

Exploring Ninth-Grade EFL Students' Perceptions of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback and AI-Assisted Writing Feedback

Elsayed Mahmoud¹, Shima Ghahari², Sufian Forawi³

¹Assistant Professor, College of Humanities, City University, Ajman, UAE Email: s.sayed@cu.ac.ae

²Associate Professor, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Iran

Email: ghaharii@gmail.com

³Professor of Science/STEM Education, The British University in Dubai

Email: sufian.forawi@buid.ac.ae

HOW TO CITE:

Elsayed Mahmoud, Shima Ghahari, Sufian Forawi (2026). Exploring Ninth-Grade EFL Students' Perceptions of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback and AI-Assisted Writing Feedback. International Journal of Special Education, 41(23s), 913 - 928

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT:

Writing is one of the most difficult skills for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, especially when there is limited opportunity for writing revision and continuous improvement in traditional written corrective feedback. This qualitative study examined the perception of DWCF and computer-mediated feedback (CMCF) by the ninth-grade EFL students of a private school in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) regarding different aspects of writing development such as content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Six ninth-grade students were interviewed using a semi-structured approach to explore their experiences of DWCF and their perspectives on the use of digital technologies in DWCF feedback. The interview data were analyzed in the seven phases of the interview analysis protocol by an inductive thematic approach. The results indicated that DWCF was a meaningful, structured, timely, manageable teaching method and that it helped the students to be more aware of their writing errors, repeat their writing and improve their confidence in writing, and become more self-reliant in their writing. Positive attitudes toward computer-mediated feedback were also expressed by the participants, including their enjoyment of the access to it, its clarity, immediacy, and organizational advantages.

Keywords: Essay Writing, Feedback, Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback, Writing Skills.

1. Introduction

Writing is the most difficult English language skill for learners to master compared to other skills (Rababah, 2022). Although many researchers strive to scaffold students' writing skills (Al Murshidi, 2014; Hourani, 2008; Hyland, 2019;

Ibrahim, 2021; Rababah, 2002; Shehadeh, 2011; Sperrazza & Raddawi, 2016), learners often continue to face challenges in developing clear, accurate, and well-organized texts, particularly in EFL contexts (Binothman et al., 2024). There is ample evidence suggesting that limited competence or practice in reading and writing

skills, grammar and lexicon, coherence and cohesion, formulating ideas and producing meaningful content, as well as cross-linguistic interference are the main sources of poor academic writing (Al Mohammedi, 2016; Al-Khasawneh et al., 2024; Al Murshidi, 2014; Al Naqbi, 2011; AlYousef, 2019; Binothman et al., 2024; Ghazouani et al., 2024; Hourani, 2008; Ibrahim, 2021; Mahmoud, 2023; Rababah, 2002; Shehadeh, 2011). Collectively, these studies suggest that traditional approaches to teaching writing have been insufficient in addressing the persistent linguistic and organizational challenges experienced by EFL learners, highlighting the need for more effective instructional approaches.

Many researchers (e.g., Binothman et al., 2024; Hartshorn et al., 2010; Hartshorn et al., 2023; Mahmoud, 2023; Messenger et al., 2020) note that one of the main challenges is the use of methodology-related criteria. That is, the prevailing teaching approach (on-time feedback) fails to enable students to enhance their writing. Such methodological limitations become specifically important in educational contexts where English functions as a foreign language and students are required to maintain high academic literacy standards. This challenge is more pronounced in the United Arab Emirates (UAE), where students are expected to produce academic writing in English, despite having limited opportunities to engage in sustained, iterative English writing practice accompanied by continuous formative feedback. This challenge is illustrated in international and national assessment outcomes, including PISA, IELTS, TIMSS, and CEPA. Although the ambitious UAE's 2031 National Vision states that the UAE aims to develop a *first-rate education system*, students' performances on PISA and TIMSS are still below the OECD average of 500 in both tests (IEA TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, 2019; OECD, 2019). Recent results indicate that Arabic students' overall academic mean performance is 5.9, suggesting that, on average, students possess a moderate level of English language proficiency (IELTS, 2022). Also, among IELTS participating countries, UAE students received the lowest score in

writing, which was 4.48 in 2018 and 5.9 in 2022 (IELTS, 2018; IELTS, 2022).

Additionally, the UAE Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research administered the Common Educational Proficiency Assessment (CEPA), reporting that Emirati Grade 12 students achieved an average writing score of only 3.2 out of 6. That highlights a nationwide weakness in the proficiency of high school students in the UAE (MOHESR, 2014). Furthermore, in Sarsar's (2008) study of 100 tenth-grade students from the UAE Model Schools, 77% of the sample reported their writing skill to be poor, and only 9% declared their writing skill to be good. Teachers also admitted that their students dislike writing classes. 70% of the 20 teachers strongly agreed that their students disliked writing tasks, and 15% agreed that their students hated writing. These findings collectively demonstrate the need for instructional approaches that move beyond traditional error correction and offer learners sustained opportunities for improvement, like Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback (DWCF).

Unlike traditional writing feedback approaches, DWCF has led to significant improvements in many linguistic elements, even in areas where traditional methods often fail to address (Evans et al., 2011; Hartshorn & Evans, 2015; Hartshorn et al., 2010; Hartshorn et al., 2023; Kurzer, 2018; Kurzer, 2023; Wind, 2024). In the UAE, a few studies (e.g., AlYousef, 2019; Al Mohammedi, 2016; Mahmoud, 2023) have shown promising results in support of DWCF in scaffolding students' writing skills or improving their positive perceptions; yet further experimental studies are required to confidently generalize the positive outcomes of its usage, especially at the secondary/high school levels.

With the help of the latest development and technologies, computer-mediated feedback has been used more widely in EFL writing teaching these days. Digital platforms allow teachers to provide timely, organized, and accessible delivery of feedback, and also allow for efficient revising and resubmission by students, compared to paper-based feedback. These technologies can

also enable ongoing interactions during the writing process, making them especially aligned with the iterative approach of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback. A study of students' perception of computer-mediated feedback in the DWCF process could thus give some clues as to how to enhance writing learning in EFL classes.

Although several studies have emerged in the field of DWCF, many have focused on university-level students and tended to look at the enhancement of writing accuracy. There is comparatively little research devoted to secondary school students, and in the UAE context, this is especially the case for younger EFL learners, leaving a gap in understanding of the experiences of younger EFL learners. Therefore, this qualitative study aims to explore the perceptions and responses of 9th-grade students in a private school in Ajman, UAE, to Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback. The results will help to build upon the existing body of literature on feedback practices and will serve as evidence for teachers to consider when implementing more effective and student-centered practices in the development of the EFL writing skill.

2. Research Questions:

This study explored the ninth-grade EFL students' views of the Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback (DWCF) and computer-mediated feedback on writing skills, focusing on the writing components of content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics in a private school in the UAE.

- i. How do ninth-grade EFL students view their experiences of incorporating dynamic written corrective feedback into their writing processes in private schools in the UAE?
- ii. How do ninth-grade EFL students perceive the role of computer-mediated tools in supporting Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback and writing development?

3. Literature Review:

3.1. *Corrective Feedback*

Corrective feedback (CF) is viewed as "a response that is provided by a teacher, researcher, or peer in reaction to an error committed by the second/foreign language (L2) learner, delivered in L1 or L2 and in oral, written, and digital mode" (Leow & Driver, 2021, p. 65). CF varies in terms of resources, timing, and modes of delivery (i.e., human and computer-mediated).

The importance of feedback in English writing instruction has been explored in numerous research papers (Paltridge, 2004). The pedagogical value of feedback in classrooms is supported by many scholars (e.g., Frances, 1993; Hartshorn et al., 2023; Khazrouni, 2019; Swain, 1985; Wind, 2024). Karim and Nassaji (2019) and Mahmoud (2023) state that Educators have generally divided WCF into four essential types: direct, indirect, focused, and unfocused feedback. Karim and Nassaji (2019) define direct feedback as feedback in which learners explicitly receive correction from their instructor (Kamalian & Lashkarian, 2014). Karim and Nassaji (2019) characterize indirect feedback as the teacher's implicit indication of the error, through highlighting, marking with a symbol, or asking students to rectify them by themselves (Kamalian & Lashkarian, 2014).

3.2. *Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback*

Due to researchers' controversy over the WCF's effectiveness, Evans et al. (2011) argue that Hartshorn et al. (2010) deliberately added the word "dynamic" to WCF because of its interactive and continuous nature, making it an effective interactional strategy. They added that the word "dynamic," as described by Pickett (2000), refers to "an interactive system or process" marked by "continuous change, activity, or process" (p. 232). Due to these three issues, researchers proposed a new model called Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback (DWCF).

Hartshorn et al. (2010) found that one of the crucial factors that leads to writing incompetence is the methodology-related criteria, such as the instructional methods used to deliver it. Hence,

they created a developed version of the WCF, which is the DWCF. Hartshorn et al. (2010) define DWCF as: (i) feedback that reflects what the individual learner needs most, as demonstrated by what the learner produces, and (ii) a principled approach to pedagogy that ensures that writing tasks and feedback are meaningful, timely, constant, and manageable for both student and teacher” (p.87). It is noted that the first element is that feedback reflects what a learner needs, as indicated by their product. The second element is a principled approach to instruction that is meaningful, timely, constant, and manageable. It is also noted that Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback is based on the concept that feedback should focus on the specific needs of learners, as indicated by their errors in production.

More recent studies found significant success of DWCF (e.g., AlYousef, 2019; Eckstein et al., 2020; Evans et al., 2011; Fithriani, 2017; Hartshorn et al., 2010; Hartshorn & Evans, 2015; Hartshorn et al., 2023; Kurzer, 2018; Leontjev, 2016; Mahmoud, 2023; Wind, 2024), arguing that WCF can be significantly effective when there is a dynamic interaction between an instructor and students with four principles, which are meaningful, timely, constant, and manageable. The second debatable question is which feedback type is more effective: direct or indirect? Some researchers conclude that indirect feedback is considered more useful than direct feedback (e.g., Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010; Eslami, 2014; Gholaminia et al., 2014; Kamalian & Lashkarian, 2014; Kloss & Quintanilla, 2022; Subon & Ali, 2022). These proponents of the indirect type conclude that it engages students more cognitively, thereby reinforcing critical thinking and retaining information for a more extended period.

3.3. Computer-Mediated and AI-Assisted Feedback

The final debatable question involves whether the technology should be integrated into the DWCF. A few studies have utilized automated feedback on FL writing; however, this number has been increasing (Arnold et al., 2020). Indeed,

since Altamimi (2014) called for the need to use a computer and its new software, there has been a reasonable number of studies which have used computer as a medium between the feedback sender and the receivers (e.g., AbuSeileek & Abualsha’r, 2014), while other researchers investigated the use of AI while giving and receiving feedback (e.g., Gayed et al., 2022; Kellogg et al., 2010; Li et al., 2015; Mikheeva & Petrova, 2021; Wang & Han, 2022; Warden, 2000; Wilson et al., 2014).

Further, Li et al. (2015) examined the impact of automated writing evaluation (AWE) corrective feedback on writing accuracy using another AI software, Criterion. To collect the qualitative data, they conducted separate semi-structured interviews with four instructors and 27 students. For the quantitative data, they used SPSS to record the total number of submissions and errors. The study recommended using the AI software Criterion, as it led to increased revisions and helped improve accuracy from a rough draft to a final draft. Interviews with instructors and some students supported its benefits. Also, Gayed et al. (2022) researched the impact of an AI-based writing assistant on ten Japanese adults learning the English language. The study revealed that AI KAKU, an AI software, is potentially helpful for English language learners who require more structured assistance than traditional computer software, such as word processors, while also highlighting the need to rethink the role of automated writing evaluation feedback in ESL writing courses.

3.4. Research Gap

According to the previous research has demonstrated the effectiveness of DWCF in improving learners’ writing accuracy; however, limited studies have explored ninth-grade EFL students’ perceptions of the DWCF Model and computer-mediated feedback within secondary-school contexts in the local context. In addition, few studies have included students’ perceptions of using computers in DWCF. Moreover, little attention has been given to integrating technology-based feedback in scaffolding writing skills. Despite having been proven to be effective

in enhancing writing performance, research on Dynamic written corrective feedback (DWCF) has focused mainly on measurable improvement in writing and not on the actual process of receiving feedback. It is therefore unknown what meaning, involvement, and reaction secondary-school EFL students interpret, take part in, and react to DWCF (in the absence of digital technologies), especially when supported by digital technologies. The students' perceptions are important to understand because if the students accept and engage with the feedback, it will have a positive impact on the students' continued writing development. First, to fill this gap, the present study aims to qualitatively examine the perceptions of the DWCF and computer-mediated feedback of the ninth-grade students in the UAE secondary-school context, and its findings are not limited to writing accuracy but encompass learners' feedback experiences. Thus, this study tries to address this gap by exploring ninth-grade EFL students' views on DWCF and their views on using the computer as a mediated tool in writing.

4. Methodology

4.1. Research Design

This qualitative research is grounded in theories of reflexivity and identity, particularly those advanced by Bourdieu in 1990, Denzin in 2014, and Gee in 2000. The theories guided research in formulating research questions and exploring student engagement while writing prompts. Students' ways of writing and identity development were considered in this research. Therefore, the design of this qualitative research allowed students to air out their ideas while giving them chances to reflect on their writings.

4.2. Semi-structured Interviews

A semi-structured interview is one of the most effective tools for collecting qualitative data. The interview design and analysis followed Kvale's seven-stage interview planning. The first step was thematizing the interview study. It identifies the primary purpose of the investigation and obtains the core knowledge of the study's investigated concepts. The second step was designing the study, which involved planning the primary

procedural techniques to describe the study's results. The third step involved administering the study's interview according to the guided design. The fourth step was transcribing the interview for conducting the interview analysis. The fifth step was integrating interview analysis into the interview inquiry while considering the nature and the primary goal of the interview. The sixth step was validating the data of the interviews, considering the validity and reliability of the data. The seventh step was reporting the data of the interviews as the researchers linked the main results with the methods and techniques of the research.

The interview consists of two sections: section one is for the instructor's feedback, and section two is for the computer-mediated feedback. The first section has 11 open-ended questions, while the second section has six. The interview questions were utilized to answer the research questions in depth. The data were recorded, analyzed, and described. The interview analysis started by transcribing the interview text into a Word file. The interview questions were checked and verified by three professors. Student interviews were conducted on school premises. The interviews were transcribed, including repetitions, pauses, laughs, and stutters.

4.3. Participants and Sample Size

The study was conducted at a private international school in the United Arab Emirates, which is adequately equipped with computers and learning facilities. The qualitative approach was conducted in the computer laboratory. This international school follows the British curriculum. The research participants were enrolled in the IGCSE program. They took the same academic exams, such as CAT4, GL, and internal assessments conducted by the school. Importantly, English is taught as a core subject and is widely used as the medium of instruction at school in all grades.

The study sample consisted of 6 ninth-grade male students from different nationalities; all enrolled in a private school in the UAE. The researchers obtained permission from the United Arab Emirates University (UAEU) research council

and the UAE Ministry of Education (MOHESR). The International General Certificate of Secondary Education (IGCSE) school was the first to respond to the ministry. The researchers selected the participants for the research. This was done to answer the research questions and better understand the effect of DWCF on ninth graders' writing skills, focusing on the writing components: content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. This study used intact classes (convenience sampling) rather than random sampling, which limits external validity.

4.4. Selection Criteria

The selection criteria were: (i) enrollment in the same school program; (ii) presence in the same class and completion of the same exams (CAT4, GL, and internal assessments by the school); (iii) shared experience of the COVID-19 pandemic; (iv) residence in the UAE; and (v) known as non-native English speakers. All participants followed the British curriculum under the Cambridge Board. They have two years in Y11, a program for grades 9 and 10. After finishing it, they would shift to A Level for grades 11 and 12.

4.5. Ethical Considerations

The researchers obtained ethical approval from the Scientific Research Ethics Committee of the UAEU, No. ERSC_2023_4032. In addition, ethical approval was obtained from the Ministry of the UAE. Moreover, students signed a consent form that assures that their data is confidential and used for only academic purposes.

4.5.1. Credibility

The research maintained trustworthiness by using the framework proposed by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Furthermore, a panel of experts from the College of Education at UAEU reviewed and approved the interview questions. The researchers also gave adequate time to the interviewees to express their thoughts clearly without restriction to ensure credibility. That aligns well with Biesta's (2010) pragmatic stance that argues that, in addition to the correct information, credibility in the educational field should go beyond a narrow focus on "what

works" and should also include the context, human judgment, and specific experience.

4.5.2. Dependability

The study followed the seven interview planning stages proposed by Kvale (2007) to ensure consistency throughout the interview design, data collection, and analysis process.

4.5.3. Confirmability

To ensure confirmability, the interviewer compared the interpretive data with the original themes of the interviewees. Another educator also cross-checked the same themes and interpretations and verified them. Therefore, the researchers put themselves in brackets to minimize or remove any kind of bias because he was the interviewer and the researchers at the same time.

4.5.4. Transferability

The current manuscript does not contain any information that addresses transferability under Lincoln and Guba's framework.

4.6. Data Analysis

The researchers recorded, analyzed, and transcribed them, following Kvale's (2007) interview analysis stages. An inductive approach was utilized in this research to allow patterns and meanings to be understood from the interview information. Two researchers cross-checked the transcription and coding process to obtain accuracy and trustworthiness. The researchers grouped the interviews into codes and broader themes that could be collected under a broader theme to reflect students' perceptions about the two research questions. They will be presented in the following section.

The data analysis was systematic and inductive, with the themes. Transcripts of the interviews were read over multiple times to familiarize oneself with the data and to look for units of meaning that were relevant to the research questions. Some open codes were then created to identify common themes and participants' perspectives. Coded items were grouped, combined, and sorted into higher-order concepts, as the similarities in concepts became

apparent. These categories were then narrowed down to themes, which were identified as recurring themes within the responses of the participants. During the analysis, both researchers discussed coding decisions, resolved discrepancies by consensus between the two, and reviewed emerging themes to ensure that these were appropriate to the participants' experiences and perspectives.

5. Results

5.1. Demographic Analysis

The study involved six male ninth-grade students aged 14 years from diverse linguistic and cultural

backgrounds, including Sudanese, Pakistani, Iranian, Omani, and Egyptian nationalities. All participants were enrolled in the same British curriculum private school in the UAE and had experienced Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback (DWCF) before participating in the interviews. Pseudonyms were assigned to protect participants' identities, and all identifying information was removed from interview quotations. The participants reside in different Emirates, including 2 in Ajman, 2 in Sharjah, 1 in Umm Al Quwain, and 1 in Dubai. They reside with their parents and study at the same time in a school in the UAE. No one has a part-time job.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Participant (Pseudonym)	Age	Nationality	Emirate of Residence	Relevant Writing Characteristics
Omar	14	Sudanese	Ajman	Highly motivated to learn vocabulary but experienced difficulties with grammar and text organization.
Shamese	14	Pakistani	Sharjah	Demonstrated awareness of his writing weaknesses, particularly in grammar and idea development.
Batal	14	Iranian	Ajman	Showed strong classroom engagement and interest in reading but struggled with vocabulary use and grammatical accuracy.
Bahi	14	Omani	Sharjah	Maintained regular writing habits but reported challenges in essay organization and formal writing.
Abdulhakeem	14	Pakistani	Sharjah	Displayed positive learning motivation but required support in organizing and expressing ideas effectively.
Abdo	14	Egyptian	Dubai	Demonstrated willingness to improve writing and responded positively to interactive and feedback-oriented learning approaches.

5.2. Thematic Analysis:

This section presents the findings derived from the semi-structured interviews conducted with the six ninth-grade students. The analysis followed an inductive thematic approach, through which participants' responses were coded and organized into themes and subthemes

corresponding to the two research questions. The findings are presented separately for each research question and supported by representative quotations from the participants to illustrate the identified themes and provide evidence for the interpretations

5.2.1. Research Question 1: Students' Experience Incorporating DWCF.

As the study employed a semi-structured interview format, comprising 11 thoughtfully designed questions, it enabled the researchers to focus on two main areas: (i) the importance of DWCF and its role in writing progress, (ii) the perceived ease of DWCF procedures. The analysis contains three major themes, and each theme contains subthemes supported by verbatim student quotes.

Theme 1: The DWCF is an Early, Orderly, and Systematic Approach for Progress

The interviewees consistently regarded Dynamic Written Feedback as crucial to their writing attainment. Their responses provided insight into how they perceived the DWCF. They viewed the DWCF as a structured and timely approach that continuously promotes writing improvement. They stressed the need for it because it provides clear, ongoing, and actionable feedback from start to finish, helping them retain information through revision. Consequently, they expressed their desire to use it as needed, noting that it lasts forever, can be viewed later, and that repetition and continuity make improvement inevitable.

Additionally, they found DWCF very helpful and preferable to verbal comments because it allowed them to revisit and understand the information more easily, which enhanced the quality of their writing. Furthermore, they viewed the repetitive and ongoing nature of DWCF as a primary motivator for progress; consequently, they became capable of correcting their errors and paid more attention to writing patterns, which guided them to better writing. Sub-themes and excerpts from some of the students will be presented below.

(i) Sub-Theme 1: A Need and Urgency for the Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback

Six interviewees were interviewed: Abdo, Shamese, Abdulkhaleem, Batal, Bahi, and Omar (all pseudonyms). Most interviewees strongly and unanimously desired written corrective feedback from their teachers regarding their essays. They perceived this feedback as genuine and formally

presented, offering insights that are particularly helpful, straightforward, reliable, and impactful in their learning journey; their excerpts underscore the interviewees' pressing need for constructive guidance from their teachers, according to their respective statements below:

- Abdo: *"I believe that the teacher's feedback is crucial for providing formal and authoritative insights into his writing."*
- Omar: *"I trust the instructor's expertise and judgment more than any other way."*
- Batal: *"There is a need for written corrective feedback because it helps him understand and retain information."*
- Shamese: *"Well, [...] I need written corrective feedback from my teacher to improve my understanding and retention."*

(ii) Subtheme 2: Written Feedback Is Durable and Sustainable

Several interviewees voiced their appreciation for receiving written corrective feedback. They emphasized that this format feels more formal and has a structured quality that enhances its value. Many noted the lasting and accessible nature of written comments, which made it easier to grasp and apply the insights. Some expressed a sense of security in knowing that they could refer back to the feedback whenever necessary. Here are a few examples of their thoughts on the matter, according to their respective statements below:

- Batal: *"Unlike oral feedback, written feedback can be more formal."*
- Bahi: *"The written feedback could be reviewed later. Furthermore, Oral feedback can be immediate, but written feedback can be understood more easily and revisited multiple times."*

Theme 2: Interviewees Praise the Effectiveness, Systematizations, and Ease of DWCF

In exploring the second theme, the interviewees appreciate the dynamic written corrective feedback procedures for their clarity, practicality, and consistent application. All participants consistently emphasized the effectiveness,

systematic nature, and user-friendliness of these feedback mechanisms, resulting in a noticeable reduction in errors.

For instance, Abdo specifically remarked on how these feedback procedures significantly helped him minimize his mistakes, emphasizing their practical benefits. Batal approached the topic from a different angle, stating that the systematic procedures ideally ensured his errors were corrected, reinforcing his confidence in the process. Here are some examples of their insights, according to their respective statements below:

- Abdo: “[in a concerned tone] *The dynamic written corrective feedback procedures are effective as they help reduce errors progressively.*”
- Batal: “*The approach is systematic, and it ensures that mistakes are corrected thoroughly.*”
- Omar: “*The DWCF procedures are easy to understand and effective, and they have helped me write much better.*”

(i) **Subtheme 1:** *The DWCF Is Meaningful, Timely, Constant, and Manageable*

Some interviewees viewed the DWCF positively, describing the approach's principles and procedures as facilitators to their writing skills due to their ease and effectiveness. Additionally, feedback procedures are viewed as meaningful to students, as the whole process addresses their areas for improvement.

The participants unanimously informed that this type of continuous written corrective feedback is significant. For instance, Abdulhakeem expressed that the feedback was particularly impactful, guiding them clearly to improve their writing. Also, Omar appreciated that the DWCF directly treated his weaknesses in writing. Further, Abdo expressed his appreciation to DWCF as it helped him understand and learn from his mistakes and look for correction. The following excerpts present how they positively expressed their opinions on this matter

- Abdulhakeem: “*The procedures of DWCF are easy to understand and effective, and they enabled me to write well. The timing is also appreciated because the teacher*

does not leave much time before giving any version of his feedback; instead, he sends us the version that needs to be modified right after the class.”

- Abdo: “*The feedback is meaningful because it enabled me to understand and learn from my mistakes. Also, it was easy to manage the task and the requirements.*”

(ii) **Subtheme 2:** *The DWCF Has Instantaneous and Prompt Features*

The participants emphasized the timeline nature of DWCF. For example, Shameese felt that the feedback was particularly well-timed for him. Also, Omar expressed his appreciation for the feedback's promptness, which facilitated his learning. The following excerpts present how they positively expressed their opinions on this matter:

- Shameese: “*The feedback is instant. It was given soon after the submission.*”
- Omar: “*The feedback is timely, as it helps to make corrections promptly.*”
- Shameese: “*The feedback is always provided after submitting our corrections and helps improve our writing skills steadily.*”
- Omar: “*The feedback is fast and precise, aiding in understanding errors.*”
- Bahi: “*The prompt feedback makes it easier to respond effectively and promptly. That enabled me to follow the instructions and correct my errors.*”

Theme 3: DWCF as an Instrumental Tool for Writing Improvement

All interviewees expressed unanimous support for adopting this DWCF, enhancing their writing quality and self-regulation. Firstly, they noted that this method significantly enhanced their writing skills. By actively engaging with their work, they could identify areas for improvement and experiment with various writing techniques, resulting in more polished and compelling content.

Secondly, the approach proved highly effective in ensuring a deeper understanding of the writing process. The interviewees emphasized that it facilitated a continuous cycle of learning and

reflection, allowing them to grasp the underlying principles of effective writing. Moreover, this method instilled a strong sense of accountability, as individuals were encouraged to correct their errors systematically. The result was a marked improvement in their writing, ultimately leading to the production of work that was consistently error-free. The dynamic approach fostered skill development and greater confidence in their writing abilities.

(i) **Subtheme 1: The DWCF Is a Viable Tool for Writing Tasks**

All interviewees viewed the DWCF positively and stated that it is an effective tool for writing tasks. The interviewees unanimously expressed that dynamic written corrective feedback is an excellent tool because it helps them improve their writing skills, understand and correct their mistakes, and benefit from their development. Some of their excerpts will be presented in the following lines, according to their respective statements below:

- Bahi: “Yes, the method (DWCF) should be continued as it effectively helps students improve their writing skills in writing tasks.”
- Batal: “Yes, this method (DWCF) is recommended because it ensures interviewees understand and correct their mistakes when writing essays.”
- Abdo: “Yes, the new approach (DWCF) benefits learning and should be used with future students because it helps them identify mistakes for better writing.”

(ii) **Subtheme 2: Indirect DWCF as a Tool for Enhancing Critical Thinking in Writing**

Nearly all interviewees viewed the indirect version of DWCF more positively than the direct one in terms of its usage, as it allowed them to discover the answer themselves. Unlike the traditional method of explicitly correcting mistakes, the indirect feedback used in this research has prompted them to think, consult English sites, and search in their books to find the correct answers to their mistakes. Some of their excerpts will be presented in the following lines, according to their respective statements below:

- Bahi: “The traditional way of writing the answer does not let me think. It gives me a ready answer, and I may forget it later. However, the indirect symbols used by the instructor led us to believe that we could correct our mistakes. In most cases, I re-read the grammatical lessons to ensure I provide my instructor with the correct answer. If it is incorrect, he will use the symbol again to help me find the correct answers.”
- Omar: “Although I found the correct answer through direct feedback from the teacher, I forgot it. However, when I see symbols from the instructors referring to my mistakes, I review the lessons again, either by studying the book or an educational website, and then write the correct answer. I also have numerous opportunities to review and provide additional feedback with the instructor.”

5.2.2. Research Question 2: Students' Experience with Computer-Mediated Feedback

Theme 1: Perceptions of Digital Feedback

To thoroughly address this question, a follow-up segment of interviews was conducted with the same six ninth-grade students ($n = 6$) from the private school, focusing specifically on their perspectives regarding computer-mediated feedback methods. This phase consisted of six semi-structured questions designed to explore two major areas: (i) students' opinions on receiving feedback through digital platforms and (ii) their thoughts on the potential integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in future feedback practices. They valued the systematic, legible, and accessible nature of computer-based communication. The discussion was organized into two overarching themes and several subthemes to ensure clarity and depth of analysis.

(i) **Subtheme 1: Clarity and Systematic Nature**

Throughout the discussions, all interviewees preferred receiving teacher feedback through computer-mediated methods. Interestingly, while three of the six interviewees had previously obtained feedback on their writing before the experiment began, every interviewee unanimously favored receiving comments on their essays in a digital format. One compelling reason for this preference is that feedback delivered via computer was more readable and

systematic than feedback received via paper and pen. The interviewers noted that receiving feedback via computer provided detailed information, including grammatical and lexical feedback. Additionally, the feedback was more readable and straightforward than the paper-based feedback. The interviewee had a positive view of the use of computers, according to their respective statements below:

- Abdo: *"Yes, I received feedback through various online platforms and software, but receiving feedback through a computer is more detailed and more precise than paper-based feedback."*
- Abdulhakeem: *"Yes, it speeds up the process, which is systematic, and that enabled me to correct errors immediately."*
- Batal: *"Before this course, I received no computer-based feedback. The feedback was handwritten. The current feedback is more precise and provides me with much information on grammar, vocabulary, thesis statement, and more."*

(ii) **Subtheme 2: Speed and Ease of Use**

The interviewees noted that receiving feedback quickly helped them make timely revisions. In addition, they viewed the digital feedback positively as it enabled them to receive the feedback faster and more easily, and they sent their production the same way. The following excerpts present how they positively expressed their opinions on this matter:

- Shamese: *"Yes, it makes the process quicker by providing instant feedback. I can revise faster. I am also able to easily revisit the feedback via my computer."*
- Bahi: *"Yes, computer feedback is beneficial because it is faster than the teacher's pen-writing. In addition, it was detailed and immediate after I submitted my work."*

Theme 2: Views on Future AI-Assisted Feedback Practices

Using AI tools in the future received positive views from the interviewees, but they had some concerns while using them during the DWCF. Their opinions were divided into two subthemes as follows:

(i) **Subtheme 1: Preference for Teacher Supervision**

The interviewees expressed positive views on using the AI tools; however, they preferred the supervision to occur through the teacher. Although they expressed that using AI tools is possible, five interviewees have a sentiment that the teacher is much more reliable, authentic, and trustworthy than AI-assisted tools. The following excerpts present how they positively expressed their opinions on this matter:

- Batal: *"The instructor's supervision of AI-mediated feedback makes it more authentic and trustworthy."*
- Abdo: *"The feedback is more trusted if their instructor supervises it, as it adds a layer of reliability."*

Nevertheless, Abdulhakeem expressed that AI can be a complementary tool to the teacher's feedback as it can play an assisting role in detecting minor mistakes. The following excerpts present how they positively expressed their opinions on this matter:

- Abdulhakeem: *"The systematic approach of AI feedback helps me catch and correct minor mistakes, improving overall writing quality. AI feedback can also catch mistakes that humans might miss, but the feedback of the teacher is also still important."*

(ii) **Subtheme 2: AI as a Future Supportive Tool**

Despite all interviewers having some concerns with using the AI tools as a primary tool or doing the teacher's job, they unanimously expressed the possibility of using these tools as a secondary resource to the teacher. The following excerpts present how they positively expressed their opinions on this matter:

- Omar: *"Yes, I would like to use AI-automated feedback in the future, but AI software is a secondary resource. It would be helpful to get faster and more detailed feedback."*
- Abdulhakeem: *"Yes, AI feedback can provide new perspectives alongside the teacher's feedback and offer faster corrections."*

6. Discussion

6.1. Learners' Perspectives on DWCF

The findings indicate that the participating students perceived Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback (DWCF) as a meaningful, structured, and effective instructional approach for improving their writing skills. Participants consistently appreciated the timely, repetitive, and systematic nature of the feedback, which enabled them to recognize their errors, revise their work, and gradually improve their writing performance. These findings support previous studies (Hartshorn et al., 2010; Hartshorn & Evans, 2015; Kurzer, 2023), which argue that continuous and iterative feedback promotes greater learner engagement and sustained writing development than traditional one-time corrective practices.

The participants also emphasized that repeated opportunities to revise their writing enhanced their confidence and encouraged independent learning. Rather than relying solely on teacher corrections, students actively reflected on their mistakes and searched for appropriate corrections, suggesting that the indirect nature of DWCF promotes learner autonomy. This finding aligns with Skill Acquisition Theory, which proposes that repeated practice enables learners to transform declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge through continuous application. Similarly, Swain's Comprehensible Output Hypothesis supports the idea that producing and revising language encourages learners to notice linguistic gaps and restructure their language knowledge.

6.2. Learners' Perspectives on Computer-Mediated Writing Support

The findings further revealed positive perceptions toward computer-mediated feedback during the writing process. Participants considered digital feedback more accessible, organized, detailed, and easier to understand than conventional handwritten feedback. The use of computers enabled students to revisit teacher comments whenever necessary, facilitating multiple rounds of revision and promoting deeper understanding of their writing errors.

These findings support previous research highlighting the advantages of digital feedback in enhancing interaction, accessibility, and efficiency throughout the writing process.

Participants also valued the immediacy of computer-mediated feedback. Receiving comments electronically enabled them to revise their work more quickly and remain engaged in the iterative feedback cycle. Such findings reinforce previous studies suggesting that technology can facilitate timely and interactive feedback while supporting continuous learner engagement.

An additional finding concerned students' perceptions of artificial intelligence (AI) in writing instruction. Although participants acknowledged the potential benefits of AI-assisted feedback for identifying errors and generating suggestions, they consistently expressed greater trust in teacher feedback. Rather than replacing teachers, participants preferred a blended approach in which AI functions as a complementary tool supporting teachers' professional judgment. This finding highlights the continuing importance of human guidance in EFL writing instruction while recognizing the growing role of educational technologies.

6.3. Alignment Between DWCF and Learner Preferences

The participants' data overtly revealed strong alignment between the principles of DWCF, which are meaningful, timely, constant, and manageable, and their personal learning preferences. This type (DWCF) is tailored to their writing challenges that derived from the traditional, monomodal pedagogy that was described "dull" and challenging to comprehend and led to weak performance in academic exams such as PISA and TIMS (Binothman et al., 2024), lead to low-grammatical competence (Hourani, 2008), limited ability to formulate ideas and produce meaningful content (Al Naqbi, 2011), lack of confidence in addressing challenging topics, and difficulty maintaining focus on L2 learning (Alhaysony, 2012; Kaplan, 1966; Rababah, 2022; Zhang, 2019). Also, the iterative,

repetitive, indirect, and interactive nature of DWCF has a significant role in enabling students to notice errors, understand how to correct them, think critically to ensure accurate correction, and retain information over time. The harmony between students' preferences and DWCF principles shows DWCF has accepted pragmatic features that align with what Biesta (2010) calls for "education that works because it matters," entailing both practical educational utility and meaningful learner participation in writing development.

7. Implications

Unlike Truscott's (1996) claim that corrective feedback leads only to "pseudo-learning," this study concludes that DWCF impact on the participants' writing skills. (Hartshorn et al., 2010; Hartshorn & Evans, 2015; Kurzer, 2018; Kurzer, 2022) to EFL settings in the UAE (AlYousef, 2019; Mahmoud, 2023). These findings of the study align with the skill acquisition theory and the comprehensible output Hypothesis, supporting the role of applying knowledge, particularly when it is repeated, giving learners opportunities to notice, think, apply, correct, and improve their writing. The findings demonstrate that DWCF, with its indirect and unfocused repetitive nature, can be used pedagogically as a practical alternative to traditional on-time feedback, which failed to improve students' writing in both the short and long term. This fascinating approach fosters students to notice, think, apply, correct, and internalize the targeted information effectively. Moreover, computer-based feedback expedites and accelerates learning. More importantly, participants expressed their tendency to use AI software, so teachers can integrate it to generate remarks. That saves a significant amount of time. Some AI platforms, such as AI KaKU, can help teachers and students in this context.

8. Limitations

Several limitations should be acknowledged when interpreting the findings of this study. First, the study involved only six male ninth-grade students from a single private school in the UAE, limiting the transferability of the findings to other

educational settings. Second, participants represented only secondary-school learners and therefore do not reflect the perspectives of students in government schools, higher education institutions, or different educational systems. Finally, the relatively small sample size, while appropriate for qualitative inquiry, limits the diversity of perspectives captured in this study. Consequently, the findings should be interpreted within the specific context in which the research was conducted

9. Conclusion:

This study explored ninth-grade EFL students' perceptions of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback and computer-mediated writing support within a UAE secondary-school context. The findings indicate that students viewed DWCF as an effective instructional approach because of its meaningful, timely, repetitive, and structured feedback process, which promoted greater engagement, confidence, and responsibility for learning. Participants also expressed positive attitudes toward computer-mediated feedback and recognized the potential of AI-assisted writing tools when combined with teacher guidance. Overall, the study suggests that integrating DWCF with digital technologies offers a promising learner-centered approach for supporting writing development and enhancing feedback practices in EFL classrooms.

10. Future Research

This research contributes to the growing body of literature advocating for the dynamic approach as a sustainable instructional strategy for EFL writing instruction. Practically, the study highlights the need for teachers, curriculum planners, and policy makers to adopt DWCF in classrooms. Future research should investigate its application across various educational levels, genres, and technological platforms to gain a deeper understanding of its adaptability and long-term effects on language learning outcomes.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the participants and the school administration for

their cooperation and support throughout this study.

References

- AbuSeileek, A., & Abualsha'r, A. (2014). Using peer computer-mediated corrective feedback to support EFL learners' writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 18(1), 76–95.
- Al Mohammedi, N. A. (2016). *Exploring the perceived and the actual written feedback preferences between EFL students and teachers in the UAE* (Master's thesis, United Arab Emirates University).
- Al Murshidi, G. (2014a). Emirati and Saudi students' writing challenges at US universities. *English Language Teaching*, 7(6), 87–95.
- Al Murshidi, G. (2014b). UAE university male students' interests impact on reading and writing performance and improvement. *English Language Teaching*, 7(9), 57–63.
- Al Naqbi, S. (2011). The use of mind mapping to develop writing skills in UAE schools. *Education, Business and Society: Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues*, 4(2), 120–133.
- Al-Khasawneh, H. A. S., Khalil, A. A. A., & Abu-Ayyash, E. A. S. (2024). EFL Arab learners' orthographic errors: A contrastive analysis. In T. Charles & E. Abu-Ayyash (Eds.), *TESOL teacher research* (pp. 3–17). Springer Nature.
- Altamimi, O. (2014). Dynamic written corrective feedback revisited: A critique and an improved model. *Arab World English Journal*, 5(3).
- AlYousef, E. A. (2019). *The impact of dynamic written corrective feedback on Arab EFL intermediate students' writing accuracy* (Master's thesis, United Arab Emirates University).
- Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers prefer and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 95–127.
- Bal, S. (2021). An investigation of the integration of blogs into EFL classes: Learners' views toward blogs and preferences for writing classes. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning*, 4(4), 594–604.
- Biesta, G. (2010). Why “what works” still won't work: From evidence-based education to value-based education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 29(5), 491–503.
- Binothman, M., Alhabbash, M., Al Mohammedi, N., & Ibrahim, A. (2024). Unraveling high-school students' learning experiences in English, science, and math: A mixed methods study. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2351243.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford University Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (2014). *Interpretive autoethnography* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Eckstein, G., Sims, M., & Rohm, L. (2020). Dynamic written corrective feedback among graduate students: The effects of feedback timing. *TESL Canada Journal*, 37(2), 78–102.
- Eslami, E. (2014). The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 445–452.
- Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., & Strong-Krause, D. (2011). The efficacy of dynamic written corrective feedback for university-matriculated ESL learners. *System*, 39(2), 229–239.
- Fithriani, R. (2017). *Indonesian students' perceptions of written feedback in second language writing* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of New Mexico).
- Frances, Z. (1993, November). *Responding to students' papers: When less is more*. Paper presented at the 83rd Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Pittsburgh, PA, United States.
- Gayed, J. M., Carlon, M. K. J., & Cross, J. S. (2022). Impact on second language writing via an intelligent writing assistant and metacognitive training. In *2022 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE)* (pp. 1–9). IEEE.
- Gee, J. P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99–125.
- Gholaminia, I., Gholaminia, A., & Marzban, A. (2014). An investigation of meta-linguistic corrective feedback in writing performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 316–320.

- Hartshorn, K. J., & Evans, N. W. (2015). The effects of dynamic written corrective feedback: A 30-week study. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 1(2), 2–30.
- Hartshorn, K. J., Evans, N. W., Merrill, P. F., Sudweeks, R. R., Strong-Krause, D., & Anderson, N. J. (2010). Effects of dynamic corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44(1), 84–109.
- Hartshorn, K. J., Rice, S. H., Eckstein, G., & Evans, N. W. (2023). Dynamic written corrective feedback frequency and its effects on ESL writing fluency, accuracy, and complexity. *Frontiers in Research in Science and Linguistics*, 1(2), Article 7.
- Hourani, T. M. Y. (2008). *An analysis of the common grammatical errors in the English writing made by secondary male students in the Eastern Coast of the UAE* (Master's thesis, The British University in Dubai).
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Ibrahim, O. (2021). Academic writing teaching method for Arab students: A case study in a health sciences university in the UAE. *Journal of Critical Studies in Language and Literature*, 2(3), 8–19.
- IEA TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center. (2019). *TIMSS 2019 international results in mathematics and science*. <https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/timss2019/international-results/>
- IELTS. (2018). *International English Language Testing System: Information for candidates*. <https://www.ielts.org>
- IELTS. (2022). *IELTS annual review 2022*. <https://www.ielts.org/-/media/annual-review-2022.pdf>
- Kamalian, A., & Lashkarian, A. (2014). The effect of dynamic written corrective feedback on Iranian elementary learners' writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(5), 47–56.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 16(1–2), 1–20.
- Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2018). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on English-as-a-second-language students' writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(4), 519–539.
- Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2019). The effects of written corrective feedback: A critical synthesis of past and present research. *Instructed Second Language Acquisition*, 3(1), 28–52.
- Kellogg, R. T., Whiteford, A. P., & Quinlan, T. (2010). Does automated feedback help students learn to write? *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 42(2), 173–196.
- Khazrouni, M. (2019). Assessment for improving ESL learners' writing skills among undergraduate students: A case study of Skyline University College. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(1), 30–44.
- Kloss, S., & Quintanilla Espinoza, A. (2022). The effectiveness of direct and metalinguistic written corrective feedback to deal with errors in the use of information-structuring connectors. *Journal of Language and Education*, 8(4), 88–101.
- Kurzer, K. (2018). Dynamic written corrective feedback in developmental multilingual writing classes. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(1), 5–33.
- Kurzer, K. (2022). Accuracy gains from unfocused feedback: Dynamic written corrective feedback as meaningful pedagogy. *Journal of Language and Education*, 8(4), 102–116.
- Kurzer, K. (2023). Dynamic written corrective feedback. In H. Mohebbi & Y. Wang (Eds.), *Insights into teaching and learning writing: A practical guide for early-career teachers* (pp. 139–154). Castledown.
- Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing interviews*. Sage.
- Leontjev, D. (2016). Exploring and reshaping learners' beliefs about the usefulness of corrective feedback: A sociocultural perspective. *ITL – International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 167(1), 46–77.
- Leow, R. P., & Driver, M. (2021). Cognitive theoretical perspectives of corrective feedback. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 65–84). Cambridge University Press.
- Li, J., Link, S., & Hegelheimer, V. (2015). Rethinking the role of automated writing evaluation feedback in ESL writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 1–18.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.

- Mahmoud, E. (2023). Tertiary students' perceptions of dynamic written corrective feedback in an ESL classroom in the UAE. *Emirati Journal of Education and Literature*, 1(1), 4–17.
- Messenger, R., Evans, N., & Hartshorn, K. (2020). Managing dynamic written corrective feedback: Perspectives of experienced teachers. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 6(1), 108–138.
- Mikheeva, N. F., & Petrova, M. G. (2021). Artificial intelligence in academic writing teaching. In *Proceedings of the Scientific Conference on Social and Economic Sciences and Management (SICONSEM)*.
- Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. (2014). *Strategic plan for higher education and scientific research (2014–2016)*. UAE Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *PISA 2018 results (Volume I): What students know and can do*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en>
- Paltridge, B. (2004). Academic writing. *Language Teaching*, 37(2), 87–105.
- Pickett, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (4th ed.). Houghton Mifflin.
- Rababah, G. (2002). *Communication problems facing Arab learners of English*. ERIC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED473079>
- Rababah, G. (2022). *Communication problems facing Arab learners of English*. ERIC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED473079>
- Ryan, B. (2010). Extraterritorial immigration control: What role for legal guarantees? In B. Ryan & V. Mitsilegas (Eds.), *Extraterritorial Immigration Control: Legal Challenges* (pp. 1–37). Brill Nijhoff.
- Sarsar, N. M. (2008). *Intervention learning plan to address the issue of poor writing skills among students of Al Ittihad Model School* [Unpublished manuscript].
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback, language aptitude, and learner attitudes on the acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 301–322). Oxford University Press.
- Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37(4), 556–569.
- Shehadeh, A. (2011). Effects and student perceptions of collaborative writing in L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(4), 286–305.
- Sperrazza, L., & Raddawi, R. (2016). Academic writing in the UAE: Transforming critical thought in the EFL classroom. In L. Buckingham (Ed.), *English Language Teaching in the Arab World* (pp. 151–169). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Subon, F., & Ali, N. A. (2022). Effect of implicit written corrective feedback on the writing skills of ESL learners. *Journal of Language and Education*, 8(4), 153–168.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327–369.
- Wang, Z., & Han, F. (2022). The effects of teacher feedback and automated feedback on cognitive and psychological aspects of foreign language writing: A mixed-methods research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 909802.
- Wind, A. M. (2024). The effects of dynamic written corrective feedback on EFL university students' writing accuracy: A complex dynamic systems theory perspective. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 10(2), 1–21.
- Zhang, X. (2019). EFL writers' reconstruction of writing beliefs in a functional linguistics-based curriculum: What does the trajectory look like? *SAGE Open*, 9(2), Article 2158244019853915.