




## EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Written Corrective Feedback in Responding to Students' Senior Essay Report Writing

Gebreslassie Gebremichael Gebrihans<sup>1\*</sup> 

Aksum University, Ethiopia

Received : July 10, 2025

Revised : August 17, 2025

Accepted : September 28, 2025

Online : September 30, 2025

### Abstract

This study mainly focuses on exploring EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of written corrective feedback in responding to students' senior essay report writing at Aksum University, Ethiopia. Using a qualitative exploratory case study design, this study examines the teachers' pedagogical beliefs, the strategies they use, the alignment between the teachers' beliefs and practices, and the challenges they experience in responding to students' written activities. Besides, the study is guided by a socio-cultural theoretical framework. Subsequently, findings reveal that EFL teachers recognize the value of written corrective feedback and believe that detailed and comprehensive feedback should be given constructively. However, practically, because of time limitations, large class size, and less engagement of students, they often focus on selective and indirect feedback strategies. In addition, the key challenges identified in this study include teachers' uncertainty about the effective feedback provision strategies, lack of students' engagement in the feedback process, and inadequate feedback-based training. As a result, the study indicates that the external contextual constraints and those teacher-student related issues should be addressed so as to improve the practices of feedback provisions. Furthermore, findings of the study refine the existing theoretical debates about teachers' beliefs and their actual practices in the feedback process and the controversies in the written feedback literature. Finally, it is recommended that teachers should be given professional training, ensure students' active participation in the feedback process, and policy-level intervention is needed to standardize written corrective feedback practices.

**Keywords:** *EFL Writing, Written Corrective Feedback, Feedback Strategies, Teachers' Beliefs, Students' Engagement*

### INTRODUCTION

In the Ethiopian context, English is taught and learned as a foreign language, and because of the influence of the language in the academic and non-academic world, it becomes necessary for many Ethiopians to have a good command of English to satisfy the growing needs of their daily lives. In connection to the dominant role of English in academia, writing skills in English are an essential part of students' academic development, but it is often a challenging skill for students to master, especially in a foreign language context where students are limited to learn and practicing writing in the classroom situations. Besides, [Leki \(2007\)](#) states that writing in English as a foreign language context is challenging and appears to be a difficult skill to master. In addition, [Nunan \(2015\)](#) states that among the four English skills, writing is deemed the most challenging skill to master, which may stem from its complicated process of generating ideas and skillfully transferring them into written texts. However, students' all-round writing is meaningful if teachers are supportive and give timely and constructive written corrective feedback in response to the students' written activities. However, [Italo \(1999\)](#), who is one of the local researchers in the area, reported that there seems to be a general tendency amongst language teachers in Ethiopia to relegate writing activities to homework or avoid them altogether. Besides, Italo confirms that writing teachers in Ethiopia at



large tend to avoid giving written assignments to their students for fear of the amount of work and time involved in correcting students' writing because of the large number of students in a class. As a result, according to [Amlaku \(2013\)](#), Ethiopian graduate students are unable to write their own CVs and application letters for jobs in English. Hence, teachers' feedback to students' writing becomes undeniably a key component and a crucial part of the students' process of written activities, although it is the most time-consuming task for writing teachers ([Ferris, 2003](#)).

Furthermore, despite its value, written corrective feedback remains the most controversial yet interesting issue among the researchers, and the debate among scholars and researchers about the value of written corrective feedback in improving students' writing skills has been ongoing both in its theoretical and practical applications ([Chandler, 2003](#); [Ferris, 1999](#); [Truscott, 1996](#); [Truscott & Hsu, 2008](#)). The debate is intensified by [Truscott's \(1996\)](#) article, in which he called on teachers to stop applying written corrective feedback, considering it as unhelpful and potentially harmful. Consequently, Truscott's argument is confronted by many researchers who argue against him, defending that feedback could be effective. For example, [Ferris \(1999\)](#) claims that the evidence about the effectiveness of written corrective feedback in improving students' writing can be seen in the revision of their writing, and she argues that teachers should continue to provide corrective feedback because it is found useful.

In general, this study is designed to explore EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of written corrective feedback in students' senior essay report writing. As a result, this study could have theoretical and practical contributions to EFL pedagogy and feedback theory by refining the existing debates in written corrective feedback (WCF). For example, it could contribute to EFL pedagogy by providing logical evidence on how the interaction between teachers' beliefs and their actual feedback practices really works. Besides, the study might help to frame context-based pedagogical approaches that are applicable in real-world teaching settings. Moreover, the study enriches feedback theory by introducing a socio-cultural lens ([Vygotsky, 1987](#)) to scrutinize written corrective feedback as a mediation tool within the learners' zone of proximal development (ZPD). This study can also help extend theoretical and practical discussions by demonstrating the fact that teachers' practices are not only manifestations of their beliefs but also negotiated within institutional and contextual constraints. Those contextual mediation helps refine the ongoing theoretical debate between scholars like [Truscott \(1996\)](#) and [Ferris \(1999\)](#) by elaborating that the effectiveness of written corrective feedback is not a matter of absolute efficacy, but depends on ecological factors such as teacher training, student readiness, and institutional support.

### Statement of the Problem

Feedback in writing is considered an input that the writer receives from readers in the form of information that helps the writer revise and improve the written text, and can be provided in different ways, like in comments, questions, and suggestions ([Keh, 1990](#)). In connection to this, proponents of feedback like [Ferris \(2006\)](#) and [Lee \(2004\)](#) suggest that teachers should take the needs of their students into account when they think of providing written corrective feedback about students' writing. In addition, [Bitchener \(2012\)](#) and [Hyland & Hyland \(2006\)](#) explain that providing written corrective feedback on students' writing is one of the pedagogical practices of EFL teachers to assist the students in improving their writing skills and grammatical accuracy. Likewise, [Ferris \(2002\)](#) states that students should be provided with additional and adjusted intervention from their instructors in order to compensate for their limitations in writing and learn the strategies to help write correct and error-free written texts. [Lee \(2009\)](#) elaborates that teachers' beliefs and practices on the provision of written corrective feedback about the students' written texts have not received enough attention.

Moreover, Ferris et al. (2011) explore how college writing teachers perceive responses to students' writing by collecting data from an online survey, teachers' interviews, and students' texts. The findings showed that teachers value feedback and believe it is important, but they often feel frustrated and dissatisfied with their feedback practices because they feel that the feedback provision practice is not influencing students' learning progress. In connection to teachers' beliefs and practice in providing written corrective feedback, scholars like Wang (2011), Lee (2009), and Montgomery & Baker (2007) state that teachers' classroom practices do not always correspond to their beliefs. In addition, Hyland and Hyland (2006) asserted that feedback is impacted by teachers' beliefs and the institutions and cultures in which teachers work. Conversely, research on language pedagogy has demonstrated that teachers' practices are greatly affected by personal theories and beliefs (Borg, 2003). Furthermore, Borg states that teachers should plan their instruction in light of the beliefs they have about learning and teaching. Lee (2009) also argues that teachers' beliefs and practices play a pivotal role in the classroom because they directly affect students' learning of writing skills in particular and other skills in general. Therefore, uncovering teachers' beliefs and practices can help identify the factors affecting the provision of corrective feedback. As a result, this study aims to fill the gap by exploring EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of written corrective feedback on students' senior essay report writing in Aksum University, and the study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the EFL teachers' beliefs in responding to students' senior essay writing?
2. What strategies do EFL teachers use in providing written corrective feedback?
3. Is there congruence between the EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in providing written corrective feedback to students' senior essay report writing?
4. What are the students' reactions to teachers' practices of written corrective feedback?
5. What are the challenges impeding EFL teachers' practice of written corrective feedback?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Written Corrective Feedback

The idea of teachers' beliefs in feedback provision requires context-specific understanding and conceptualizations. According to Borg (2001), beliefs are often measured through self-reports that represent the perceptions, feelings, or emotions of participants. Likewise, in the present study, teachers' beliefs are taken as a set of assumptions, values, knowledge, feelings and attitudes that can be consciously held by writing teachers which are evaluative and can be expressed in the statement of what should be done and what is preferable in teaching writing in general and in giving written corrective feedback on students' writing in particular. In the process of teaching in general and writing skills and feedback provision in particular, studying the teachers' beliefs and practices is vital. In this context, researchers like Borg (2006) and Pajares (1992) recognized the importance of studying teachers' beliefs so as to improve teachers' professional development and practices. For example, Almarza (1996) states that teachers' beliefs influence what teachers do in the classroom, but teacher classroom practices are not always reflected in their stated beliefs. Some of the studies conducted on teacher beliefs and practice regarding written feedback show that teachers' practice does not necessarily reflect teacher beliefs (Lee, 2009). According to Adzhar et al. (2025), from a cross-cultural perspective, there are notable differences in teachers' beliefs about written corrective feedback in how feedback strategies are applied and perceived. Besides, Liu (2024) also indicates that research conducted in mainland China shows how environmental factors influence teachers' beliefs and practices regarding written corrective feedback provision. Furthermore, it is reported that the success of written corrective feedback depends not only on teachers' beliefs but also on how students respond to the feedback. For example, Al-Ahmadi and Khadawardi (2024) indicate that students may not always fully comprehend or value the feedback and this results in

misalignment between teachers' intentions and students' outcomes.

### **Strategies of Providing Written Corrective Feedback**

#### *Direct Written Corrective Feedback*

Direct corrective feedback is defined as the provision of the correct linguistic form or structure by the teachers around the linguistic error (Ferris, 2003, & Bitchener & Knoch, 2009). Direct correction is a strategy of providing feedback to students to help them correct their errors by inserting a missing word or crossing out the error and providing the correct linguistic structure of the target language (Ferris, 2006). Besides, it is usually practiced by teachers upon noticing a grammatical mistake by providing the correct answer or the expected response above or near the linguistic or grammatical error (Bitchener et al., 2005; Ferris, 2003). Direct corrective feedback aims to help students edit their writing and improve their performance in future tasks (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Ferris (2002) argues that it is useful in treating errors of prepositions and other issues of idiomatic lexis. Chandler (2003) also argues that direct feedback enables learners to internalize the correct form immediately and helps students produce the correct form in revising their writing. This study, however, is designed to explore whether EFL teachers practice direct corrective feedback as a strategy when they respond to their students' senior essay report writing.

#### *Indirect Written Corrective Feedback*

Indirect written corrective feedback is one of the widely used corrective feedback strategies by teachers to help students correct their errors by indicating an error without providing the correct form (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). In this strategy, instead of the teachers providing the target form, they mark the errors by underlining, circling, and highlighting, and the students are left to correct the problem that the feedback has drawn to their attention. In this regard, Ferris (2002) defines indirect feedback as indicating an error through circling, underlining, highlighting or otherwise marking it at its location in the margin of the text with an error code and asking students to mark corrections themselves. Besides, Bitchener & Knoch (2009) define indirect corrective feedback as indicating that an error has been made without explicit descriptions, and the teachers simply identify the error, but he or she does not provide the correct form, and students resolve their errors by themselves. In connection to this, Ferris (2003) states that assisting students with indirect feedback increases their engagement to discover the correct form, allows them to solve problems, and leads them to long-term learning improvement. Consequently, indirect corrective feedback is viewed as more clinical than direct feedback because it engages students in the correction activity and helps them reflect upon it and foster their long-term acquisition of the target language (Chandler, 2003; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Sheen et al., 2009).

Research evidence about the choice of direct and indirect corrective feedback (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Leki, 1991) states that students prefer indirect correction because they learn more from it than from direct feedback. For example, Chandler's (2003) study involving 31 ESL university undergraduate students shows that indirect feedback with underlining on students' errors is a preferred alternative to direct correction in a multiple-draft setting, as indirect feedback engages the students in the correction process and engages them more cognitively during the process. In contrast, Buckingham and Aktuğ-Ekinci's (2017) research has indicated that more indirect correction code symbols frequently triggered unsuccessful attempts at re-drafting for Turkish elementary and intermediate-level EFL students.

### **Metalinguistic Written Corrective Feedback**

According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), metalinguistic feedback is any information, questions, or remarks on how well a student's writing is constructed without specifically stating

the proper format. Ellis (2008) claims that metalinguistic written corrective feedback uses error codes and metalinguistic explanations to give students some kind of clear statement regarding the type of mistakes they have committed. As to Ellis, the precise location of the fault may or may not be indicated in metalinguistic explanations; students must first identify the error and then figure out how to fix it. In addition, Ellis elaborates that metalinguistic corrective feedback provides the students with some kind of metalinguistic clues, but it does not provide a direct correction. In addition, Sheen (2007) states that metalinguistic feedback is seen in terms of its explicitness and suggests that explicitness of feedback plays a fundamental role in helping students' writing development. Explicit corrective feedback occurs when a teacher provides feedback to students by not only indicating that an error exists, but also providing an explicit grammatical explanation in the form of corrective feedback (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010).

### **Reformulation Written Corrective Feedback**

Reformulation is another type of written corrective feedback strategy, which is the reworking of the students' entire text by native speakers without changing the contents of the original text. According to Sachs and Polio (2007), reformulation involves a native speaker reformulating a whole text while attempting to maintain the integrity of the meaning expressed by the writer. Yang & Zhang (2010) also state that reformulations can help learners identify linguistic inadequacies in their texts when they compare their writing with a more native-like version of the text. Furthermore, Hedge (2000) describes reformulation as a useful procedure, especially for students who have produced a first draft and are looking for additional possibilities for improvement. Students can compare the target model on their own to notice the differences. This strategy also provides a wide range of useful discussions on the development of ideas and the use of structure, vocabulary, and conjunctions. In general, reformulation is the reworking of the students' entire text to make the language seem as native-like as possible while keeping the content of the original work. In general, despite extensive research on different kinds of written corrective feedback strategies, the findings are debatable, and there is still no consensus on the type of written corrective feedback that would best enable EFL students to write effectively (Khadawardi, 2020).

### **Students' Reactions to Teachers' Corrective Feedback Practices**

As far as the students' reaction and their agreements about the teachers' practice of written corrective feedback are concerned, different studies revealed that there exist different opinions on the students' proficiency level of the target language. For example, according to Riazi (1997) and Leki (2006), advanced students consider their teachers' written corrective feedback as an effective tool that helps them improve specific disciplinary literacy. Conversely, less advanced students viewed teachers' written corrective feedback as a means of helping them get better grades and eventually pass the course (Zacharias, 2007). In connection to this, Hyland and Hyland (2006) explain that students tend mostly to view teachers' written corrective feedback as effective when it engages their thinking and when it is contextualized, considering students' individual needs. In connection with this, Hopper and Bowen's (2023) research findings indicated that if feedback is to be given, most students prefer comprehensive written corrective feedback.

### **Challenges in Providing Written Corrective Feedback**

The challenges that prevent teachers from enacting their beliefs into their actual practices in providing written corrective feedback are diverse, which include the context, the teachers, and the students themselves. For example, in relation to institutional context, Gahin (2001) states that large class sizes, heavy teaching loads, insufficient instruction time, and scheduling are some of the challenges. In addition, Lee (2013) states that giving written corrective feedback is a difficult task



for EFL teachers as it requires hard work and time, and gives teachers extra pressure when they face other challenges like heavy workloads. Besides, teachers' beliefs and practices are influenced not only by the teachers' past learning experiences at school, but also by their teaching experiences and training. Concerning lack of training, many researchers like [Lee \(2008\)](#) and [Ferris et al. \(2011\)](#) found that the fact that teachers had not attended any training sessions, seminars, and workshops on writing instruction and giving written corrective feedback on students' writing was an issue that has also influenced the way they responded to their students' texts. Furthermore, [Zaman and Azad \(2012\)](#) state that teachers complain that students do not always value feedback, and they do not pay attention to it. They further explain that some students expect teachers to spoon-feed them and solve all their language problems, and they do not realize that language learning is a skill.

### **Theoretical Framework of the Study**

The theoretical framework guides the researcher in driving the research process by providing a framework of understanding to enhance the trustworthiness of the research. Therefore, this study aligns with socio-cultural theory, which is built on the work of [Vygotsky \(1987\)](#). According to Vygotsky, people do not evolve into social creatures; rather, they develop into individuals through the social experiences they encounter, and writing becomes an act of co-constructed meaning because of social interaction. Hence, Vygotsky explains that teaching and learning in the zone of proximal development (ZPD) is dependent on social interaction and the feedback process that students and teachers interact in giving and receiving comments on students' writing drafts in an attempt to improve the students' writing accuracy. In general, in socio-cultural theory, feedback as ZPD demands the practice of social interaction, scaffolding, mediation, and internalization between teachers and students in helping them produce quality written text. At that level of writing ability, the students appear to have exceeded their actual development and can find their potential development with the help of their teachers in the process of corrective feedback provision towards the zone of proximal development. As a result, this study is theoretically framed under socio-cultural theory in an attempt to explore ELF teachers' beliefs and practices of written corrective feedback provision on students' senior essay report writing.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

### **Research Paradigm**

In conducting a research paper, deciding on a research paradigm that underpins the study is very important because the methodological process is highly influenced by the researcher's worldview (Paradigm) about the nature of reality, values, and the way knowledge is studied and interpreted. Therefore, this study revolves around EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of written corrective feedback on students' senior essay report writing. To this end, the researcher believes that the experiences of English language teachers of this study could be constructed into knowledge through interpretations and reflections of the teachers' beliefs and practices in the provision of written corrective feedback. As a result, in this research, the researcher used the constructivist paradigm in order to address the issue of EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of written corrective feedback in responding to students' writing.

### **The Research Design**

In selecting a research design, researchers need to develop a conceptual framework for the research methodology, either to make it a quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods approach ([Creswell, 2003](#)). In this case, the main purpose of this study is to explore EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in providing written corrective feedback on students' senior essay report writing, and the nature of the study suits an exploratory case study research design. As a result, an exploratory case

study research design, which is a qualitative research approach, was employed in exploring teachers' beliefs and practices about the written corrective feedback during data collection and analysis processes. Thus, qualitative research has become a crucial approach in understanding social phenomena and human behavior in depth (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

### **The Study Area**

The research setting of this study was in Aksum University, which is located in the regional state of Tigray, Aksum town, Ethiopia. The reason why that study area is chosen is because the researcher believes that the issue of EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in providing written corrective feedback on the students' senior essay report writing has not been addressed so far, to the researcher's knowledge. These phenomenological experiences of the researcher become the driving force to explore the teachers' beliefs and practices in responding to students' senior essay report writing in that particular study area.

### **The Study Participants**

The study subjects of this work were EFL teachers who were advising graduating class students' senior essay report writing, and graduating class English language major students of Aksum University who were writing their senior essay reports during the time of study.

### **The Sampling Techniques**

In this study, the interview participants of EFL teachers (5) who are advising graduating class students were selected purposively from the rest of the English language teachers in the department. With regards to the teachers-student conference about corrective feedback provision, convenience sampling was employed because this allows the researcher to choose the nearest individuals due to its accessibility and feasibility. Besides, the participants of the stimulated recall discussion were selected purposely from the other teachers because those participants are EFL teachers who participated in the teacher-student conference. With the focus group discussion (FGD), all the available graduating class English language major students (15) were part of the discussion. As far as the selection of teachers' commented students' senior essay report writing is concerned, the papers collected for analysis concerning written corrective feedback were selected using judgment sampling because the number of papers was equivalent to the number of advisors who are advising senior essays of the graduating class students. The reason why the researcher is keen to focus only on those small sample sizes was that the study mainly aims to explore EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of written corrective feedback in responding to students' senior essay report writing in one particular group. Hence, there were 15 4<sup>th</sup> year graduating class English language students, and only five (5) teachers were assigned to advise that particular batch of students in their senior essay report writing. As a result, the researcher believes that adequate data is obtained from the participants and the issue of data saturation is addressed.

### **Data Collection Instruments**

In this research, a variety of qualitative data collection methods and procedures were employed. For that reason, the researcher utilized five instruments to obtain reliable and rich data from various sources of qualitative data. The instruments of data collection employed in an attempt to provide a more complete picture of EFL teachers' beliefs and practice of written corrective feedback are teachers' interviews, teacher-student conferences, stimulated recall discussion, focus group discussion, and teachers' written commentary on students' senior essay report writing. In conducting research, it is essential to ensure the trustworthiness of the study by addressing the validity and reliability of the study. The issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research

correspond to the criteria of truthfulness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). According to Denzin & Lincoln (2000), in a qualitative study, the key factors to ensure trustworthiness are credibility, transferability, dependability, and conformability. As to Lincoln and Guba, credibility needs to show evidence of lengthy engagement in the field, and it can be achieved depending on the richness and accuracy of the data, rather than the amount of gathered data. As a result, in this study, the researcher triangulated the data obtained from the different data sources to reduce the researcher's bias and enhance the validity and reliability of the information. In general, as this study is pure qualitative in nature, in the process, the researcher gave due attention to trustworthiness and exerted huge effort to ensure the credibility, transferability, dependability, and conformability so as to maintain validity and reliability of the study.

### Techniques of Data Analysis

In this qualitative research, data analysis was conducted inductively within a constructivist paradigm based on emerging themes, concepts, and categories. In this study, the qualitative data from teachers' interviews, teacher-student conference, stimulated recall discussion, students' FGDs and teachers' written commentary were analyzed qualitatively using Creswell's (2012) systematic design of grounded theory. Besides, Creswell and Poth (2018) state that grounded theory is a method that aims to build theories based on data obtained from the field, rather than relying on pre-existing theories. As to Creswell and Poth (2018), this approach provides researchers the opportunity to deeply explore these dynamics without the limitations of pre-established theoretical frameworks. Then, the data obtained through the five instruments were triangulated to reduce the effect of researcher bias and increase the validity of the findings.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Discussion

**Table 1.** Demographic information of the Participants

Teacher Participants				Student Participants			
Teachers' Code	Academic Rank	Specialization	Teaching experience	Students' Code	Sex and	Department	Year level
Tr. <sub>1</sub> (M)	MA	TEFL	18 Years	S <sub>1</sub> (F)	S <sub>8</sub> (M)	English	4 <sup>th</sup> Year
Tr. <sub>2</sub> (M)	MA	Literature	20 Years	S <sub>2</sub> (M)	S <sub>9</sub> (M)	English	4 <sup>th</sup> Year
Tr. <sub>3</sub> (M)	PhD	Linguistics	18 Years	S <sub>3</sub> (M)	S <sub>10</sub> (F)	English	4 <sup>th</sup> Year
Tr. <sub>4</sub> (F)	MA	TEFL	15 Years	S <sub>4</sub> (F)	S <sub>11</sub> (F)	English	4 <sup>th</sup> Year
Tr. <sub>5</sub> (M)	PhD	TEFL	30 Years	S <sub>5</sub> (M)	S <sub>12</sub> (M)	English	4 <sup>th</sup> Year
				S <sub>6</sub> (M)	S <sub>13</sub> (M)	English	4 <sup>th</sup> Year
				S <sub>7</sub> (M)	S <sub>14</sub> (F)	English	4 <sup>th</sup> Year
					S <sub>15</sub> (M)	English	4 <sup>th</sup> Year

The above table provides demographic information about teachers and students involved in the study. The researcher believes that this demographic information of the study participants is



useful for understanding the background of the respondents in the study. In general, the data highlights a group of highly experienced five (5) male and female EFL teachers with diverse academic ranks (MA and PhD holders) and specializations like literature, linguistics, and TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language). With regards to the student participants, fifteen (15) males and females graduating class English language students were part of the study.

### **Teachers' Beliefs**

To begin with, the EFL teachers' beliefs towards provisions written corrective feedback, most of the teacher participants expressed their strong beliefs about the importance of providing written corrective feedback to students' senior essays and report writing. Besides, the EFL teacher participants believe that the students should be provided with clear and constructive written corrective feedback to help students understand and internalize the given corrections. The teacher participants also believe that the written corrective feedback given to the students' senior essay report writing should be comprehensive and motivating to the students. In connection to this, studies indicate that addressing all errors at once can demotivate learners and reduce the effectiveness of corrections (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009). In addition, the teacher participants recognize the importance of written corrective feedback, stating that written corrective feedback is not a one-way transmission, but an interactive process where students engage in feedback and ask for clarification. Furthermore, with regard to their beliefs, some of the EFL teacher participants explain that despite the efforts they made, there is some resistance from the students to feedback, and this is causing some students to ignore or misunderstand the given feedback, which finally leads them to repeat the errors. Despite the resistance, the EFL teachers still believe that if students are not given detailed feedback explicitly, they will repeat the same mistakes in future assignments. In contrast, a few teacher participants reflected that the students' resistance to their feedback led them to be uncertain over the effectiveness of their feedback, and they questioned whether their feedback was effective or not. In general, regardless of the diverse challenges, the teacher participants have positive feelings towards the provision of written corrective feedback. For example, in response to the teachers' view of written corrective feedback, one of the teacher participants (Tr 1) explained his view as:

*"I encourage my students to react to my feedback, and I ask that they edit their work and explain how they corrected the faults. This technique allows me to determine whether they understood my comments. In addition, I allow students to ask me questions if they do not understand my comments, and I occasionally have a one-on-one discussion about their work in further detail. However, I realized that my students are not editing their work or addressing the mistakes, and they do not want to discuss their errors, which is becoming an issue for me to investigate."*

### **Feedback Strategies**

With regards to the strategies EFL teachers use in providing written corrective feedback to students' senior essay report writing, many of the teachers are seen writing their comments around the margin and general comments at the end. Besides, there are a lot of comments given in the form of underlining, circling, and coding too. This shows that the EFL teachers predominantly use indirect feedback as a strategy while responding to the students' writing. Unlike their beliefs, practically all EFL teachers are found to highlight errors without providing corrections, requiring students to self-edit. In relation to this, researches indicate that indirect feedback is more effective for advanced learners who possess the linguistic knowledge to self-correct (Ferris, 2006). In this regard, one of the teacher participants (Tr. 4) reflected her view as follows:

*"I prefer to provide indirect feedback such as underlining and circling the errors since it encourages students to think critically and make self-correct. Besides, indirect feedback increases learner autonomy and helps students build problem-solving skills in writing. Furthermore, I sometimes worry that providing too many critical comments could devastate learners and may discourage them from writing. Consequently, I always make efforts to maintain a balance of my feedback provision by focusing on major errors rather than commenting on every single mistake."*

Nevertheless, some teachers avoid it due to concerns that students may struggle to identify and correct errors accurately, and this could lead to frustration (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). In addition, the analysis of the teachers' written commentary on the students' written work showed that EFL teachers rarely use direct feedback because they do not see the need to supply the correct form of the errors explicitly. In this regard, researchers like Chandler (2003) indicate that direct feedback may hinder long-term grammatical development by reducing opportunities for students' engagement. Furthermore, the EFL teacher participants are observed using a metalinguistic feedback providing grammatical codes or explanations and reformulation feedback, asking students to rewrite sentences that lack clarity.

### **Alignment of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices**

As far as the association between the EFL teacher participants' beliefs and their practices of written corrective feedback is concerned, it is found that there is a significant incongruence between their beliefs and practices when providing written corrective feedback (WCF) on students' senior essay reports. For example, almost all of the teacher participants believe in the provision of comprehensive feedback that addresses all errors to improve students' writing accuracy, but practically, they stick to selective feedback due to time constraints and workload pressures. In connection to this, Hyland and Hyland (2006) state that teachers prefer to provide detailed feedback, but the focus on a certain type of errors to manage their load, and this could bring a mismatch between their beliefs and their actual practices. Such disparity shows that teacher face challenges in balancing pedagogical approaches with their practical classroom implementations. Another factor contributing to the teachers' incongruence is their uncertainty about the most effective written corrective strategies. In connection to this, for example, Ellis (2009) states that indirect feedback promotes long-term learning by encouraging self-correction, and in the study, the EFL teachers are found to give indirect feedback to their students practically. However, during the interview sessions, most of the participants illustrated that students should be provided with detailed and explicit feedback so as to protect against fossilization of errors because they believe that most of the students are not good at self-editing. In addition, Bitchener and Ferris (2012) argue that institutional expectations and students' demands for explicit corrections often pressure teachers into adopting practices that contradict their pedagogical beliefs. Furthermore, as to the participants' contextual factors, such as large class sizes, workloads, and the students' readiness, they also exacerbate the gap between beliefs and practices in the study area. For example, Zheng and Yu (2018) explain that many teachers believe in the value of individualized and interactive feedback, but they end up providing product-oriented comments because of time limitations.

### **Students' Reaction to Teachers' Feedback**

Coming to the reactions of the students towards the teachers' written corrective feedback, most of the student participants elaborate that they feel frustrated when the written corrective feedback is overly critical or lacks clarity, because they believe it leads them to discouragement rather than improvement. In connection to this, Hyland and Hyland (2006) found that learners

often perceive excessive error correction as devastating, especially when teachers focus solely on mistakes without providing constructive guidance. Similarly, [Lee \(2009\)](#) noted that when feedback is inconsistent or overly ambiguous, learners struggle to apply corrections effectively, resulting in repeated errors and dissatisfaction. Another negative reaction of the students is that they perceive that the written corrective feedback they receive from their teachers is too generic and fails to address the individual needs of the Students. About this view, [Zhang \(2021\)](#) reported that students feel dissatisfaction when their teachers provide them with uniform corrections without considering their proficiency levels or learning goals. In addition, the student participants state that they sometimes resist and disregard their teachers' feedback when teachers prioritize grammatical accuracy over content, making them feel their original thoughts were undervalued. In general, the reaction of the students towards teachers' written corrective feedback is not positive, and how written corrective feedback is delivered significantly influences students' willingness to engage with and benefit from corrections. For instance, with regards to the students' reaction towards their teachers' feedback, one of the focus group discussions of the students reacted as follows:

*"When receiving critical comments, we become frightened and sometimes discouraged since we do not fully understand the teachers' opinions owing to ambiguous explanations. We know the teachers are trying to help us, but our initial reaction is always emotional, and most of our students feel the same way since we focus on the bad comments rather than the positive. Conversely, after some time, we attempt to consider it as an opportunity to improve our report writing."*

### **Challenges in Feedback**

Providing feedback is not a simple activity that teachers can impose on the students' written activities, but rather it requires the commitment, knowledge, and skills of the teachers. Therefore, it is natural for the teachers to face challenges when providing written corrective feedback. As to the teacher participants, one of the major challenges is the time constraints associated with meticulously reviewing and correcting students' written work, particularly in large classes. The teachers report that providing detailed feedback is time-consuming and often leads to burnout or superficial corrections. In addition, the pressure they have to complete courses leaves little room for in-depth feedback. In relation to this, [Hyland and Hyland \(2006\)](#) state that teachers might focus on prioritizing quantity over quality due to a shortage of time, and this could hinder their ability to deliver effective written corrective feedback for students' writing development. Another significant challenge that the teacher participants reported is the lack of students' engagement with feedback. Most of the teacher explained that they feel frustrated because their students do not read or apply the corrections provided. Even though it is reported that some students simply focus solely on grades rather than constructive comments, and others struggle to understand the feedback due to language barriers. This lack of engagement discourages teachers from investing effort in detailed corrections as they perceive their feedback is not productive. In connection to this, [Ellis \(2009\)](#) states that if the students are struggling to understand feedback due to language barriers and lack engagement, the teachers may feel demotivated to provide comprehensive written corrective feedback, further aggravating the problem. In addition, the teacher participants reflected that the uncertainty and inconsistent practices about the most effective written corrective feedback strategies are also a challenge. For example, some teacher participants admit that they feel confused about whether to use direct, indirect, or metalinguistic feedback strategies. This indecision brings inconsistency in teachers' feedback practices that may confuse students rather than helping them learning. In connection to this, for instance, in an interview, one of the teacher participants (Tr. 5) explained his ideas as follows:

*"As an EFL teacher, one of the major challenges I face is harmonizing the quantity and type of feedback I provide. Yes, I want to help my students learn, and I am also conscious that giving too much feedback can be terrifying. As a result, I utilize a blend of direct and indirect feedback because I feel that it could be more effective. This strategy could encourage students to interact with their comments and take responsibility for their learning. Nonetheless, it is not always simple to maintain proper balance, and I frequently question if my comments are really helpful in their long-term learning development."*

Furthermore, research indicates that many EFL teachers lack training in evidence-based feedback methods, causing them to rely on intuition rather than pedagogical principles (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Therefore, professional development programs targeting written corrective feedback that the teachers in the study area are lacking could help alleviate these challenges and improve the feedback efficacy. In general, despite these concerns, most of the teacher participants believe that written corrective feedback plays a crucial role in students' academic writing development, mainly when adapted to the individual student's needs.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study is framed under socio-cultural theory, and the implication is that the EFL teachers are expected to scaffold their students while providing written corrective feedback to help the students move beyond their zone of proximal development (ZPD). Hence, in the socio-cultural theoretical framework, written corrective feedback is expected to serve as a mediating tool. Besides, in the lens of socio-cultural theory and providing written corrective feedback, the gap between the teachers' beliefs and practices is expected to be narrow. However, the practical implication of this study shows teachers are not found implementing the concepts of ZPDs like scaffolding, mediation, and internalization in providing written corrective feedback to their students. In addition, this study briefs the existing debates in written corrective feedback literature between Truscott (1996), who argued for the abolition of grammar correction, and Ferris (1999), who advocates the value of feedback. Hence, the findings show that all of the EFL teachers and student participants are in favor of Ferris's assumptions, believing that written corrective feedback is useful and should be provided in response to students' writing. In contrast, the study is unable to resolve the debate and disparities among teachers about whether direct or indirect feedback is more effective in the feedback provision process. Besides, findings of this study extensively refine the existing theoretical debates of the gap between teachers' beliefs and their actual practices in the feedback process. Thus, the study indicates that the relationship is extremely mediated by a complex web of contextual constraints like shortage of time, class sizes, students' motivation, and resources. Therefore, this implies that there needs to be a theoretical shift from blaming teachers for perceived inconsistencies to a system and other stakeholders because teachers are arguing that their actual practice is not a pure reflection of their beliefs, but also a negotiated outcome of contextual realities, too.

Moreover, the result shows that students' reaction to the teachers' written corrective feedback practices reveals observable frustration of the students, mainly due to feedback that is very critical, vague, and general. Besides, many students feel discouraged when corrections focus excessively on grammatical issues at the expense of content and when feedback fails to address their individual needs. As a result, such kinds of dissatisfaction often lead students to resistance, disengagement, and repeated errors they had committed before. Besides, the findings showed that written corrective feedback is valuable if it is delivered in a manner that is constructive and supportive, fostering students' motivation. In conclusion, this study identifies numerous challenges

teachers come across when providing written corrective feedback, such as time constraints, lack of students' engagement, and uncertainty about the most effective feedback strategies they could use. These challenges are also aggravated by a lack of necessary feedback-related training that could improve their inconsistent practices. Regardless of these impediments, the teachers remain dedicated to making efforts to provide written corrective feedback in an attempt to help students' academic writing development. So, addressing these issues and empowering teachers equipped with the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitude could help bridge the gap between the teachers' beliefs and practices of feedback provision.

In general, based on the research findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The EFL teacher participants believe in comprehensive and constructive feedback, but they shift to selective or indirect strategies due to the reported challenges like shortage of time, workload, large class sizes, and students' less participation. Then, this results in misalignment between the teachers' beliefs and their actual practices of feedback.
2. Some students frequently react negatively to the teacher's written corrective feedback because they feel that the comments are not supportive, clear, and motivating; rather, they lead to disengagement because the needs of the students have no room in the process.
3. The teachers face diverse challenges in the feedback delivery process, like time constraints, low student engagement, and teachers' uncertainty about the most effective feedback strategies they should employ.
4. Teachers lack research-based training about written corrective feedback strategies, and this highlights the need for professional capacity development training.
5. The teachers need to adapt effective feedback strategies that could address individual student needs that foster motivation and long-term writing improvements.

### **LIMITATION & FURTHER RESEARCH**

This study mainly focused on EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of written corrective feedback in responding to students' senior essay report writing at Aksum University. One possible limitation of the study could be that it is a pure qualitative exploratory case study focusing on a single university context that may not comprehensively capture the diverse knowledge, skills, and attitudes of EFL teachers and students across different educational settings in Ethiopia. Therefore, the results of this study could not be generalized to other settings and participants. Methodologically, the data collected are only qualitative sources, and not considering a mixed methodology focusing on wider study subjects could be a limitation of this study. In addition, in this study, some of the self-reported data from teachers and students may not always reflect their actual practices or attitudes toward written corrective feedback. For example, teachers might overstate their obedience to ideal feedback strategies due to social desirability bias. Besides, in this study, students' responses could be influenced by their immediate frustrations rather than long-term perspectives on feedback efficacy. As a result, further research could explore the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of EFL teachers and students in a broader range of educational institutions, including more participants, modifying the methodology to investigate the feedback practices. For instance, longitudinal studies could be useful in exploring the actual practices and beliefs of teachers in written corrective feedback provisions and analyzing the real reactions of the students to teacher feedback. Besides, experimental research could also address how professional development training can affect teachers' feedback strategies and students' engagement. To sum up, by filling in these research gaps, future researchers can make greater contributions to the effective implementations of written corrective feedback and finally narrow the gaps between the needs of students and the practices of teachers in the EFL writing instructions.

## Recommendations

So as to enhance the effectiveness of written corrective feedback in EFL contexts, a collaborative effort is needed among teachers, students, institutions, and other stakeholders. Teachers should work on professional development in order to refine their feedback strategies, ensuring alignment with pedagogical beliefs and student needs. Students need to actively engage with feedback by seeking clarifications and applying corrections interactively. Educational institutions should consider teachers' workload into account, introduce professional development training, and create a supportive environment for feedback and information exchanges. Besides, curriculum designers and policy makers should introduce research-based written corrective feedback frameworks and guidelines to standardize effective feedback practices. Addressing these areas comprehensively will bridge the gap between theory and practice and then eventually improve students' writing proficiency. To put in a nutshell, the researcher forwards the following recommendations for the respective stakeholders:

1. Teachers should be provided with the opportunity to attend professional development workshops to master the diverse written corrective strategies and align practices with pedagogical beliefs.
2. Students need to be actively engaged with the feedback process, share the feedback information, and seek clarifications from teachers when necessary.
3. Institutions should reduce teachers' workloads by limiting class sizes, organizing regular training sessions on effective written corrective feedback methods, and creating platforms for teachers' collaboration concerning written corrective feedback.
4. Curriculum designers ought to integrate research-based written corrective feedback strategies into teacher education programs and develop standardized feedback frameworks adapted to different proficiency levels that guide teachers.
5. Policymakers also have a great role to play in allocating funds and resources for written corrective feedback research and supporting teachers. Besides, policymakers are responsible for incorporating best practices of written corrective feedback into their curriculum and assessment policies and giving emphasis to students' writing development across every educational level.

## REFERENCES

- Adzhar, N., Puteh, M., & Sazalli, N. A. H. (2025). Exploring teachers' beliefs in written corrective feedback (WCF) in Kuala Lumpur secondary schools. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 15(1), 381–396. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v15-i1/24483>
- Al-Ahmadi, S. O. A., & Khadawardi, H. A. (2024). Students' beliefs toward the effectiveness of receiving written corrective feedback for developing L2 writing skills. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 14(1), 30. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v14n1p30>
- Almarza, G. G. (1996). Student foreign language teacher's knowledge growth. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 50–78). Cambridge University Press.
- Amlaku, B. (2013). Language policies and the role of English in Ethiopia. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual Conference of IATEFL BESIG, Bielefeld, Germany. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259267200>
- Bitchener, J. (2012). A reflection on 'the language learning potential' of written CF. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 348–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.006>
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.



- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The value of a focused approach to written corrective feedback. *ELT Journal*, 63(3), 204–211. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn043>
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 193–214. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp016>
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 191–205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001>
- Borg, S. (2001). Self-perception and practice in teaching grammar. *ELT Journal*, 55(1), 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/55.1.21>
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81–109. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903>
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. Continuum.
- Buckingham, L., & Aktuğ-Ekinci, D. (2017). Interpreting coded feedback on writing: Turkish EFL students' approaches to revision. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 26, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2017.01.001>
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback. *System*, 31(3), 349–361. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9)
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 62(2), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 63(2), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>
- Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 1–11. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80110-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6)
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing* (pp. 81–102). Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161–184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X)

- Ferris, D., Brown, J., Liu, H. S., & Stine, M. E. A. (2011). Responding to L2 students in college writing classes: Teacher perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(2), 207–234. <https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2011.247706>
- Gahin, G. H. M. A. (2001). An investigation into EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in Egypt: An exploratory study [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Exeter.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford University Press.
- Hopper, D., & Bowen, N. (2023). Students' and teachers' beliefs about written corrective feedback: Perspectives on amount, type, and focus of feedback in an EFL setting. *rEFlections*, 30(3), 735–756. <https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v30i3.268135>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Italo, B. (1999). A comparison of the effectiveness of teacher versus peer feedback on Addis Ababa University students' writing revisions (Doctoral dissertation). Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
- Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294–304. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/44.4.294>
- Khadawardi, H. A. (2020). The effect of implicit corrective feedback on English writing of international second language learners. *English Language Teaching*, 14(1), 123–139. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n1p123>
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 285–312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.08.001>
- Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 69–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.10.001>
- Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal*, 63(1), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn010>
- Lee, I. (2013). Research into practice: Written corrective feedback. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 108–119. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000390>
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 203–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x>
- Leki, I. (2006). You cannot ignore: L2 graduate students' response to discipline-based written feedback. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 266–285). Cambridge University Press.
- Leki, I. (2007). *Undergraduates in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Liu, X. (2024). Understanding the development and implementation of teachers' beliefs of written corrective feedback: A study of two novice transborder teachers in mainland China. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 142, 104519. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104519>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002>
- Nunan, D. (2015). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages: An introduction*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315716893>

- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307>
- Riazi, A. (1997). Acquiring disciplinary literacy: A sociocognitive analysis of text production and learning among Iranian graduate students of education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(2), 105–137. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(97\)90030-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(97)90030-8)
- Sachs, R., & Polio, C. (2007). Learners' use of two types of written feedback on an L2 writing revision task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 29(1), 76–100. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263107070034>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x>
- Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37(4), 556–569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.09.002>
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327–369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
- Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. Y. P. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(4), 292–305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.05.002>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky: Volume 1—Problems of general psychology*. Plenum Press.
- Wang, Z. (2011). A case study of one EFL writing teacher's feedback on discourse for advanced learners in China. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 6, 21–42.
- Yang, L., & Zhang, L. (2010). Exploring the role of reformulations and a model text in EFL students' writing performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 464–484. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810375369>
- Zacharias, N. T. (2007). Teacher and student attitudes toward teacher feedback. *RELC Journal*, 38(1), 38–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206076157>
- Zaman, M., & Azad, A. B. (2012). Feedback in EFL writing at tertiary level: Teachers' and learners' perceptions. *ASA University Review*, 6(1), 371–383.
- Zhang, Z. (2021). Student engagement with teacher written feedback: Insights from multiple case studies. *Assessing Writing*, 48, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100514>
- Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. *Assessing Writing*, 37, 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.03.001>