard. In this role, teacher feedback functions as information about performance, not merely as judgment. Criterion-referenced comments, rubric-based notes, and targeted questions can make writing expectations visible. For example, when a teacher explains that a paragraph lacks a controlling idea or that evidence does not support the claim, students receive information that can guide revision more precisely than a general score.

The corrective role of feedback is most visible in written corrective feedback research. Corrective feedback can be direct, indirect, focused, unfocused, metalinguistic, coded, or uncoded (Ellis, 2009). Direct feedback provides the correct form, while indirect feedback signals an error without giving the answer. Focused feedback targets selected error categories, while unfocused feedback addresses many types of errors. The reviewed studies suggest that corrective feedback can improve grammatical accuracy, especially when it is clear, manageable, and connected to revision. However, correction is less effective when students receive too many marks without explanation or when they are not required to revise.

The developmental role of teacher feedback concerns higher-order aspects of writing, including content, organization, coherence, genre, argument, and reader awareness. Many students need feedback that goes beyond sentence-level accuracy. They need to know whether their ideas are sufficiently developed, whether paragraphs are logically sequenced, whether transitions are effective, and whether the text meets genre expectations. Teacher comments that ask students to clarify claims, add evidence, reorganize paragraphs, or strengthen conclusions can help improve overall writing quality. This role is important because grammatically accurate writing is not necessarily effective writing.

The dialogic role of feedback emphasizes interaction. Feedback becomes more effective when students can ask questions, negotiate meanings, and clarify teacher comments. Written comments alone may

be misunderstood if students lack the language or assessment knowledge to interpret them. Teacher-student conferences, short oral explanations, peer discussion of teacher comments, and revision planning sessions can transform feedback from one-way correction into a learning dialogue. Dialogic feedback also helps teachers understand how students interpret comments and what additional support they need.

The self-regulatory role of teacher feedback is increasingly important in contemporary writing pedagogy. The ultimate goal of feedback is not to make students dependent on teachers but to help them develop the ability to evaluate and revise their own writing. Feedback supports self-regulation when it prompts students to compare drafts with criteria, identify recurring errors, plan revision priorities, and apply learned strategies in new writing tasks. This role is closely related to feedback literacy, which refers to students' ability to understand, value, and use feedback productively.

Table 2 Conditions that Strengthen the Effectiveness of Teacher Feedback

Condition	Explanation	Pedagogical Implication
Specificity	Feedback identifies exact strengths, weaknesses, and revision needs.	Avoid vague comments such as unclear or revise without explanation.
Manageability	Feedback is limited to priorities that students can process.	Focus on selected language or content problems.
Timeliness	Feedback is provided while revision is still possible.	Use feedback before final grading whenever possible.
Revision requirement	Students act on feedback through rewriting.	Require revision logs, second drafts, or reflection notes.
Dialogue	Students can clarify feedback and discuss revision choices.	Use short conferences or guided feedback review.
Feedback literacy	Students learn how to interpret and use feedback.	Teach students to read comments, prioritize changes, and monitor progress.

Source: Synthesized from reviewed literature.

2. Discussion

The findings confirm that teacher feedback improves writing performance when it operates as formative support rather than terminal correction. In many classrooms, feedback is given after the writing task is completed and is attached to a grade. Such feedback may have limited learning value because students have little reason or opportunity to use it. In contrast, formative feedback is integrated into the writing process and is followed by revision. This confirms the principle that feedback becomes powerful when it informs students

about their current performance and enables action toward improvement.

The first implication is that feedback should be aligned with writing objectives. If the learning objective is to write an argumentative paragraph, feedback should address claim clarity, evidence, reasoning, coherence, and audience awareness, not only grammar. If the objective is to improve accuracy in past tense use, feedback may focus on relevant grammatical forms. Alignment prevents feedback from becoming random correction. It also helps students understand why a comment matters for the specific writing task.

The second implication is that feedback must be selective. Teachers often feel responsible for correcting every error in students' writing. However, excessive feedback may overwhelm students and reduce their ability to revise meaningfully. Selective feedback helps teachers prioritize problems that are most relevant to learning goals and student proficiency. For lower-proficiency writers, feedback may focus on sentence boundaries, verb forms, and basic paragraph organization. For more advanced writers, feedback may address argument structure, coherence, academic style, and source integration.

The third implication is that corrective feedback should be connected to learning, not merely editing. Direct correction may be useful when errors are beyond students' current ability or when time is limited. Indirect feedback may be useful when students are able to self-correct and need to develop editing awareness. Metalinguistic feedback can help students understand why an error occurs. Therefore, no single type of feedback is universally best. The effectiveness of feedback depends on the match between feedback type, learner readiness, task complexity, and revision opportunity.

The fourth implication is that teacher feedback should address both local and global dimensions of writing. Local feedback concerns grammar, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, and mechanics. Global feedback concerns content, organization, coherence, purpose, genre, and audience. If teachers focus only on local errors, students may revise sentences without improving the quality of ideas. If teachers focus only on content and ignore recurring language problems, students may continue producing inaccurate texts. A balanced approach is needed, although not all dimensions should be addressed in the same draft.

The fifth implication concerns learner engagement. Feedback does not improve writing simply because teachers provide it. Students must read, interpret, accept, question, and apply feedback. Some students

may ignore comments because they do not understand them, feel discouraged, or see feedback only as justification for grades. Therefore, teachers need to design activities that require students to engage with feedback. Revision plans, feedback logs, error analysis charts, and reflective notes can help students transform comments into learning actions.

The sixth implication is that feedback should promote feedback literacy. Students need explicit instruction on how to use teacher comments. They should learn to distinguish between content feedback and language feedback, identify high-priority revisions, ask clarification questions, and transfer feedback from one task to another. Feedback literacy also includes affective dimensions. Students need to understand that feedback is not a sign of failure but a resource for improving writing. This is particularly important in EFL classrooms where students may feel anxious about negative comments on language accuracy.

The seventh implication is that teacher feedback practices must consider workload. High-quality feedback requires time, especially in large classes. Teachers may use strategies such as focused marking, rubrics, comment banks, audio feedback, peer review before teacher feedback, and staged feedback. However, efficiency should not reduce feedback to generic comments. A practical approach is to combine brief text-specific comments with class-level feedback on common problems. This allows teachers to address individual needs and shared writing difficulties simultaneously.

The synthesis also shows that feedback should be embedded within a process writing pedagogy. A feedback cycle may include pre-writing criteria explanation, first draft submission, teacher response, feedback discussion, revision planning, second draft submission, and reflection. This cycle positions writing as development rather than one-time performance. Students learn that good writing emerges through drafting and revision, not through immediate correctness.

There are several challenges in implementing effective teacher feedback. First, students may depend too heavily on teachers if feedback always provides answers. Second, students may resist feedback when they perceive comments as criticism. Third, teachers may focus heavily on grammar because it is easier to mark than content or organization. Fourth, large classes may reduce the amount of individualized response. Fifth, feedback may not lead to improvement if assessment systems value final scores more than revision processes. These challenges suggest that teacher feedback should be supported by institutional assessment policies, writing rubrics, and classroom routines that value revision.

In Indonesian EFL classrooms, teacher feedback has strong potential because students often need explicit support in both language accuracy and text organization. However, feedback should be culturally and pedagogically sensitive. Some students may be reluctant to question teacher comments, so teachers need to create safe opportunities for clarification. Feedback can be delivered through written annotations, short conferences, digital platforms, or group feedback sessions. What matters is not the medium itself but whether the feedback is understandable, actionable, and connected to revision.

Overall, teacher feedback plays a decisive role in improving students' writing performance when it functions as a scaffold. It helps students notice errors, understand writing criteria, revise ideas, reorganize texts, and become more strategic writers. The strongest feedback practice is not the most detailed correction but the one that helps students move from teacher-dependent revision toward independent control of writing quality.

Comparison with Previous Studies

The written corrective feedback debate has produced a large and unusually consistent body of evidence. Chandler (2003) and Ashwell (2000) examined which forms and sequences of teacher response produced accuracy gains, and Sheen (2007) showed that focused feedback on a single structure outperformed unfocused correction. Bitchener and Knoch (2010a, 2010b) extended this to longer time frames and to advanced writers, demonstrating that gains from targeted written correction persist over ten months. Sachs and Polio (2007) compared feedback types and found that the learner's processing of the feedback mattered more than its form. The two meta-analyses by Li (2010) and Li and Vuono (2019) confirm a positive overall effect across twenty-five years of research while noting that effects vary substantially with target structure, timing, and learner proficiency.

More recent work has shifted attention from the feedback itself to what learners do with it. Zhang and Hyland (2018, 2022) show that student engagement with feedback, understood as the combination of behavioural, cognitive, and affective response, predicts uptake better than the quantity or accuracy of the comments provided, and that engagement can be fostered deliberately through an integrated approach. Ene and Upton (2014) document the same pattern for electronic feedback, where learners acted on comments they understood and ignored those they did not. Lee (2008) adds the institutional dimension, showing that teachers' feedback practices are

shaped by examination pressure and school policy as much as by their beliefs about what helps students learn.

Theoretical and Pedagogical Implications

Theoretically, the synthesis indicates that the long-running debate about whether written corrective feedback works has been framed too narrowly. The studies reporting null or weak effects and those reporting durable gains differ less in the feedback provided than in what learners were required to do with it. Where revision was mandatory and the learner had to account for each change, gains appeared and persisted; where feedback was returned with a grade at the end of a cycle, it did not. This shifts the theoretical question from the properties of feedback to the conditions of uptake, which is the direction the engagement and feedback-literacy literature has taken.

Pedagogically, three implications follow. First, feedback should be scheduled before a revision opportunity rather than after a final submission, since feedback with nothing left to revise cannot function as feedback. Second, teachers should focus rather than scatter: the reviewed evidence favours targeted comment on a small number of features over comprehensive correction, which learners rarely process in full. Third, students need to be taught how to read feedback. The reviewed studies repeatedly found that learners misinterpreted or ignored comments they did not understand, and that a short explicit induction into the teacher's commenting conventions changed this substantially.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This review has several limitations. First, it is a structured narrative review and does not quantify the effects it describes; the two available meta-analyses are drawn on but not recomputed. Second, the reviewed studies use markedly different outcome measures, from accuracy on a single structure to holistic writing quality, which limits comparability. Third, the search was restricted to sources in English and Indonesian. Fourth, most reviewed studies were conducted in university settings, so their transfer to secondary classrooms is an inference rather than a finding. Future research could conduct a meta-analysis with revision requirement as a moderator, test feedback-literacy induction experimentally, examine feedback practices in school settings, and follow learners across several assignment cycles to observe how uptake changes with experience.

D. Conclusion

This article examined the role of teacher feedback in improving students' writing performance in EFL classrooms through a structured narrative review and pedagogical synthesis. The findings indicate that teacher feedback contributes to writing development through five interrelated roles: diagnostic, corrective, developmental, dialogic, and self-regulatory. Feedback helps students identify writing problems, improve linguistic accuracy, develop ideas and organization, revise drafts, and gradually build autonomy as writers. However, feedback is not automatically effective. It becomes pedagogically powerful when it is specific, manageable, timely, criterion-referenced, dialogic, and followed by revision. The synthesis also shows that feedback should address both local and global dimensions of writing and should be integrated into a process writing cycle. The article concludes that teacher feedback should be understood not merely as error correction but as a formative scaffold that connects assessment, instruction, revision, and learner agency. Future studies should examine classroom-based feedback interventions in Indonesian EFL contexts, compare different forms of teacher feedback, and investigate how students' feedback literacy affects their writing improvement over time.

Declaration of AI-Assisted Technologies

In preparing this manuscript, the authors used AI-assisted tools only to improve English language quality, grammar, readability, sentence clarity, and academic expression. The AI tools were not used to generate research data, conduct data analysis, produce findings, or draw conclusions. All conceptual arguments, data interpretation, methodological decisions, and scholarly conclusions remain the full responsibility of the authors. The authors carefully reviewed, edited, and verified all AI-assisted outputs to ensure the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the final manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Bibliography

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 227-257. doi: 10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00027-8

- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102-118. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010a). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 193-214. doi: 10.1093/applin/amp016
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010b). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207-217. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2010.10.002
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315-1325. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), 267-296. doi: 10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97-107. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccn023
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36(3), 353-371. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001
- Ene, E., & Upton, T. A. (2014). Learner uptake of teacher electronic feedback in ESL composition. *System*, 46, 80-95. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2014.07.011
- Evans, C. (2013). Making sense of assessment feedback in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(1), 70-120. doi: 10.3102/0034654312474350
- Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339. doi: 10.2307/3588049
- Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 181-201. doi: 10.1017/S0272263109990490
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3), 445-476. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.445
- Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 31-44. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.002
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. doi: 10.3102/003465430298487
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83-101. doi: 10.1017/S0261444806003399
- Kang, E. Y., & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta-analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(1), 1-18. doi: 10.1111/modl.12189

- Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 69-85. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2007.10.001
- Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309-365. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x
- Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System*, 84, 93-109. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006
- Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218. doi: 10.1080/03075070600572090
- Sachs, R., & Polio, C. (2007). Learners' uses of two types of written feedback on an L2 writing revision task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 29(1), 67-100. doi: 10.1017/S0272263107070039
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255-283. doi: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153-189. doi: 10.3102/0034654307313795
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(4), 255-272. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2007.06.003
- Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning*, 62(1), 1-41. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00674.x
- Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Parker, M., & Rowntree, J. (2017). Supporting learners' agentic engagement with feedback: A systematic review and a taxonomy of recipience processes. *Educational Psychologist*, 52(1), 17-37. doi: 10.1080/00461520.2016.1207538
- Zhang, Z. V., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 36, 90-102. doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004
- Zhang, Z. V., & Hyland, K. (2022). Fostering student engagement with feedback: An integrated approach. *Assessing Writing*, 51, 100586. doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2021.100586