

Research Article:

Formative Assessment and English as A Foreign Language (EFL) Teachers' Corrective Feedback on Teaching Writing in Higher Education Level: Practice and Challenges

Jhems Richard Hasan¹, Alvons Habibie¹ and Karmila Machmud^{2*}

¹English Education Department, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo, Jl. Sultan Amai, Pone, Gorontalo 96215, Indonesia

²English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Letters and Culture, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Jl. Sudirman No.6, Kota Gorontalo 19128, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: karmila@ung.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Assessment and corrective feedback are vital in enhancing the learning process by guiding students toward improvement. These elements help identify areas of strength and weakness, allowing learners to refine their skills and understanding in writing. To better understand the practice and challenges, this study explores the practices of four English language instructors in administering formative assessments and providing feedback on 19 students' writing within the English Education Department at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo. It also examines the challenges instructors face in delivering formative assessments and feedback in the context of writing instruction. Additionally, it investigates students' attitudes toward lecturers' feedback on their writing performance. This study uses narrative inquiry to have a deeper understanding of the topics. This study used an observation sheet, interview guidelines, and a questionnaire to collect the data. The study reveals that English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers employ diverse strategies for formative assessment in writing classes, including Short Writing Prompts, Error Correction Tests, Paragraph Writing, Guided Writing, and Summary Writing. These strategies target key writing aspects such as grammar, coherence, idea organisation, and critical thinking, fostering holistic writing development through regular feedback and practice. However, instructors face challenges such as managing workloads and time constraints, ensuring students understand and apply feedback effectively, balancing constructive criticism with motivation, and addressing emerging issues like plagiarism, citation errors, and AI-generated content. Students value detailed feedback, particularly on grammar and writing structure, and appreciate positive reinforcement alongside constructive criticism. Despite recognising its importance, many students struggle to implement feedback in their revisions effectively. The findings underscore the need for balanced, actionable feedback and greater technology integration to enhance writing instruction and support students' confidence and skill development.

Keywords: Formative assessment, corrective feedback, higher education, English as a foreign language, writing instruction

Published: 30 September 2025

To cite this article: Hasan, J. R., Habibie, A., & Machmud, K. (2025). Formative assessment and English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' corrective feedback on teaching writing in higher education level: Practice and challenges. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educators and Education*, 40(2), 69–99. <https://doi.org/10.21315/apjee2025.40.2.4>

INTRODUCTION

The development of research on formative assessment and feedback in English writing classes over the past three decades has shown significant growth. Formative assessment and feedback are essential components of the learning process. In the context of higher education, these areas have gained considerable attention in recent years, with advocates highlighting their connections to educational, social, psychological, and employability advantages (Zhang, 2023). Its significance stems from the process-oriented writing approach that emerged in the 1980s, with feedback gaining recognition in the 1990s as a core principle of formative assessment (Shabitha & Mekala, 2023). Teacher feedback during formative assessment is crucial for fostering student learning progress.

Formative assessment involves assessing, evaluating, or reviewing students' work or performance and using the results to enhance and develop their skills (Alharbi, 2022). These practices may include observation, measurement, and direct questioning. Corrective feedback is vital in fostering effective learning, particularly in writing instruction. Defined as targeted suggestions for improvement following performance, feedback must be specific, actionable, and timely (Ahmetovic et al., 2023). Effective feedback meets four criteria: objectivity, specificity, immediacy, and performance focus (Wang et al., 2024). The research underscores that the quality and delivery of feedback significantly influence student learning and attitudes. Therefore, educators must create a supportive environment where feedback is perceived constructively rather than as punitive to enhance students' motivation, engagement, and learning outcomes.

Teacher-written corrective feedback (WCF) has been consistently highlighted as a key contributor to improving writing accuracy (Jinowat & Wiboolyasarin, 2022; González-Cruz et al., 2022). weaknesses, but not without persisting challenges. For instance, Borrego (2024) identifies miscommunications between teachers' feedback intentions and students' interpretations, while Nemati et al. (2017) report dissatisfaction among advanced learners regarding feedback practices. Addressing these challenges is crucial for maximising the effectiveness of WCF.

The debate about the effectiveness of teacher corrective feedback remains a significant focus in the study of writing in second languages. Although studies about WCF were in support of fostering students' achievement in second language writing (Crosthwaite et al., 2022; Klimova & Pikhart, 2022; Mao et al., 2024; Nguyen & Chu, 2024), other studies are still questioning its impact and usefulness on grammar correction urgency (Gebremariam, 2024; Huang et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2021; Scherer et al., 2023). While model-based WCF can enhance fluency, self-editing may be more effective for improving writing speed and efficiency (Criado et al., 2022), studies show that teachers often place more emphasis on the assessment aspect of scoring than on developmental feedback (Lee, 2022; Sanjaya et al., 2023), which raises concerns about the loss of the formative function of feedback. However, numerous studies have been conducted, and conclusions regarding the effectiveness of Teacher Corrective Feedback (TCF) remain inconsistent due to the varying findings and complex influences of various factors. Moreover, while the integration of formative assessment with corrective feedback is of significant interest, previous studies have largely focused on general contexts, with limited attention to specific educational

settings, such as Islamic Higher Education institutions. This study addresses these gaps by investigating formative assessment and WCF practices specifically within the context of Islamic Higher Education, involving instructors and students with unique characteristics. By integrating these two frameworks, this research offers a novel contribution to the field, providing insights into writing instruction practices and informing the challenges faced by EFL teachers and students at the English Education Study Programme in IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo.

In the English Education Department at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo, writing instruction is a key component of the curriculum, taught in semesters 2, 4, and 6. This course plays a crucial role in preparing students for their undergraduate theses and enhancing their academic writing skills. However, the implementation of formative assessment models and teacher feedback practices in writing has not been extensively studied. This research aims to fill this gap by examining formative assessment practices, feedback strategies, challenges faced, and students' attitudes toward feedback. Of course, this can provide valuable insights for educators and policymakers in the English Education Department.

This study aims to explore in-depth the following research questions:

1. What practices are employed by English language instructors in administering formative assessments and providing feedback on students' writing within the English Education Department at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo?
2. What challenges do instructors face in responding to formative assessments and feedback in the context of writing instruction in the English Education Department at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo?
3. What are students' attitudes toward lecture feedback on their writing results?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing Instruction in Higher Education Level

The learning process of writing at a higher education is an essential competency to be mastered by every student, especially in the English language education study programme. Writing skills are not only needed for academic purposes, such as the preparation of essays, reports, and scientific papers, but also an indicator of critical thinking maturity, logical argumentation, and good mastery of language structure (Sato, 2022; Putra et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2024; Wang & Newell, 2025). A recent study confirms that a genre-based approach to writing has become a dominant strategy, encouraging students to produce academic writing that is more structured and appropriate to social and rhetorical contexts (Dlamini et al., 2024; Khammee et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024). This approach enables students to comprehend the forms of discourse commonly employed in the academic world, such as argumentative essays, research reports, and critical reviews, allowing them to tailor their writing style and structure to specific goals and audiences. The research also highlights the importance of explicit instruction on rhetorical structures and academic writing conventions, enabling students to more easily understand the expectations of scientific communication and not merely imitate models mechanically. However, the challenges in teaching writing remain significant.

Wang et al. (2024) revealed that the combination approach, which integrates the writing process and the evidence-generator approach, is efficacious in improving students' writing skills. The implementation of the strategy in the classroom still faces various obstacles, including limited time for learning, high administrative burden for lecturers, differences in academic backgrounds and student mastery levels, and low active student participation in the writing process (Bowen et al., 2023). In addition, the perception of writing as an individual activity, demanding final results rather than a continuous process that can be developed gradually, remains an obstacle to internalising more reflective and in-depth writing skills. To answer these challenges, a pedagogical strategy that is more adaptive and responsive to student needs is needed, an approach that integrates collaborative learning (Milla & García-Mayo, 2024), the application of continuous formative feedback (Morris, 2021), and the use of digital technology in writing is proven to increase the motivation and engagement (Han, 2023). For example, the use of online platforms for co-writing, peer review, and digital portfolios enables students to develop their writing skills gradually while receiving constructive feedback (Nipaspong, 2022). Furthermore, these strategies also open up space for students to develop metacognitive awareness (Teng, 2020), critical thinking (Anderson et al., 2023) in conveying ideas in writing (Harrington et al., 2024). Thus, writing teaching in college is not only focused on mastering technical skills such as grammar and paragraph structure, but is also geared towards shaping reflective, strategic, and autonomous academic writing.

The Concept of Formative Assessment in Writing

Formative assessment in the context of writing learning is a continuous, interactive, and development-oriented process, not just a measurement of the final result. The main goal is to monitor students' learning progress in real-time and provide constructive feedback that can be used to improve the quality of their writing (Calkins et al., 2019). This approach views assessment as an integral part of the learning process, not a separate entity. The success of formative assessment is highly dependent on the feedback literacy possessed by teachers, namely the ability to provide, manage, and facilitate effective and actionable feedback by students (Kong et al., 2022). This literacy includes an in-depth understanding of how students respond, interpret, and use feedback in improving their writing. Effective formative assessment creates a dialogue space in the classroom where students not only receive feedback passively but are also invited to reflect and design improvements based on the input received. This encourages students' active involvement in the evaluation process, making them empowered subjects in their learning process. A study by Jin et al. (2022) shows that teachers' feedback and self-assessment not only strengthen revision skills but also develop learning autonomy, metacognitive awareness, and a sense of responsibility for students' writing. Students learn to assess the quality of the text, recognise the strengths and weaknesses in their own and others' writings, and develop improvement strategies independently.

Nourazar et al. (2022) emphasised the significance of scaffolded metacognitive writing strategies within the framework of formative assessment. This approach has been shown to positively enhance students' self-confidence, sharpen their focus on writing topics, and cultivate critical thinking skills both prior to and during the writing process. In this context, formative assessment serves not merely as a tool for evaluating the final written product but

as a pedagogical instrument that fosters awareness of the entire writing process (Wardana et al., 2025). Thus, formative assessment in writing functions as a learning reinforcement mechanism that promotes self-reflection, supports continuous improvement in writing quality, and facilitates the development of more mature and practical academic writing competencies over time.

Written Corrective Feedback

The proven value of WCF in improving students' overall writing abilities in EFL settings is widely acknowledged, particularly as diverse feedback approaches have emerged in contemporary educational environments (ElEbyary et al., 2024; Zeevy-Solovey, 2024; Rahimi et al., 2025). (AI. Feedback plays a crucial role in formative assessment as it aims to enhance student learning by delivering instructional insights from the teacher (Patra et al., 2022). This guidance enables learners to reactivate prior knowledge, strengthen their understanding, and concentrate on key aspects of the subject matter—elements that are vital in the context of formative assessment (Chong, 2018). Admiraal et al. (2020) further argue that feedback should evolve into feedforward, meaning it must actively support learning by encouraging students to engage with the feedback and implement the suggested improvements.

Although numerous studies have examined the effectiveness of WCF (Pourdana et al., 2021; Jinowat & Wiboolyasarin, 2022; Barrot, 2023; Gebremariam, 2024), the findings remain inconclusive. This uncertainty stems from limitations in the generalisability of the research outcomes. One reason is the variability in WCF effectiveness observed across different contexts and participant groups, making it unclear whether the results can be applied beyond the specific settings studied. Furthermore, certain regions or learning environments, particularly those where second language acquisition occurs solely within the classroom, have been underrepresented in research. Additionally, existing data indicate that learners respond to written feedback in varied ways, reflecting differences in how they utilise such feedback.

In the practice of writing instruction, the two main forms of corrective feedback that are often used are direct feedback and indirect feedback. Direct feedback refers to providing direct correction to students' mistakes (Hamano-Bunce, 2022), for example, by crossing out and replacing incorrect words or sentence structures, while indirect feedback is given in the form of marking or indicating that there is a mistake without providing an explicit solution or correction (Kawashima, 2023). These two types of feedback have advantages and limitations. The direct feedback is considered more effective for learners who are less able to recognise or correct their own mistakes, but can create dependence on the teacher, on the other hand, indirect feedback encourages learners to be more active in reflecting and revising their writing, but its effectiveness is highly dependent on the student's metalinguistic ability (Masrul et al., 2024).

In the formative context of writing assessment, teachers face numerous challenges. One of the main challenges is adjusting the type and intensity of feedback to match the individual abilities and needs of students (Singh & Halim, 2023). Other challenges include limited time to provide meaningful feedback, difficulties in continuously monitoring students' progress, time and resource limitations, and teachers' uneven and lack of understanding of

the principles of practical formative assessment (Lee, 2022; Almahal et al., 2023; Hagos & Andargie, 2024). Moreover, not all students are motivated to make optimal use of the feedback they receive, which reduces the potential impact of WCF on improving the quality of their writing. Therefore, teachers need to integrate WCF into a well-planned, continuous, and responsive formative assessment strategy that takes into account students' characteristics.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The subjects involved in this research are EFL teachers and students at the English Education Department of IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo. The selection of participants is based on their experience, both as teaching faculty for the Writing Course and as students who have previously taken Writing Classes. A total of four lecturers and 19 students participated in the data collection process for this research. The participants of this study are described in Table 1.

Table 1. Profile of the participants in the study

Number of participants	Teaching experiences	Qualification
4 EFL teachers	Above 10–15 years	3 PhD and 1 Magister
19 EFL students	-	-

Instruments and Procedures

To address the research questions, we collected data using observation sheets specifically designed to monitor the implementation of writing assessment models by four EFL teachers. The observed aspects included: (a) types of formative assessment, (b) goals of assessments, (c) modes of delivery, (d) tools of delivery, (e) instructors' roles, and (f) frequently used methods. Meanwhile, to examine feedback practices, the observed aspects included: (a) types of feedback, (b) instructors' feedback strategies, (c) subjects involved, (d) types of error correction, (e) timing of feedback, and (f) language used in providing feedback. Data collection through observations was conducted systematically over an entire semester to obtain comprehensive and representative insights into formative assessment and feedback delivery in writing instruction.

Additionally, we conducted in-depth interviews with the four EFL teachers to gain a deeper understanding of the challenges they faced when implementing formative assessment and providing feedback during the teaching process. The interview process was conducted through focus group discussions (FGD) over two sessions, with each session lasting two hours. These interviews provided valuable insights into the teachers' understanding, preparedness, and the challenges they encountered in the writing instruction process. By combining data from observations and interviews, this study aims to offer a comprehensive understanding of the implementation of formative assessment and the significance of feedback in writing instruction within the context of Islamic higher education. Furthermore, data on students' attitudes toward the feedback provided by their teachers on their written

work were collected using a questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed to 19 students from the English Education Department who were enrolled in a Writing Course. It was administered via Google Forms and distributed directly during class sessions, with students given 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of 16 statement items divided into three indicators: (a) perception, (b) engagement, and (c) preferences. It used a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 represented “strongly disagree,” 2 represented “disagree,” 3 represented “neutral,” 4 represented “agree,” and 5 represented “strongly agree.”

Data Analysis

For the analysis, we employed thematic analysis, as outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006), which enabled us to explore the patterns and themes within the data systematically. The process involved multiple rounds of careful and repeated reading of the interview transcriptions to ensure a thorough understanding of the content. During this process, we identified recurring and meaningful patterns that were relevant to the research questions. To manage and simplify the data, we applied structured coding, a technique described by Dörnyei and Csizer (2012), which helped to categorise and condense the information into manageable segments. This approach enabled us to identify key themes related to the EFL teachers' formative assessment and feedback, as well as the challenges they encountered. By using thematic analysis, we were able to generate a rich and nuanced interpretation of the data, providing a comprehensive understanding of the teachers' experiences and insights. For the questionnaire data, we calculated the results descriptively and presented the figures in table format.

FINDINGS

The findings and discussion of this research are centred on addressing the three problem formulations posited in this study.

1. What practices are employed by English language instructors in administering formative assessments and providing feedback on students' writing within the English Education Department at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo?
2. What challenges do instructors face in responding to formative assessments and feedback in the context of writing instruction in the English Education Department at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo?
3. What are students' attitudes toward lecture feedback on their writing results?

Research Question 1: What Practices Are Employed by English Language Instructors in Administering Formative Assessments and Providing Feedback on Students' Writing within the English Education Department at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo?

This observation process was conducted by a research team comprising students who had attended the Writing Class in the previous semester. The findings were based on observation sheets recorded throughout one semester. Four lecturers, each teaching in Class A and B, were noted to have implemented five types of formative assessments during the learning process. The details of these findings can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Types of formative assessment in writing

No.	Types of formative assessment	Goals of assessment	Modes of delivery	Tools of delivery	Instructors' roles	Frequently used
1	Short Writing Prompts	Test students' ability to respond directly, organise ideas, and use appropriate language.	Daily classroom activities with short questions.	Oral questions, whiteboards, PPT slides.	Providing prompts, facilitating discussions, and giving feedback after students present their writing.	Two times at the 2nd meeting and 4th meetings.
2	Error Correction Tests	To assess students' abilities to identify and correct grammar, spelling, and vocabulary errors.	Written tests are conducted within a limited timeframe in class.	The instructor prepared texts with errors.	Providing error-laden texts, discussing correction results, and giving direct feedback.	Three times at 3rd, 5th, and 7th meetings.
3	Paragraph Writing	To train students to write structured and coherent paragraphs.	Writing assignments based on instructors' instructions.	Assignment sheets and digital documents.	Providing topics, explaining paragraph structure, and offering feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the writing.	Three times at the 9th, 11th, and 13th meetings.
4	Guided Writing	To help students write texts with step-by-step guidance from the instructor.	Writing assignments with detailed instructions.	Images, key points, or story frameworks.	Give guidance, discuss students' writings, and correct them based on the provided guidelines.	Two times at the 10th and 12th meetings.

(Continued on next page)

Table 2. *(Continued)*

No.	Types of formative assessment	Goals of assessment	Modes of delivery	Tools of delivery	Instructors' roles	Frequently used
5	Summary Writing	Train students to summarise a text's main ideas concisely and clearly.	Reading and writing assignments conducted in class.	Articles or short stories, whiteboards, class discussions.	Providing texts, explaining how to summarise, correcting results, and discussing common issues with the class.	Two times at the 14th and 15th meetings.

Table 2 presents an overview of frequently used formative assessment types implemented in writing instruction, highlighting their goals, modes, delivery tools, instructors' roles, and frequency of use. Each type is tailored to enhance specific writing skills, from organising ideas to improving grammar and vocabulary. Short writing prompts evaluate students' ability to respond directly, organise thoughts, and use appropriate language, often delivered through oral questions or slides during classroom activities. Error correction tests focus on identifying and rectifying linguistic errors, with instructors providing pre-prepared error-laden texts for in-class correction exercises. Similarly, paragraph writing tasks are designed to train students in structuring coherent paragraphs, supported by assignment sheets and digital documents, with feedback addressing strengths and weaknesses.

Guided writing and summary writing offer more structured approaches. In guided writing, students receive step-by-step guidance or practice concise summarisation. Guided writing utilises frameworks like images or key points, while summary writing emphasises capturing the main ideas clearly through class discussions and provided texts. Across all types, instructors play an active role, from preparing materials and explaining concepts to facilitating discussions and delivering feedback. These assessments are strategically scheduled throughout the semester, ensuring varied and consistent opportunities for skill development while addressing diverse aspects of students' writing proficiency.

Corrective feedback practices by writing instructors

The findings in this section describe the practice of feedback provided by lecturers in the classroom, focusing on the moments when lecturers give feedback on students' written work. Table 3 shows an initial overview of the feedback practices from the research findings.

Table 3. Corrective feedback practices by writing instructors

No.	Types of corrective feedback	Feedback strategies	Subject involved	Types of errors	Times of giving feedback
1	Direct feedback	Providing direct comments and corrections (oral) on students' texts, whether in the form of written notes on paper or in a document file, such as correcting sentence structure.	Lecturer and student	Grammar (tenses, subject-verb agreement)	During class
2	Indirect feedback	Providing marks or codes without giving direct solutions.	Lecturer	Spelling and punctuation errors	After assignments are submitted
3	Metalinguistic feedback	Giving clues or explanations related to the errors made.	Lecturer	Word choice errors	During individual discussions
4	Peer feedback	Students provide feedback to each other based on guidelines.	Students	Coherence and cohesion	During group revision sessions
5	Digital feedback	Feedback using applications or online platforms.	Lecturer and student	Organisation of ideas	After uploading assignments

Table 3 outlines five types of corrective feedback strategies employed in writing instruction, detailing their methods, target subjects, error types addressed, timing, and the language used for feedback delivery. Direct feedback involves explicit corrections and comments on students' texts, focusing on grammar issues like tenses and subject-verb agreement. This feedback is usually delivered during class and utilises both the first language (L1) and the second language (L2) for clarity and comprehension. Indirect feedback, in contrast, employs marks or codes to indicate errors without providing immediate solutions, encouraging students to identify and correct spelling and punctuation mistakes independently. This type of feedback is typically given after assignments are submitted and is conveyed in L2.

Other feedback types include metalinguistic, peer, and digital feedback, each offering unique approaches to address specific aspects of students' writing. Metalinguistic feedback provides clues or explanations related to errors, such as word choice issues, during one-on-one discussions, with L1 and L2 used to enhance understanding. Peer feedback allows students

to review each other's work, promoting collaborative learning by focusing on coherence and cohesion, often conducted in group revision sessions and delivered in L1. Digital feedback leverages online platforms or applications to provide comments on organisational aspects of writing, usually given after students submit their assignments online, with feedback presented in both L1 and L2 for accessibility. These diverse strategies collectively support comprehensive error correction while catering to different learning contexts and needs.

Research Question 2: What Challenges Do Instructors Face in Responding to Formative Assessments and Feedback in the Context of Writing Instruction in the English Education Department at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo?

Challenges faced by writing instructors in teaching writing

The data for this challenge was collected during two FGDs with the four lecturers involved in this study. In the first meeting, the discussion or questions focused on their understanding of the concept of formative assessment, their readiness, and the methods they use to provide formative assessment in their respective writing classes. The second meeting, on the other hand, addressed the challenges faced when providing formative assessments and giving corrective feedback on students' written work. This second meeting discussed the challenges and explored the solutions proposed by each lecturer to overcome the issues they encountered during the corrective feedback process. However, the main focus was on the challenges faced. The first meeting took place on Monday, 8 July 2024. The results from this first meeting are outlined as follows:

1. EFL teachers' understanding and readiness of formative assessment

The lecturers' understanding of formative assessment can be considered highly comprehensive. They not only grasp the importance of implementing formative assessment in teaching but also have in-depth knowledge of the various types of formative assessments that can be applied inside and outside the classroom. This understanding includes direct feedback, evaluation rubrics, and digital technology to provide more interactive and effective feedback.

This is evident in the learning process, where all four lecturers consistently explain the objectives, benefits, and strategies for implementing formative assessment in a clear and relevant manner. They can provide concrete examples that align with the needs of writing instruction, such as giving feedback on paragraph structure, idea coherence, or correct grammar usage. Their understanding is also reflected in their ability to adapt formative assessment methods to students' characteristics and understanding levels, making the learning process more personalised and meaningful. With this approach, lecturers help students understand their mistakes and provide opportunities for reflective learning, gradually improving writing skills. From this data, it can be concluded that the lecturers teaching Writing Courses at the English Education Department at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo face no difficulties understanding formative assessment in writing instruction.

From the interviews with the four lecturers, it was found that there are differences in experience when preparing formative assessments for writing courses. One lecturer admitted to facing difficulties in preparing formative assessments for students, mainly due to a heavy

teaching schedule, which made it difficult to allocate enough time to prepare formative assessments for each meeting. Furthermore, this lecturer explained that they had not taught the writing course for the last two semesters, which posed an additional challenge in reading the relevant teaching methods and needs. As expressed in the interview:

I find it difficult to prepare formative assessments for each session due to my busy teaching schedule. I will also teach this writing course again this semester, but I haven't taught it for the past two semesters. (L2)

However, the other three lecturers stated they did not encounter significant difficulties preparing formative assessments for the writing class. They noted that regularly teaching the writing course each semester helped them develop effective strategies and patterns for organising formative assessments. One lecturer mentioned having a systematically designed assessment guide for each session, which made the preparation process more structured. Another lecturer explained that using technology, such as online platforms for providing feedback, helped save time and ensured that students received consistent evaluations.

These lecturers also emphasised the importance of good time management and planning to simplify the preparation of formative assessments. They argued that while this task requires effort, the outcomes greatly support the development of students' writing skills. L1 stated, "I always prepare rubrics and feedback formats before the semester starts, so I only need to adjust them according to the student's progress in each session." These three lecturers demonstrated through this approach that the right strategy can minimise challenges in preparing formative assessments.

2. EFL teachers' feedback challenges

The second meeting was held on Thursday, July 11, 2024. This meeting focused on the lecturers' feedback on students' written work. The lecturers were asked about their challenges when providing feedback on students' writing during the writing instruction process. The interview data is described as follows:

a. Workload and time management

All four lecturers interviewed agreed that workload and time management were the main obstacles in providing feedback on students' writing. Administrative tasks related to teaching, such as grade management, reports, and lesson preparation, often consume a significant amount of the lecturers' time, making it difficult for them to provide detailed and thorough feedback.

However, they noted that they still monitored the revisions made by students, although the errors found in the revisions were no longer communicated to the students. This suggests that there is an effort to improve the quality of students' writing, although further feedback is not always provided. Meanwhile, L3 revealed that he provided feedback at least twice during each writing process. The first feedback focused on the student's writing's paragraph structure and technical errors. After the student made revisions, the second feedback focused on sentence use, cohesion, and coherence, which are essential elements for enhancing the overall quality of the writing. This approach demonstrates that the lecturer attempts to

give students space to reflect on their writing more deeply, but also reflects the challenge of ensuring that each student receives adequate attention amid many tasks and limited time.

Lecturers must find ways to manage their workload and utilise technology or more efficient time management strategies to enable higher-quality feedback. Some studies suggest that repeated and well-structured feedback can significantly positively impact the development of students' writing skills, but this requires careful planning and proper time distribution. This is the first challenge lecturers face in providing feedback on students' written work. The next challenge identified by the lecturers is the gap in students' understanding of the feedback provided on their written work.

b. Gap in students' understanding of feedback

The gap in students' understanding of feedback provided by lecturers has become one of the main challenges identified by the four lecturers teaching writing courses in the English Language Education Department at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo. During the interviews, the lecturers revealed that students often struggle to understand and apply the feedback given, especially when the feedback is technical or complex.

Sometimes students cannot immediately grasp what I mean with the feedback I give. It seems they don't know where to start correcting the mistakes I've pointed out. This suggests a gap between the lecturers' expectations and the student's understanding of how to link the feedback to specific improvements in their writing. (L4)

Another lecturer added, "students often focus only on language improvements, such as grammar or spelling, but ignore other aspects like the flow of ideas or cohesion between paragraphs, that is also part of the feedback I give" (L1). This indicates that students may find it difficult to see the bigger picture in their writing and tend to focus more on technical corrections that are easier to identify. In some cases, students overlook deeper feedback related to structure and argumentation, which is crucial in enhancing the overall quality of their writing.

One lecturer emphasised the importance of clearly communicating feedback and providing concrete examples.

I try to give concrete examples of how sentences can be improved, but sometimes students feel confused by the suggested changes. (L3)

This shows that a more structured and in-depth approach might be needed to ensure that students truly understand and can effectively apply the feedback in their writing. This challenge is related to writing skills and the critical reading skills students need to develop to utilize the feedback they receive fully.

c. Balancing criticism with student motivation to write

Balancing between providing criticism and maintaining student motivation is a complex challenge in writing instruction. In interviews with four English lecturers from the English

Language Education Department at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo, they revealed that offering critical feedback often becomes a dilemma.

When giving feedback, I have to be careful so my comments don't sound too negative. If it's too harsh, students tend to feel intimidated and lose the motivation to improve their writing. (L2)

This shows that an approach that is too direct or critical without being accompanied by constructive suggestions can negatively impact students' motivation. Another lecturer explained that the main challenge is finding the right words to convey criticism.

I often try to offer small praise before pointing out mistakes, but if there are too many errors, students sometimes feel the criticism is too harsh. They often feel their writing is not good enough, when in fact, I want to help them grow. (L4)

This highlights the importance of effective communication techniques when giving feedback. Strategies like "sandwich feedback," which begins with praise, followed by criticism, and ends with positive suggestions, have been applied by some lecturers but still require adjustments to match the students' characteristics. Additionally, one lecturer emphasised the importance of understanding that criticism is part of learning.

I always stress that feedback is not meant to bring them down but to help them see areas for improvement. However, some students need more time to accept this. (L3)

In this case, patience and a personal approach are essential. The lecturer also suggested that every criticism be accompanied by specific directions that students can immediately apply, so they feel motivated to see better writing results. With a balanced approach between constructive criticism and motivation, lecturers can create a learning environment that optimally supports the development of students' writing skills.

d. Identifying plagiarism, citation, and use of AI in student writing

Identifying plagiarism, citation issues, and the use of AI in student writing has become one of the challenges faced by the four lecturers teaching writing courses in the English Language Education Department at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo. According to one lecturer,

Plagiarism is a problem I often encounter, especially with students new to academic writing. They sometimes don't understand that copying sentences without citing the source is unethical. This highlights the need to improve students' information literacy and understanding of academic ethics. (L2)

Another lecturer pointed out challenges related to citations.

Some students struggle with applying the correct citation format, such as using APA style. They often get confused about how to cite sources from journal articles or websites. (L1)

According to him, this limitation can affect the quality of students' academic writing. To address this, the lecturer suggested intensive teaching on citation techniques, accompanied by hands-on practice using supporting applications like Zotero or Mendeley.

Regarding the use of AI, one lecturer mentioned that the main challenge is identifying the extent to which students use AI to compose their writing. "We notice an increase in technically well-structured papers, but they lack the students' original thought. This makes us suspicious that they are using AI without understanding the content generated." AI in writing must be closely monitored to ensure that students are relying on technology and understanding the critical thinking process behind their writing.

The final lecturer added that although AI has great potential to assist students in writing, its unregulated use can be detrimental. "I always emphasise that AI is just a tool. If used without understanding, students' writing will lose its identity and originality." To address this, the lecturer recommended implementing clear guidelines regarding the use of AI in academic writing and having open discussions with students about the boundaries and benefits of using this technology. This approach is expected to help students develop writing that is original, structured, and aligned with academic standards.

e. Utilisation of peer correction

The use of peer correction as part of the writing learning process at the English Language Education Department of IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo faces several challenges, as revealed by the four lecturers in interviews. One lecturer stated that the gap in writing abilities among students is often the main obstacle in peer correction.

"Some students with better writing skills tend to dominate the discussion, while others just follow without truly contributing," he explained. This causes the peer correction process to be ineffective, as not all students are actively involved in providing meaningful feedback. (L3)

Another lecturer highlighted the challenge of providing clear guidelines to students. "Often, students don't know what to focus on in their peer's text. They tend to give general comments like it's good without getting into the details" (L4). The lack of structured guidance makes it difficult for students to provide constructive feedback. The lecturer emphasised the importance of providing specific rubrics or evaluation guidelines so students can focus on aspects like cohesion, coherence, or grammar.

Additionally, limited time during class sessions also poses a challenge. One lecturer explained that the peer correction process requires substantial time to be done effectively. "In one class session, it's difficult to ensure that all students receive and give feedback of sufficient quality" (L1). The lecturer recommended integrating peer correction as an out-of-class assignment using technology such as Google Docs or other online learning platforms to address this. This approach allows students to engage more deeply and flexibly in the peer review.

f. Utilisation of online/digital correction

Using online correction in writing instruction presents various challenges, as four lecturers from the English Language Education Department of IAIN, Sultan Amai Gorontalo, described. One lecturer shared that the main challenge is students' limited access to technology.

“Not all students have devices or stable internet connections, so it’s difficult to use online correction tools optimally,” he explained. As a result, some students cannot fully take advantage of features offered by platforms like Grammarly, ProWritingAid, or others, leading to disparities in learning outcomes. (L1)

Another lecturer pointed out the challenge of ensuring that students truly understand the corrections provided by digital tools. He stated,

“Students tend to accept suggestions from the applications without checking if the changes are appropriate for the context of their writing.” According to him, this indicates that online correction must be accompanied by adequate guidance. Students must be taught how to analyse correction suggestions critically rather than accept or reject them automatically. This requires additional time in the learning process, especially to guide students in understanding relevant correction features. (L3)

Furthermore, one lecturer mentioned that online correction also presents challenges regarding the lecturers' ability to integrate this technology into teaching.

We need to ensure that the tools used not only help in technical aspects but also support the comprehensive development of writing skills. (L4)

To address this challenge, the lecturer recommended training on the pedagogical use of digital tools for lecturers and students. With a directed approach, online correction can become an effective tool to enhance the quality of students' writing without undermining the essence of writing instruction.

Based on findings about the challenges faced by lecturers teaching writing courses at the English Language Education Department of IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo, several significant obstacles were identified to affect the effectiveness of feedback on student writing. At least six main challenges were identified: (a) workload and time management. The administrative workload and tight teaching schedules make it difficult for lecturers to allocate time for comprehensive feedback on student writing. This results in feedback often being provided only once, without further revision; (b) students' understanding of feedback. Students often struggle to understand and apply the feedback provided, particularly if they lack sufficient critical reading skills.

Next, the third challenge is (c) balancing criticism with motivation for students to write. Lecturers face the dilemma of providing constructive criticism without demotivating students. This requires a careful approach to ensure that the feedback improves the writing and motivates students to continue developing; (d) identifying plagiarism, citation, and

AI use in writing became the fourth challenge, especially with the increasing use of technology in writing. Lecturers need to ensure the originality of students' writing, teach correct citation techniques, and monitor AI use to ensure it supports the development of independent writing skills.

The fifth challenge is (e) utilising peer correction, where the gap in abilities among students can hinder the effectiveness of mutual feedback. Less confident students often feel unsure, while more skilled students dominate the process. Finally, (f) utilising online/digital correction. Limited access to technology and a lack of understanding of digital correction features hinder lecturers and students from maximising these tools. A collaborative approach is needed to address these challenges, including training, clear guidelines, and integrating technology that supports writing instruction needs. With this approach, the writing learning process can be more effective and provide optimal results for students.

Research Question 3: What Are Students' Attitudes Toward Lecture Feedback on Their Writing Results?

English students' attitudes toward feedback on their writing from lecturers

Data regarding these attitudes were obtained from a questionnaire distributed to 19 respondents involved in this study. The results of the questionnaire are illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4.

English students' attitudes toward feedback on their writing from lecturers

No.	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Section 1: Perception of feedback						
1	The feedback from lecturers helps me understand the errors in my writing.		3	2	10	4
2	I feel the feedback given by lecturers is clear and easy to understand.			4	8	7
3	The feedback I receive motivates me to improve my writing.				5	14
4	I feel the feedback focuses more on the weaknesses than the strengths of my writing.	2	4	4	5	4
5	The feedback from lecturers is crucial for my academic writing development.				15	4

(Continued on next page)

Table 4. *(Continued)*

No.	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
6	I often find it difficult to apply the feedback to revise my writing.			2	3	14
7	The feedback highlights specific areas in my writing that need improvement.		2	4	5	8
8	I feel overwhelmed when receiving too much criticism on my writing.	2	2	7	3	5
Section 2: Engagement with feedback						
9	I carefully review the feedback before revising my writing.		6	9	2	3
10	I actively apply the feedback to my next draft of writing.	2	4	5	6	2
11	I prefer feedback that includes examples of corrections.				2	17
12	Feedback from peers is as helpful as feedback from lecturers.	6	6	5	1	1
Section 3: Preferences						
13	I prefer detailed feedback on grammar and writing structure.		7	2	5	5
14	I prefer feedback that focuses on the overall cohesion of my writing.			5	7	7
15	Receiving positive comments alongside criticisms makes me more confident in writing.				5	14
16	I believe digital tools (e.g., Grammarly) effectively improve my writing.			1	2	16

Table 4 presents a questionnaire on students' attitudes toward EFL teachers' feedback on writing, filled out by 19 students from the English Education program at IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo. The questionnaire was designed to measure students' perceptions, engagement, and preferences regarding the feedback they receive on their writing

a. Section 1: Perception of feedback

This section assesses students' views on how effective and precise the feedback from lecturers is. The students mostly agreed that feedback is crucial for their academic development (Statement 5), with 15 students agreeing and 4 strongly agreeing. However, challenges were identified in applying feedback, with 14 students reporting difficulty in revising their writing based on the feedback provided (Statement 6). Additionally, many students felt that feedback often focused more on their weaknesses than their strengths (Statement 4), though feedback was generally found to motivate students to improve their writing (Statement 3).

b. Section 2: Engagement with feedback

The section measures how actively students engage with the feedback they receive. Most students reported that they do not always actively apply the feedback to their next draft (Statement 10), as indicated by a significant number choosing "neutral" or "disagree." However, a majority (17 out of 19) preferred feedback that includes examples of corrections (Statement 11), indicating a preference for more detailed, constructive guidance. Peer feedback was considered less helpful than feedback from lecturers (Statement 12), with many students either disagreeing or neutral regarding the equivalence of peer and lecturer feedback.

c. Section 3: Preferences

In this section, students shared their preferences for the type of feedback they found most beneficial. A majority preferred detailed feedback on grammar and writing structure (Statement 13) while also recognising the importance of feedback on the overall cohesion of their writing (Statement 14). Interestingly, the students indicated that receiving positive comments alongside critiques (Statement 15) significantly boosted their confidence in writing, suggesting that balancing criticism with encouragement is key for fostering motivation. Furthermore, most students agreed that digital tools like Grammarly effectively improve writing (Statement 16), showing a trend toward embracing technological aids in their writing process. Overall, this data highlights the importance of clear, constructive, and balanced feedback while pointing to the challenges students face in applying feedback effectively and the value they place on detailed guidance for improving their writing skills.

DISCUSSION

Formative assessment is pivotal in writing instruction, offering students structured opportunities to improve their writing skills while receiving targeted feedback (Guo & Xu, 2021; Nishizuka, 2022). Research highlights those formative assessments bridge the gap between students' current abilities and desired learning outcomes, fostering growth through iterative improvement. Practical formative assessment involves ongoing interaction between teachers and students, enabling educators to identify students' strengths and weaknesses and adapt instruction accordingly (McCallum & Milner, 2021; Patra et al., 2022). This is particularly crucial in writing classes, where skills such as organisation, coherence, and grammatical accuracy evolve incrementally.

A significant advantage of formative assessments is their capacity to promote active learning. Practices such as short writing prompts, guided writing, and peer feedback engage students directly, fostering deeper cognitive processing (Granberg et al., 2021; Guo & Xu, 2021). As Nourazar et al. (2022) noted, students' active participation in the assessment process enhances their metacognitive awareness, enabling them to reflect critically on their work and constructively apply feedback. This reflection is essential in writing instruction, where understanding the "why" behind corrections can significantly improve students' performance and confidence.

Despite their advantages, implementing formative assessments in writing instruction is not without challenges. Time constraints and workload are among the most cited barriers for educators. A study by Zhu (2020) and Lee (2021) found that teachers often struggle to provide comprehensive feedback due to large class sizes and limited instructional time. This challenge underscores the importance of integrating technology into formative assessments. Tools like Grammarly and ProWritingAid can support teachers by automating error identification, freeing up time for instructors to focus on higher-order concerns such as argument development and stylistic choices (Parra & Calero, 2019; Thi & Nikolov, 2022).

The integration of technology, however, requires a balanced approach. While tools can efficiently identify grammatical errors, they often fail to consider contextual appropriateness, a critical aspect of writing. Research by Ranalli et al. (2018) warns against over-reliance on such tools, emphasising the need for teacher guidance to help students critically evaluate and contextualise automated feedback. This highlights the role of instructors as evaluators and facilitators of students' analytical and critical thinking skills in writing.

Moreover, formative assessments must be designed to address diverse learning needs. For example, guided writing and peer feedback are particularly effective for students at varying proficiency levels. Teng (2020) note that guided writing helps struggling students build confidence by breaking down tasks into manageable steps, while peer feedback allows more advanced students to deepen their understanding through collaboration. However, these methods require careful management to ensure equity and effectiveness. For instance, pairing students with similar abilities during peer feedback can prevent feelings of inadequacy and ensure constructive exchanges.

Another critical aspect of formative assessments is their potential to balance correction with motivation. Feedback focusing solely on errors can discourage students, particularly those with lower confidence. Hyland (2019) advocates for a balanced approach, where constructive criticism is paired with acknowledging students' efforts and achievements. This dual focus fosters a positive learning environment, motivating students to persist in improving their writing skills despite challenges.

In conclusion, formative assessment in writing instruction is a dynamic process that requires careful planning, adaptability, and innovation. By combining traditional practices with technological advancements and addressing individual learning needs, educators can create a supportive framework that empowers students to achieve their full potential. Future research should explore strategies to optimise formative assessment practices, particularly in resource-limited contexts, to ensure that all students benefit from these powerful pedagogical tools.

Corrective Feedback Practices in Writing Instruction

Corrective feedback is a cornerstone of writing instruction, addressing specific errors to guide students toward improvement (Gao & Ma, 2022; Jinowat & Wiboolyasarin, 2022; Zeevy-Solovey, 2024). Combining quantitative and qualitative data collection, was used to explore this phenomenon. The data were collected using an internet-based questionnaire and a semi-structured interview. The questionnaire was utilised to gather quantitative information from 93 Thai EFL students at a Bangkok-based Rajabhat University, while the interview collected qualitative data from ten respondents who were willing to be interviewed. The findings indicated that Thai EFL undergraduate students, on the whole, appreciated receiving WCF in several forms. The most desired type of WCF was direct feedback, while feedback given to learners regarding global errors was not favourable. Additionally, the rationale for the students' WCF preferences included: 1. The practices outlined in the data reveal diverse approaches employed by instructors to address students' needs. These strategies, ranging from direct corrections to peer and digital feedback, serve unique purposes and bring specific challenges. The findings provide critical insights into the effectiveness and adaptability of corrective feedback in enhancing writing skills.

Direct feedback

Direct feedback, which involves explicit corrections and comments on student work, is highly effective for addressing structural issues such as grammar and sentence construction. Direct feedback is particularly beneficial for low-proficiency learners, as it eliminates ambiguity and provides clear guidance on error correction (Masrul et al., 2024). However, a notable limitation is its tendency to foster dependency, where students may rely heavily on instructors for revisions rather than developing their own self-editing skills. The dual use of L1 (native language) and L2 (target language) in this feedback strategy allows greater comprehension, which is essential for facilitating learning among students with limited proficiency in L2.

Indirect feedback

Indirect feedback, which provides cues without explicit corrections, encourages students to identify and correct their errors autonomously. This strategy aligns with some studies' findings that indirect feedback fosters long-term retention of writing conventions, compels students to engage in self-reflection and problem-solving (Klimova & Pikhart, 2022; Alkhateeb & Daweli, 2024). However, its effectiveness heavily depends on students' ability to interpret feedback accurately (Criado et al., 2022). Using marks and codes, particularly in addressing spelling and punctuation errors, may require initial training to ensure students understand the provided annotations. The reliance on L2 for this type of feedback further immerses students in the target language, promoting linguistic accuracy. Professional development in writing feedback can help teachers to be more indirect and content-oriented (Soleimani et al., 2024).

Metalinguistic feedback

Metalinguistic feedback, which offers clues or explanations about errors, empowers students to connect grammatical rules with practical applications. According to Pourdana

et al. (2021), this approach enhances students' grammatical understanding by bridging the gap between theoretical knowledge and its practical application. Its application in individual discussions provides a tailored learning experience, addressing the unique needs of each student. The bilingual approach (L1 and L2) in delivering metalinguistic feedback ensures that complex explanations are comprehensible, especially for students struggling with linguistic concepts (Hashemian & Farhang-Ju, 2018). This dual-language method also fosters deeper cognitive processing by allowing students to reflect on language patterns in both their native and target languages. Moreover, it promotes learner autonomy as students become more aware of their errors and actively engage in self-correction and rule discovery.

Peer feedback

Peer feedback fosters collaborative learning, allowing students to learn from one another. This approach aligns with Yu (2021) and Zou et al.'s (2023) argument that peer feedback cultivates critical thinking and a deeper understanding of writing conventions. Peer feedback encourages students to evaluate the logical flow and connectivity of ideas in writing by focusing on coherence and cohesion. However, a common challenge is the variability in peers' evaluative abilities, leading to inconsistent feedback quality. Using L1 during group revision sessions ensures effective communication among peers, making the process more accessible for students with varying L2 proficiency levels. Additionally, engaging in peer feedback activities enhances students' sense of responsibility and ownership over their learning process. It also builds learners' confidence, as they not only receive constructive input but also practice articulating their thoughts and suggestions in a supportive environment.

Digital feedback

Digital feedback leverages technological platforms to provide structured, timely responses to students' work (Criado et al., 2022; Plonsky, 2022). Applications like Grammarly or Turnitin enable detailed evaluations of organisational aspects, such as idea structuring. Studies by Thi and Nikolov (2022) highlight the potential of digital tools to reduce instructors' workload while offering consistent, data-driven feedback. Integrating L1 and L2 in digital platforms enables nuanced corrections tailored to students' linguistic capabilities. However, the data highlights the importance of instructor oversight in ensuring that students critically evaluate automated feedback rather than accepting it uncritically. A notable finding across all feedback types is the strategic use of L1 and L2 to enhance understanding and application. This bilingual approach ensures that feedback is accessible while gradually transitioning students toward more excellent proficiency in L2. Another critical insight is the balance between instructor-led and peer-driven feedback mechanisms, fostering guided learning and autonomy. However, challenges such as dependency on direct feedback, training in interpreting codes, and variability in peer feedback quality highlight areas requiring intervention.

In conclusion, corrective feedback practices in writing instruction must balance clarity, autonomy, and accessibility. Integrating diverse strategies tailored to students' proficiency levels and learning contexts can optimise their writing development. Future research should explore hybrid feedback models that combine traditional and technological approaches, ensuring adaptability to evolving educational environments. These models have the potential to provide more immediate, personalised, and scalable feedback for learners.

Moreover, understanding students' perceptions and preferences toward various feedback types can inform more effective instructional practices and promote sustained engagement in the writing process.

EFL Students' Attitude Toward Lecturers' Feedback on Their Writing Results

The findings of this study highlight the nuanced perceptions and attitudes of EFL students toward lecturers' feedback in writing instruction. Students largely agree that feedback aids their understanding of errors (Item 1) and is crucial for the development of academic writing (Item 5). These results align with Crosthwaite et al. (2022) Klimova and Pikhart (2022), Mao et al. (2024), and Nguyen and Chu (2024)'s arguments that effective feedback bridges the gap between knowledge and application, enabling students to internalise corrections and improve their writing. However, the data reveal a divergence in students' ability to implement feedback, with a significant proportion finding it challenging to apply suggestions to revisions (Item 6). This echo concerns Lee (2020) raised that feedback must be scaffolded with actionable guidance to be effectively utilised.

Another key finding relates to the clarity and motivational impact of feedback. While most students perceive feedback as clear (Item 2) and motivating (Item 3), there is a sentiment that feedback often emphasises weaknesses over strengths (Item 4). This imbalance can lead to overwhelming feelings (Item 8), particularly when criticism outweighs positive reinforcement. Research by Sanchayan et al. (2024) emphasises the importance of balancing critical and positive feedback to sustain motivation and reduce anxiety. Feedback practices should incorporate strengths-based comments to boost confidence and create a more constructive learning environment.

Engagement with feedback presents another dimension of students' attitudes. The data suggest a gap between reviewing feedback and applying it to subsequent drafts (Items 9 and 10). While students value detailed feedback, particularly with examples (Item 11), active application remains inconsistent. These findings align with Mamad and Vigh (2022) teachers' WCF assertion that students often lack the skills to interpret and act on feedback autonomously. Providing detailed feedback with specific examples can address this gap, offering a practical model for students to emulate. Integrating reflective activities where students analyse feedback could enhance their engagement and critical understanding.

Finally, students express preferences for feedback focusing on both grammar and cohesion (Items 13 and 14) and emphasise the confidence-building effect of combining positive and critical comments (Item 15). Interestingly, most view digital tools like Grammarly as effective for improving writing (Item 16). This reflects a growing acceptance of technology in language learning, as supported by Thi and Nikolov (2022), who notes that automated tools provide immediate, consistent feedback that complements human instruction. However, the findings underscore the need for lecturers to provide humanised feedback that addresses higher-order concerns such as organisation and coherence, which automated tools often overlook.

In conclusion, while EFL students value and recognise the importance of lecturers' feedback, challenges remain in clarity, motivational balance, and application. These findings call for a feedback framework that combines detailed, constructive comments with opportunities

for active engagement, enhanced by technological tools for a holistic approach to writing instruction.

CONCLUSION

The study on formative assessments in writing classes reveals that instructors use a variety of strategies, including Short Writing Prompts, Error Correction Tests, Paragraph Writing, Guided Writing, and Summary Writing, to enhance students' writing skills. These assessments address vital aspects such as grammar, coherence, idea organisation, and critical thinking. Short Writing Prompts encourage spontaneous idea generation, while Error Correction Tests focus on grammar and error detection. Paragraph Writing helps students structure ideas effectively, and Guided Writing offers step-by-step support for those struggling with independent writing. Summary Writing improves students' ability to synthesise and condense information. Together, these strategies promote a holistic approach to writing development, with regular feedback and practice enabling continuous improvement in students' writing abilities. The study identified several challenges faced by lecturers teaching writing courses. These include workload and time management, which make it difficult to provide comprehensive feedback due to tight schedules; students' understanding of feedback, as many struggle to interpret and apply it effectively; and balancing criticism with motivation, where lecturers must offer constructive feedback without discouraging students. Additionally, challenges such as identifying plagiarism, citation issues, and AI use in writing have become more prominent with technological advancements, while utilising peer correction is hindered by varying student abilities, and limited access to online or digital correction tools further complicates the feedback process. Addressing these challenges requires a collaborative approach, including targeted training, clear guidelines, and better technology integration to enhance writing instruction. Students recognise the importance of lecturer feedback in their academic development but face challenges in applying it effectively. Many students struggle to revise their writing based on the feedback given and feel that the feedback often focuses more on their weaknesses than their strengths. Feedback that is detailed, particularly in areas like grammar and writing structure, is highly valued, especially when accompanied by concrete examples to aid understanding. Lecturer feedback is considered more effective than peer feedback, and positive comments alongside constructive criticism enhance students' confidence in writing. Students also utilise digital tools like Grammarly to improve their writing. These findings highlight the need for clear, constructive, and balanced feedback that not only addresses technical improvements but also supports students' motivation and self-confidence in developing their writing skills.

The findings of this study underline the importance of varied formative assessment strategies and feedback in enhancing students' writing skills. The use of diverse assessment methods, such as Short Writing Prompts, Error Correction Tests, and Guided Writing, plays a crucial role in addressing multiple aspects of writing development. However, the challenges identified—such as time constraints, students' difficulties in applying feedback, and the growing concern over plagiarism and AI use—highlight the need for systemic changes in writing instruction. In particular, these challenges suggest that both instructors

and students would benefit from improved training, clearer feedback guidelines, and better integration of technology. By addressing these barriers, writing instruction can be more effective in supporting students' academic development. Future research could explore the impact of specific feedback techniques on student motivation and writing improvement, especially in the context of balancing constructive criticism with positive reinforcement. Studies could also examine the effectiveness of digital tools like Grammarly in supporting students' independent learning and writing enhancement. Moreover, it would be valuable to investigate how peer feedback, when facilitated properly, can complement lecturer feedback and foster a collaborative learning environment. Longitudinal studies could further assess the long-term effects of formative assessments on students' writing competencies across different academic levels. Additionally, research into the challenges of plagiarism detection and the ethical use of AI in writing could provide valuable insights into maintaining academic integrity while embracing technological advances.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the Research and Community Service (Litapdimas) Program of the Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia through the Institute for Research and Community Service (LP2M) of IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo for the funding support provided for this research under Registration Number: 241020000088692.

REFERENCES

- Admiraal, W., Vermeulen, J., & Bulterman-Bos, J. (2020). Teaching with learning analytics: How to connect computer-based assessment data with classroom instruction? *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 29(5), 577–591. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2020.1825992>
- Ahmetovic, E., Becirovic, S., Dubravac, V., & Brdarevic-Celjo, A. (2023). The interplay between corrective feedback, motivation and EFL achievement in middle and high school education. *Journal of Language and Education*, 9(1), 26–40. <https://doi.org/10.17323/JLE.2023.12663>
- Alharbi, M. A. (2022). Exploring the impact of teacher feedback modes and features on students' text revisions in writing. *Assessing Writing*, 52, 100610. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2022.100610>
- Alkhateeb, A., & Daweli, T. W. (2024). Investigating composition instructors' written feedback practices at KSAU-HS of the academic year 2022–23. *Heliyon*, 10(7), e28705. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e28705>
- Almahal, E. A., Osman, A. A. A., Tahir, M. E., Hamdan, H. Z., Gaddal, A. Y., Alkhidir, O. T. A., & Gasmalla, E. E. (2023). Fostering formative assessment: Teachers' perception, practice and challenges of implementation in four Sudanese medical schools, a mixed-method study. *BMC Medical Education*, 23, 247. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04214-3>

- Anderson, R. C., Chaparro, E. A., Smolkowski, K., & Cameron, R. (2023). Visual thinking and argumentative writing: A social-cognitive pairing for student writing development. *Assessing Writing*, 55, 100694. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100694>
- Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using automated written corrective feedback in the writing classrooms: effects on L2 writing accuracy. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 36(4), 584–607. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1936071>
- Borrego, M. M. (2024). Error corrective treatment in Spanish L1 ESL learners: Suggesting an empirical method. *Spanish Journal of English Studies*, 45(45), 269–295. <https://doi.org/10.24197/ersjes.45.2024.269-295>
- Bowen, N., Insuwan, C., Satienchayakorn, N., & Teedaaksornsakul, M. (2023). The challenge of teaching English writing in Thailand: A tri-ethnography of Thai University lecturers. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 16(2), 482–498.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Calkins, L., Ehrenworth, M., & Akhmedjanova, D. (2019). Creating formative assessment systems in the teaching of writing, and harnessing them as professional development. In H. L. Andrade, R. E. Bennett & G. J. Cizek (Eds.), *Handbook of formative assessment in the disciplines*. Routledge.
- Chong, S. W. (2018). Three paradigms of classroom assessment: Implications for written feedback research. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 15(4), 330–347. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2017.1405423>
- Criado, R., Sánchez, A., & Rodríguez, M. S. (2022). Efficacy of WCF and focus on forms in EFL learners' writing accuracy: A comparative study. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(4), 631–656. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2022.12.4.8>
- Crosthwaite, P., Ningrum, S., & Lee, I. (2022). Research trends in L2 written corrective feedback: A bibliometric analysis of three decades of Scopus-indexed research on L2 WCF. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 58, 100934. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100934>
- Dlamini, S. B., Govender, S., & Mhlongo, H. (2024). Teaching strategies for improving creative writing in English first additional language. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 14(4), 332–344. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2024-0106>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Csizer, K. (2012). How to design and analyze surveys in second language acquisition research. In A. Mackey, & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide* (pp. 74–94). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444347340.ch5>
- ElEbyary, K., Shabara, R., & Boraie, D. (2024). The differential role of AI-operated WCF in L2 students' noticing of errors and its impact on writing scores. *Language Testing in Asia*, 14(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-024-00312-1>
- Gao, J., & Ma, S. (2022). Instructor feedback on free writing and automated corrective feedback in drills: Intensity and efficacy. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(5), 986–1009. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820915337>
- Gebremariam, H. T. (2024). Exploring the effects of written corrective feedback types on grammatical accuracy in L2 writing: Evidence from Ethiopian High School students. *SAGE Open*, 14(3), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241274331>

- González-Cruz, B., Cerezo, L., & Nicolás-Conesa, F. (2022). A classroom-based study on the effects of WCF on accuracy in pen-and-paper versus computer-mediated collaborative writing. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(4), 623–650.
- Granberg, C., Palm, T., & Palmberg, B. (2021). A case study of a formative assessment practice and the effects on students' self-regulated learning. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 68, 100955. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100955>
- Guo, Q., & Xu, Y. (2021). Formative assessment use in university EFL writing instruction: A survey report from China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 41(2), 221–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1798737>
- Hagos, T., & Andargie, D. (2024). Effects of formative assessment with technology on students' meaningful learning in chemistry equilibrium concepts. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 25(1), 276–299. <https://doi.org/10.1039/D2RP00340F>
- Hamano-Bunce, D. (2022). The effects of direct written corrective feedback and comparator texts on the complexity and accuracy of revisions and new pieces of writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 29(6), 2460–2479. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221127643>
- Han, S. (2023). The contribution of blog-based writing instruction to enhancing writing performance and writing motivation of Chinese EFL learners. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1069585. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1069585>
- Harrington, E. R., McWilliams, S. R., Karraker, N. E., Druschke, C. G., Morton-Aiken, J., Finan, E., & Lofgren, I. E. (2024). A new approach for increasing graduate students' science communication capacity and confidence. *PeerJ*, 12(12), e18594. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.18594>
- Hashemian, M., & Farhang-Ju, M. (2018). Effects of metalinguistic feedback on grammatical accuracy of Iranian field (in)dependent L2 learners' writing ability. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 141–161. <https://doi.org/10.22055/rals.2018.13797>
- Huang, L., Xu, M., Chen, Z., & Liu, F. (2019). Syllabus design for teacher education MOOCs (massive open online courses): A mixed methods approach. In S. Cheung, J. Jiao, L. K. Lee, X. Zhang, K. Li, & Z. Zhan (Eds.), *Technology in education: Pedagogical innovations. ICTE 2019. Communications in computer and information science* (Vol. 1048, pp. 156–168). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-9895-7_14
- Hyland, K. (Ed.) (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547>
- Jin, X., Jiang, Q., Xiong, W., Feng, Y., & Zhao, W. (2022). Effects of student engagement in peer feedback on writing performance in higher education. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 32(1), 128–143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2081209>
- Jinowat, N., & Wiboolyasarin, W. (2022). Investigating learner preferences for written corrective feedback in a Thai higher education context. *Teflin Journal*, 33(2), 386–402. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i2/386-402>
- Kawashima, T. (2023). Student perceptions of Grammarly, teacher's indirect and direct feedback: Possibility of machine feedback. *JALT CALL Journal*, 19(1), 113–139. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v19n1.1017>
- Khammee, K., Liang-Itsara, A., Nomnian, S., & Rhee, S. (2024). The effects of using scientific genre to promote undergraduate students' English Academic Writing in an ESP Course. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(3), 170–180. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n3p170>

- Klimova, B., & Pikhart, M. (2022). Application of corrective feedback using emerging technologies among L2 university students. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 2132681. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2132681>
- Kong, Y., Molnar, E. K., & Xu, N. (2022). Pre- and in-service teachers' assessment and feedback in EFL writing: Changes and challenges. *SAGE Open*, 12(3), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221126672>
- Lee, H. (2020). The effectiveness and features of formative assessment in US K-12 education: A systematic review. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 33(2), 124–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08957347.2020.1732383>
- Lee, I. (2021). Feedback and assessment in second language education: Learnings from COVID-19. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 30(6), 655–657. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00632-3>
- Lee, J. (2022). EFL learners' uptake and retention of written corrective feedback: A meta-analytic review. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(4), 497–521. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2022.12.4.2>
- Lee, I., Luo, N., & Mak, P. (2021). Issues of error selection for focused written corrective feedback in authentic classroom contexts. *ELC Journal*, 54(3), 616–629. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211028425>
- Liu, H., Ismail, L., & Ahmad, N. K. (2024). Genre-based approaches and ESL/EFL writing: A review of the literature. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(2), 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n2p25>
- Mamad, A., & Vigh, T. (2022). Moroccan EFL public university instructors' perceptions and self-reported practices of written feedback. *Journal of Language and Education*, 8(4), 117–136. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2022.15895>
- Mao, Z., Lee, I., & Li, S. (2024). Written corrective feedback in second language writing: A synthesis of naturalistic classroom studies. *Language Teaching*, 57(4), 449–477. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000393>
- Masrul, Erliana, S., Rasyidah, U., & Wicaksono, B. H. (2024). The effect of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on accuracy and fluency of university students' English writing. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(2), 388–399. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n2p388>
- McCallum, S., & Milner, M. M. (2021). The effectiveness of formative assessment: Student views and staff reflections. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1754761>
- Milla, R., & García-Mayo, M. del P. (2024). Collaborative writing, written corrective feedback and motivation among child EFL learners. *Porta Linguarum*, 41, 27–43. <https://doi.org/10.30827/portalin.vi41.23971>
- Morris, R. (2021). Formative assessment and feedback for learning in higher education: A systematic review. *Review of Education*, 9(3), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3292>
- Nguyen, T. N., & Chu, H. L. (2024). Enhancing students' writing performance through mobile-assisted written corrective feedback. *Reflection: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 31(2), 858–870. <https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v31i2.275269>
- Nemati, M., Alavi, M., Mohebbi, H., & Panahi, A. (2017). Teachers' writing proficiency and assessment ability: The missing link in teachers' written corrective feedback practice in an Iranian EFL context. *Language Testing in Asia*, 7(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-017-0053-0>

- Nipaspong, P. (2022). The effects of online corrective feedback on university students' self-regulation in writing. *PASAA Journal*, 64, 23–51. <https://doi.org/10.58837/chula.pasaa.64.1.2>
- Nishizuka, K. (2022). Significance and challenges of formative ipsative assessment in inquiry learning: A case study of writing activities in a “contemporary society” course in a Japanese high school. *SAGE Open*, 12(2), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221094599>
- Nourazar, S., Kakvand, R., & Aliasin, S. H. (2022). The impact of scaffolded metacognitive writing strategy instruction on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' IELTS writing task 2. *Education Research International*, 2022, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/6297895>
- Parra, G. L., & Calero, S. X. (2019). Automated writing evaluation tools in the improvement of the writing skill. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(2), 209–226. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12214a>
- Patra, I., Alazemi, A., Al-Jamal, D., & Gheisari, A. (2022). The effectiveness of teachers' written and verbal corrective feedback (CF) during formative assessment (FA) on male language learners' academic anxiety (AA), academic performance (AP), and attitude toward learning (ATL). *Language Testing in Asia*, 12(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00169-2>
- Plonsky, L. (2022). Models as written corrective feedback: Effects on young L2 learners' fluency in digital writing from product and process perspectives. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(4), 697–719. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2022.12.4.8>
- Pourdana, N., Nour, P., & Yousefi, F. (2021). Investigating metalinguistic written corrective feedback focused on EFL learners' discourse markers accuracy in mobile-mediated context. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 6(7), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-021-00111-8>
- Putra, J. W. G., Teufel, S., & Tokunaga, T. (2023). Improving logical flow in English-as-a-foreign-language learner essays by reordering sentences. *Artificial Intelligence*, 320, 103935. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2023.103935>
- Rahimi, M., Fathi, J., & Zou, D. (2025). Exploring the impact of automated written corrective feedback on the academic writing skills of EFL learners: An activity theory perspective. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(3), 2691–2735. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12896-5>
- Ranalli, J., Feng, H.-H., & Chukharev-Hudilainen, E. (2018). Exploring the potential of process-tracing technologies to support assessment for learning of L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 36, 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.03.007>
- Sanchayan, S., Olupeliyawa, A., & Chandratilake, M. (2024). Feedback practices in undergraduate clinical teaching in Sri Lanka: A qualitative study. *BMC Medical Education*, 24(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-05556-2>
- Sanjaya, D., Siregar, M., Riswanto, Yusif, M., & Husain, M. P. M. (2023). Developing symbolized corrective feedback application machine for English writing using deep learning (DL) technology. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 2732, 040002. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0133373>
- Sato, T. (2022). Assessing critical thinking through L2 argumentative essays: An investigation of relevant and salient criteria from raters' perspectives. *Language Testing in Asia*, 12(9), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00159-4>

- Scherer, S., Graham, S., & Busse, V. (2023). How effective is feedback for L1, L2, and FL learners' writing? A meta-analysis. *Learning and Instruction*, 93, 101961. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101961>
- Shabitha, M. P., & Mekala, S. (2023). Impact of integrated writing tasks on thinking and writing skills of Indian ESL learners. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 198–208. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.7>
- Singh, A. K., & Halim, H. A. (2023). Addressing challenges in language teaching in India: Exploring the role of corrective feedback in enhancing learning. *Advanced Education*, 10(22), 152–184. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.278042>
- Soleimani, H., Gholami, J., & Nejadgholi, M. (2024). Investigating EFL teachers' written feedback strategies in virtual classrooms. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 47, 153–170. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2025.47.09>
- Supiani, Yansyah & Bashtomi, Y. (2023). Indonesian university students' engagement with teacher's written corrective feedback in English as an additional language writing classroom. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 11(2), 147–166. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2023.121334>
- Teng, F. (2020). The benefits of metacognitive reading strategy awareness instruction for young learners of English as a second language. *Literacy*, 54(1), 29–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12181>
- Thi, N. K., & Nikolov, M. (2022). How teacher and Grammarly Feedback complement one another in Myanmar EFL students' writing. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 31(6), 767–779. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00625-2>
- Wang, K., Zhang, L. J., & Cooper, M. (2024). Metacognitive instruction for improving the effectiveness of collaborative writing for EFL learners' writing development. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 34(2), 661–673. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00886-7>
- Wang, Q., & Newell, G. E. (2025). Teaching and learning argumentative writing as critical thinking in an EFL composition classroom. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 51, 100891. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2025.100891>
- Wardana, I. K., Joni, D. A. A. W., & Arsana, A. A. P. (2025). Factors affecting teacher feedback on writing achievement, self-efficacy, and self-regulation in EFL context. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(3), 596–611. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v14i3.73964>
- Yu, S. (2021). Giving genre-based peer feedback in academic writing: sources of knowledge and skills, difficulties and challenges. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(1), 36–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1742872>
- Zeevy-Solovey, O. (2024). Comparing peer, ChatGPT, and teacher corrective feedback in EFL writing: Students' perceptions and preferences. *Technology in Language Teaching and Learning*, 6(3), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v6n3.1482>
- Zhang, W. (2023). Application of formative assessment model in college English Course assisted by digital platforms—taking HFUT as an example. In C. S. Gonzales-Gonzales, B. Fernandez-Manjon, F. Li, F. J. Garcia-Penalvo, F. Sciarone, M. Spaniol, A. Garcia-Holgado, M. Area-Moreira, M. Hemmje, & T. Hao (Eds.), *Learning technologies and systems* (pp. 502–512). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-33023-0_47

- Zhao, H., Dang, T. N. Y., & Finlayson, N. (2024). Education lecturers' expectations about writing proficiency: Insights from corpus analysis of teacher feedback on academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 67, 101173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.101173>
- Zhu, M., Liu, O. L., & Lee, H.-S. (2020). The effect of automated feedback on revision behavior and learning gains in formative assessment of scientific argument writing. *Computers and Education*, 143, 103668. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103668>
- Zou, D., Xie, H., & Wang, F. (2023). Effects of technology enhanced peer, teacher and self-feedback on students' collaborative writing, critical thinking tendency and engagement in learning. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 35(1), 166–185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-022-09337-y>