

PEDAGOGIK MAHORAT

5
2025



PEDAGOGIK MAHORAT

Ilmiy-nazariy va metodik jurnal

5-son (2025-yil, may)

Jurnal 2001-yildan chiqa boshlagan

Buxoro – 2025

PEDAGOGIK MAHORAT

Ilmiy-nazariy va metodik jurnal

2025, № 4

Jurnal O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Vazirlar Mahkamasi huzuridagi OAK Rayosatining 2016-yil 29-dekabrda qarori bilan **pedagogika** va **psixologiya** fanlari bo‘yicha dissertatsiya ishlari natijalari yuzasidan ilmiy maqolalar chop etilishi lozim bo‘lgan zaruriy nashrlar ro‘yxatiga kiritilgan.

Jurnal 2001-yilda tashkil etilgan.

Jurnal 1 yilda 12 marta chiqadi.

Jurnal O‘zbekiston matbuot va axborot agentligi Buxoro viloyat matbuot va axborot boshqarmasi tomonidan 2016-yil 22-fevral № 05-072-sonli guvohnoma bilan ro‘yxatga olingan.

Muassis: Buxoro davlat universiteti

Tahririyat manzili: 200117, O‘zbekiston Respublikasi, Buxoro shahri Muhammad Iqbol ko‘chasi, 11-uy.

Elektron manzil: nashriyot_buxdu@buxdu.uz

TAHRIR HAY’ATI:

Bosh muharrir: Adizov Baxtiyor Rahmonovich – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor

Mas’ul kotib: Sayfullayeva Nigora Zakiraliyevna – pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Xamidov Obidjon Xafizovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Begimqulov Uzoqboy Shoyimqulovich, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor

Navro‘z-zoda Baxtiyor Nigmatovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Ibragimov Xolboy Ibragimovich, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor

Rasulov To‘lqin Husenovich, fizika-matematika fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

Yanakiyeva Yelka Kirilova, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor (N. Rilski nomidagi Janubiy-G‘arbiy Universitet, Bolgariya)

Andriyenko Yelena Vasilyevna pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor (Novosibirsk davlat pedagogika universiteti Fizika, matematika, axborot va texnologiya ta’limi instituti, Novosibirsk, Rossiya)

Romm Tatyana Aleksandrovna pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor (Novosibirsk davlat pedagogika universiteti Tarix, gumanitar va ijtimoiy ta’lim instituti, Novosibirsk, Rossiya)

Chudakova Vera Petrovna, psixologiya fanlari nomzodi (Ukraina pedagogika fanlari milliy akademiyasi, Ukraina)

Zotova Firuza Raxmatullova, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor (Volgabo‘yi davlat jismoniy tarbiya, sport va turizm universiteti, Rossiya)

Hamroyev Alijon Ro‘ziqulovich – pedagogika fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

Qahhorov Siddiq Qahhorovich, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor

Mahmudova Muyassar, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor

Kozlov Vladimir Vasilyevich, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor (Yaroslavl davlat universiteti, Rossiya)

Tadjixodjayev Zokirxo‘ja Abdusattorovich, texnika fanlari doktori, professor

Amonov Muxtor Raxmatovich, texnika fanlari doktori, professor

O‘rayeva Darmonoy Saidjonovna, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor

Durdiyev Durdimurod Qalandarovich, fizika-matematika fanlari doktori, professor

Mahmudov Nosir Mahmudovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Olimov Shirinboy Sharofovich, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor

Chariyev Irgash To‘rayevich, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor

Qiyamov Nishon Sodiqovich, pedagogika fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

Shomirzayev Maxmatmurod Xuramovich, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor

Ro‘ziyeva Dilnoza Isomjonovna, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor

Qurbonova Gulnoz Negmatovna, pedagogika fanlari doktori (DSc)

To‘xsanov Qahramon Rahimboyevich, filologiya fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

Nazarov Akmal Mardonovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

Dilova Nargiza Gaybullayevna, pedagogika fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

Jumayev Rustam G‘aniyevich, siyosiy fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent

Abdullayev Mehridin Junaydulloyevich, pedagogika fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

Sattorov Anvar Ergashovich, pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), professor

Nurulloev Firuz No‘monjonovich, pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Navruz-Zoda Layli Baxtiyorovna, iqtisodiyot fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent

Fayziyeva Umida Asadovna, pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent

Xalikova Umida Mirovna, pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent

ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОЕ МАСТЕРСТВО

Научно-теоретический и методический журнал

№ 5, 2025

Решением Высшей аттестационной комиссии при Кабинете Министров Республики Узбекистан от 29 декабря 2016 года журнал включён в перечень изданий, рекомендованных для публикации научных результатов статей по направлениям «Педагогика» и «Психология».

Журнал основан в 2001 году.

Журнал выходит 12 раз в год.

Журнал зарегистрирован Бухарским управлением агентства по печати и массовой коммуникации Узбекистана.

Свидетельство о регистрации средства массовой информации № 05-072 от 22 февраля 2016 г.

Учредитель: Бухарский государственный университет

Адрес редакции: 200117, Узбекистан, г. Бухара, ул. Мухаммад Икбол, 11.

E-mail: nashriyot_buxdu@buxdu.uz

РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ:

Главный редактор: Адизов Бахтиёр Рахманович – доктор педагогических наук, профессор

Ответственный редактор: Сайфуллаева Нигора Закиралиевна – доктор философии педагогических наук (PhD)

Хамидов Обиджон Хафизович, доктор экономических наук, профессор

Бегимкулов Узакбай Шаимкулович, доктор педагогических наук, профессор

Навруз-заде Бахтиёр Нигматович, доктор экономических наук, профессор

Ибрагимов Холбой Ибрагимович, доктор педагогических наук, профессор

Расулов Тулкин Хусенович, доктор физико-математических наук, профессор

Янакиева Елка Кирилова, доктор педагогических наук, профессор (Болгария)

Андрienko Елена Васильевна (Институт физико-математического, информационного и технологического образования НГПУ, Новосибирск, Россия)

Ромм Татьяна Александровна (Институт истории, гуманитарного, социального образования ФГБОУ ВО НГПУ, Новосибирск, Россия)

Чудакова Вера Петровна, кандидат психологических наук (Национальная академия педагогических наук Украины, Украина)

Зотова Фируза Рахматулловна, доктор педагогических наук, профессор (Поволжский государственный университет физической культуры, спорта и туризма, Россия)

Хамроев Алижон Рузikuлович, доктор педагогических наук (DSc), профессор

Каххаров Сиддик Каххарович, доктор педагогических наук, профессор

Махмудова Муяссар, доктор педагогических наук, профессор

Козлов Владимир Васильевич, доктор психологических наук, профессор (Ярославль, Россия)

Таджикходжаев Закирходжа Абдусаттарович, доктор технических наук, профессор

Аманов Мухтор Рахматович, доктор технических наук, профессор

Ураева Дармоной Саиджановна, доктор филологических наук, профессор

Дурдиев Дурдимурод Каландарович, доктор физико-математических наук, профессор

Махмудов Насыр Махмудович, доктор экономических наук, профессор

Олимов Ширинбой Шарофович, доктор педагогических наук, профессор

Чариев Иргаш Тураевич, доктор педагогических наук, профессор

Киямов Нишон Содикович, доктор педагогических наук, профессор

Шомирзаев Махматмурод Хурамович, доктор педагогических наук, профессор

Рузиева Дилноза Исомжоновна, доктор педагогических наук, профессор

Курбонова Гулноз Негматовна, доктор педагогических наук (DSc), профессор

Тухсанов Кахрамон Рахимбоевич, доктор филологических наук (DSc), профессор

Назаров Акмал Мардонович, доктор психологических наук (DSc), профессор

Дилова Наргиза Гайбуллаевна, доктор педагогических наук (DSc), профессор

Жумиев Рустам Ганиевич, доктор философии политических наук (PhD), доцент

Абдуллаев Мехриддин Жунайдуллоевич, доктор педагогических наук (DSc), профессор

Сатторов Анвар Эргашович, доктор философии педагогических наук (PhD), профессор

Нуруллоев Фируз Нумонжонович, доктор философии педагогических наук (PhD)

Навруз-заде Лайли Бахтиёровна, доктор философии экономических наук (PhD), доцент

Файзиева Умида Асодовна, доктор философии педагогических наук (PhD), доцент

Халикова Умида Мировна, доктор философии педагогических наук (PhD), доцент

PEDAGOGICAL SKILLS

The scientific-theoretical and methodical journal

№ 5, 2025

By the decision of the Higher Attestation Commission under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated December 29, 2016, the journal was included in the list of publications recommended for publishing scientific results of articles in the areas of «Pedagogy» and «Psychology».

The journal was founded in 2001.

The journal is published 12 times a year.

The journal is registered by the Bukhara Department of the Agency for Press and Mass Communication of Uzbekistan.

The certificate of registration of mass media № 05-072 of 22 February 2016

Founder: Bukhara State University

Publish house: 200117, Uzbekistan, Bukhara, Muhammad Ikbol Str., 11.

E-mail: nashriyot_buxdu@buxdu.uz

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Chief Editor: Pedagogical Sciences of Pedagogy, Prof. Bakhtiyor R. Adizov.

Editor: Doctor of Philosophy in Pedagogical Sciences (PhD), Nigora Z. Sayfullaeva

Doctor of Economics Sciences Prof. Obidjon X. Xamidov

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Prof. Uzokboy Sh. Begimkulov

Doctor of Economics Sciences, Prof. Bakhtiyor N. Navruz-zade

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Prof. Holboy I.Ibragimov

Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences (DSc), Prof. Tulkin Kh. Rasulov

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Prof. Yelka K. Yanakieva (Bulgaria)

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Prof. Andrienko Yelena Vasilyevna (Russia)

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Prof. Romm Tatyana Aleksandrovna (Russia)

Candidate of Psychology, Vera P. Chudakova (Kiev, Ukraine)

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Prof. Zotova Firuza Raxmatullova (Russia)

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences (DSc), Prof. Alijon R. Hamroev

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Prof. Siddik K. Kahhorov

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Prof.M.Mahmudova

Doctor of Psychology, Prof. Vladimir V. Kozlov (Yaroslavl, Russia)

Doctor of Technical sciences, Prof. Zakirkhodja A. Tadjikhodjaev

Doctor of Technical sciences, Prof. Mukhtor R.Amanov

Doctor of Philology, Prof. Darmon S. Uraeva

Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Prof. Durdimurod K. Durdiev

Doctor of Economics, Prof. Nasir N. Mahmudov

Doctor of Pedagogical Science, Prof. Shirinboy Sh. Olimov

Doctor of Pedagogical Science, Prof. Irgash T. Chariev

Doctor of Pedagogical Science, Prof. Nishon S. Kiyamov

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Prof. Maxmatmurod X. Shomirzaev

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Prof. Dilnoza I. Ruzieva

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Prof. Gulnoz N. Qurbonova

Doctor of Philology, Prof. Qahramon R.Tuxsanov

Doctor of Psychology, Prof. Akmal M. Nazarov

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences (DSc), Prof. Nargiza G. Dilova

PhD in Political Sciences, Doc. Rustam G.Jumaev

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences (DSc), Prof. Mekhriddin J. Abdullaev

PhD in Pedagogical Sciences, Prof. Anvar E. Sattorov

PhD in Pedagogical Sciences, Firuz N. Nurulloev

PhD in Economics Sciences, Doc. Layli B. Navruz-zade

PhD in Pedagogical Sciences, Doc. Umida A. Fayzieva

PhD in Pedagogical Sciences, Doc.Umida M. Khalikova

MUNDARIJA

	Familiya I.Sh.	Mavzu	Bet
MAKTABGACHA VA BOSHLANG‘ICH TA‘LIM			
	AXMEDOVA Gavhar Faxriddinovna	Boshlang‘ich sinf o‘quvchilarining kreativ kompetensiyalarini rivojlantirishning pedagogik xususiyatlari	8
	BOBOYOROV Davron Ismatullayevich	Boshlang‘ich sinf o‘quvchilariga matematika fanini o‘qitishda axborot texnologiyalaridan foydalanish metodlari	12
	BOYMURODOVA Sadoqat Istam qizi	Boshlang‘ich ta‘lim samaradorligini oshirishda interfaol metodlarning imkoniyatlari	17
	ISMOILOVA Surmaxon Amonovna	Boshlang‘ich sinflarda darslarni integratsiya asosida tashkil etish	22
	RAXMATOVA Shodiya Ilhomovna	Boshlang‘ich ta‘limda texnologiya fanini o‘qitish samaradorligini oshirish yo‘llari	26
	XOLDAROVA Irodaxon Valijonovna, XOLMATOVA Gulabzaxon Olimjon qizi	Kichik maktab yoshidagi o‘quvchilarni ijtimoiy ko‘nikmalarini rivojlantirishda tarbiya fanining o‘rni	30
	XUDAYBERGANOV Shuhrat Shavkat o‘g‘li, MATRIZAYEVA Bonu Saburjon qizi	Maktabgacha ta‘lim tashkilotlari o‘quv-tarbiya jarayonini kreativ yondashuv asosida boshqarish mexanizmlari	34
	ESHBKOVA Dilnoza Ibraimovna	Boshlang‘ich ta‘lim yo‘nalishi talabalarida grammatik kompetentsiyani rivojlantirish	39
	OTAJONOVA Sitorabonu Shuxratovna	Boshlang‘ich sinf o‘quvchilarida mustaqil fikrlash ko‘nikmalarini shakllantirish	45
FILOLOGIYA VA TILLARNI O‘RGANISH			
	AZIMOVA Dilfuza Sobirovna	Talabalarining til ko‘nikmalarini rivojlantirishda autentik materiallarning dolzarbligi	49
	ISOKOVA Sitora Shamsiddin qizi	Cultural aesthetic stereotypes in language teaching and didactic approaches	54
	JAHONOVA Nargiza Yunus qizi	Boshlang‘ich sinf ona tili darsliklaridagi pragmatik matn va topshiriqlarning mazmuni	60
	KUBAYEVA Nilufar Shuhrat qizi	Boshlang‘ich sinf ona tili darslarida mashqlar bilan ishlashning muhim jihatlari	66
	RUSTAMOVA M.T.	Bo‘lajak ingliz tili o‘qituvchilari emotsional intellektini rivojlantirishning psixologik xususiyatlari	70
	SAPAROVA Mohigul Ramazonovna	The role of teacher feedback: analyzing oral and written feedback in efl writing	75
	SHAROPOV Sherzod Shirinboy ugli	Information gap activities in teaching english language	80
	TAYLANOVA Shohida Zayniyevna, QURBONOVA Nigina Asqarjon qizi,	Ingliz tili mashg‘ulotlarida tarbiyalanuvchilarning tafakkur olamini rivojlantirishning mazmuni	83
	XUDOYAROVA Dildora Najmidinovna	Chet tillarini o‘qitishda integratsion yondashuv orqali talabalarining lingvistik va kommunikativ kompetentligini rivojlantirish	87

THE ROLE OF TEACHER FEEDBACK: ANALYZING ORAL AND WRITTEN FEEDBACK IN EFL WRITING

Saparova Mohigul Ramazonovna,

Senior teacher, Bukhara State University

Uzbekistan, Bukhara

m.r.saparova@buxdu.uz

Orcid:0009-0008-9941-6482

This paper delves into the multifaceted role of teacher feedback in enhancing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students' writing skills. Specifically, it investigates the differential effects of oral and written feedback modalities, analyzing their strengths, weaknesses, and contextual influences. A comprehensive review of existing literature will be undertaken to synthesize current research findings, exploring the impact of various feedback types on different aspects of writing proficiency, such as grammar, vocabulary, organization, and coherence. The analysis will consider learner characteristics, feedback delivery methods, and technology integration, aiming to offer insights into best practices for maximizing the effectiveness of teacher feedback in EFL writing instruction. The studies by Kkali (2017), Hamtaei and Rahimy (2015), and Peungcharoenkun and Waluyo (2024) provide foundational frameworks for this investigation.

Keywords: teacher feedback, oral feedback, written feedback, peer feedback, direct and indirect feedback, focused and unfocused feedback.

РОЛЬ ОБРАТНОЙ СВЯЗИ УЧИТЕЛЯ: АНАЛИЗ УСТНОЙ И ПИСЬМЕННОЙ ОБРАТНОЙ СВЯЗИ В ОБУЧЕНИИ ПИСЬМУ НА АНГЛИЙСКОМ КАК ИНОСТРАННОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

В данной статье рассматривается многогранная роль обратной связи с учителями в совершенствовании письменных навыков учащихся на английском языке. В частности, он исследует дифференциальные эффекты устной и письменной обратной связи, анализируя их сильные и слабые стороны, а также контекстуальные влияния. Будет проведен всесторонний обзор существующей литературы, чтобы обобщить результаты текущих исследований и изучить влияние различных типов обратной связи на различные аспекты навыков письма, такие как грамматика, словарный запас, организация и связность. В анализе будут учитываться характеристики учащихся, методы предоставления обратной связи и интеграция технологий, чтобы дать представление о лучших практиках для максимизации эффективности обратной связи с учителями при обучении письму на английском языке. Исследования Ккали (2017), Хамтаи и Рахими (2015), а также Пунгчароенкуна и Валуё (2024) обеспечивают основополагающую основу для этого исследования.

Ключевые слова: Отзывы учителей, устная обратная связь, письменная обратная связь, обратная связь со сверстниками, прямая и косвенная обратная связь, целенаправленная и несфокусированная обратная связь.

O'QITUVCHI SHARHINING ROLI: CHET TILI SIFATIDA INGLIZ TILIDA YOZISHNING OG'ZAKI VA YOZMA SHARHLAR TAHLILI

Ushbu maqolada o'quvchilarning ingliz tilida yozish ko'nikmalarini oshirishda o'qituvchining fikr-mulohazalarining roli ko'rib chiqiladi. Xususan, og'zaki va yozma fikr-mulohazalarning farqli ta'sirini o'rganadi, ularning kuchli va zaif tomonlarini, shuningdek, kontekstual ta'sirlarni tahlil qiladi. Joriy tadqiqot natijalarini umumlashtirish va har xil turdagi fikr-mulohazalarning grammatika, lug'at, tashkiliy va izchillik kabi yozish ko'nikmalarining turli jihatlariga ta'sirini o'rganish uchun mavjud adabiyotlarni har tomonlama ko'rib chiqish o'tkaziladi. Tahlil ingliz tilida yozishni o'rgatishda o'qituvchilarning fikr-mulohazalarining samaradorligini oshirish bo'yicha ilg'or tajribalar haqida tushuncha berish uchun o'quvchilarning xususiyatlarini, fikr-mulohazalarni yetkazib berish usullarini va texnologiya integratsiyasini ko'rib chiqadi. Kkali (2017), Hamtai va Rahimi (2015) va Pungcharoenkun va Waluyo (2024) tomonidan olib borilgan tadqiqotlar ushbu tadqiqot uchun fundamental asos bo'lib xizmat qiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: o'qituvchining fikr-mulohazasi, og'zaki fikr-mulohazalar, yozma fikr-mulohazalar, tengdoshlarning fikr-mulohazalari, to'g'ridan-to'g'ri va bilvosita fikr-mulohazalar, yo'naltirilgan va yo'naltirilmagan fikr-mulohazalar.

Introduction. In the context of teaching writing in English as a Foreign Language (EFL), efficient feedback systems are essential for influencing students' writing growth. One of the most important ways for students to see their areas of strength and growth is through teacher feedback. It promotes student interest and engagement in addition to helping them acquire new skills.

Literature review. Oral feedback, typically delivered through individual conferences, small group discussions, or even brief interactions during class, offers a unique advantage: immediacy. This real-time interaction allows for immediate clarification of doubts, negotiation of meaning, and personalized guidance tailored to the specific needs of each learner. Kkali's (2017) mixed-methods study [1,24] found a significant positive effect of oral feedback on overall writing performance and various subscores, including organization, lexis, grammar, and coherence. The study attributes this success to the opportunity for meaningful interaction, clarification, and negotiation between students and the teacher. This interactive nature of oral feedback enables teachers to address misconceptions promptly, provide targeted explanations, and guide students toward more effective writing strategies. The ability to adapt feedback based on a student's immediate response is a key strength of this approach. The use of nonverbal cues, such as tone of voice and facial expressions, further enhances the effectiveness of oral feedback, as highlighted by Race & Brown (1993) in Hamtaei and Rahimy's (2015) literature review [2,46]. Nassaji's (2007a) research, also cited in Hamtaei and Rahimy (2015), underscores the positive impact of negotiation feedback on successful error correction, demonstrating that interactive feedback leads to more effective learning outcomes.

Challenges in Implementing Oral Feedback: Time Constraints and Scalability Issues

Despite its advantages, the implementation of oral feedback faces significant challenges, particularly in large class settings. Time constraints often limit the extent of individual attention each student can receive. The sheer number of students necessitates a more efficient allocation of time, which can compromise the depth and personalization of feedback. Susanti, Mallya, and Indawan (2020) [4,128] note the challenges of providing comprehensive feedback in large classes, highlighting the tension between individual attention and efficient use of instructional time. Astrid and Manalullaili (2021) [5,113] further complicate this issue by emphasizing the need to consider student personality traits when selecting feedback methods, suggesting that extroverted students might respond differently to oral feedback compared to introverted students. The practical limitations of oral feedback in large classes are further underscored by Tursina, Susanty, and Efendi (2021) [6,86], who discuss the difficulties in providing sufficient time for individual oral feedback. These studies collectively point to the need for strategic approaches to oral feedback delivery that balance individual attention with the demands of large class sizes.

Materials and Methods. Written feedback, typically provided in the margins of a student's paper or through online commenting tools, offers a distinct advantage: permanence. Students can refer back to written comments at their convenience, allowing for repeated review and reflection on teacher suggestions. This feature is particularly valuable for students who require additional time to process feedback or may benefit from revisiting comments over time. Hamtaei and Rahimy (2015) [2,54] highlight the importance of written feedback as a permanent record, emphasizing its role in facilitating self-directed learning and revision. Furthermore, written feedback permits teachers to provide a more comprehensive and detailed account of their observations, addressing multiple aspects of the writing simultaneously. Susanti, Mallya, and Indawan (2020) [4,130] and Astrid and Manalullaili (2021) [5,115] both acknowledge the capacity of written feedback to offer more extensive comments compared to oral feedback. This allows for a more thorough analysis of strengths and weaknesses and provides a more detailed roadmap for improvement.

Despite its strengths, written feedback presents certain limitations. The lack of immediate interaction may hinder the clarification of misunderstandings and reduce the opportunity for dynamic dialogue between teacher and student. ER and Kkali (2024) [7,66] found that while written feedback had a positive effect on writing skills, face-to-face feedback was more effective due to enhanced communication, negotiation, and immediate clarification. The potential for misinterpretations is higher with written feedback, especially for students with limited language proficiency or those unfamiliar with academic writing conventions. Putri, Lestari, and Wafa (2024) [8,45] found that only a small percentage of students experienced negative emotions when unable to comprehend lecturer feedback, but this still highlights the potential for frustration and discouragement if written feedback is not clear or easily understood. Smyth (n.d.) [9,167] further emphasizes the role of student perceptions and beliefs about the feedback process, noting that a perceived lack of usefulness or relevance can significantly impact the effectiveness of written feedback.

Results. The advent of technology has opened up new avenues for delivering feedback, offering opportunities to enhance both the efficiency and effectiveness of the feedback process. Peungcharoenkun and Waluyo (2024) investigated the efficacy of technology-mediated feedback using writeabout.com, finding that the experimental group showed significantly better writing skills compared to the control group. The use of screencasting, where teachers record video feedback incorporating both oral and written elements, has gained traction. Xie, Che, and Huang (2022) [10,22] explored the impact of screencast feedback on Chinese secondary school students, finding that it strengthened student-teacher interaction and promoted student confidence. Alvira (2016) [11,134] also supports the use of screencasting as a motivating strategy that enhances feedback quality and student uptake. Alvira Quiroga (2013) [12,54] further demonstrates the positive impact of a screencasting-based methodology on improving paragraph writing skills. These studies suggest that screencasting can effectively combine the benefits of oral and written feedback, catering to diverse learning styles and preferences.

Automated writing evaluation (AWE) systems, such as Grammarly, represent another technological advancement in feedback provision. These systems offer rapid feedback on grammar and mechanics, potentially reducing the teacher's workload and providing students with immediate feedback on technical aspects of their writing. Han and Sari (2022) [13,78] found that combined automated teacher feedback was as effective as full teacher feedback in improving analytic writing scores and more effective in reducing grammar and mechanics errors. However, AWE systems have limitations. They often fail to address higher-order writing concerns such as organization, argumentation, and style. Kawashima (2023) [14,95] found that while students appreciated automated feedback (Grammarly), they valued human feedback (direct and indirect) more highly for its appropriateness and reliability. Govindasamy (n.d.) [15,44] compared teacher-written feedback with online automated feedback, revealing student preference for teacher feedback but acknowledging improvement in essay writing with both feedback modes. Alam and Usama (2023) [16,176] similarly found that online written peer feedback was significantly more helpful than automated written corrective feedback in improving writing. These studies highlight the need for a balanced approach, using AWE systems as a supplementary tool rather than a replacement for human feedback.

Discussion. Peer feedback, where students provide feedback to each other, presents a collaborative learning approach that can significantly enhance both writing skills and critical thinking abilities. Susanti, Mallya, and Indawan (2020) found that while students preferred teacher feedback, peer feedback enhanced their L2 writing skills. Lu, Zhu, and Cheong (2021) [17,55] compared self- and peer feedback, finding that peer feedback had a greater effect on writing improvement. Phe (2023) [18,90] found that collaborative peer-written corrective feedback motivated students and improved their business English writing performance. Kuyyogsuy (2019) [19,33] also demonstrated the significant positive effects of peer feedback on undergraduate students' English writing ability, emphasizing the value of social interaction and collaborative learning. Tian and Li (2018) [20,22] investigated Chinese EFL students' perceptions of peer feedback, finding that students enjoyed providing and receiving both oral and written feedback. Nguyen (2017) explored a combined peer-teacher feedback model, showing its success in terms of student attitudes and overall scores. Guasch et al. (2013) investigated feedback in an online environment, finding that epistemic feedback, or a combination of epistemic and suggestive feedback, best improved collaborative writing. These studies collectively demonstrate the significant potential of peer feedback to enhance EFL writing but also emphasize the need for careful implementation.

The effectiveness of peer feedback is strongly contingent on providing adequate training and guidance to students on how to offer constructive and helpful criticism. Without proper training, peer feedback may be superficial, unhelpful, or even counterproductive. Srirakarn (2018) and Srirakarn (2018) compared teacher and senior student feedback, finding that metalinguistic corrective feedback from both sources was most effective, but also highlighting the limitations of teacher feedback. Tian and Li (2018) [20,24] noted that students preferred giving positive oral feedback and receiving negative written feedback, suggesting a need for training in providing balanced and constructive criticism. Amin (2014) investigated the impact of peer response groups, finding significant improvements in grammar and vocabulary, but also emphasizing the importance of training students in the peer review process. These studies highlight the crucial role of teacher intervention in ensuring that peer feedback is a valuable and effective component of EFL writing instruction.

Different Types of Feedback

Direct and Indirect Feedback:

The literature reveals a significant debate surrounding the relative effectiveness of direct versus indirect feedback. Mohammadnia Alfruzi, Vaez-Dalili, and Hadian (2022) compared direct, indirect, and metalinguistic written corrective feedback, finding that direct feedback with revision was most effective in improving the use of present and past perfect tenses. Nusrat, Ashraf, and Narcy-Combes (2019) investigated

the effect of oral meta-linguistic (direct), indirect, and no feedback on ESL students' writing accuracy, finding that meta-linguistic feedback led to fewer errors. Agustiningsih and Andriani (2021) explored the impact of direct corrective feedback on students' writing performance and motivation, finding positive results. Mekuriaw Wondim, Shifere Bishaw, and Teklesellassie Zeleke (2023) similarly found that direct written corrective feedback with metalinguistic explanations enhanced writing performance more than indirect feedback. Carambas et al. (2024) found that direct feedback was the most frequently used strategy by teachers and that students valued reflective learning facilitated by written corrective feedback. Westmacott (2017) conducted action research shifting from direct to indirect coded feedback, finding that students perceived indirect feedback as more useful, promoting deeper cognitive processing. These studies suggest that while direct feedback can be effective, particularly when combined with revision, indirect feedback may also be beneficial, promoting deeper learning and learner autonomy. The optimal approach likely depends on factors such as learner proficiency, error type, and the overall learning context.

Focused and Unfocused Feedback:

Another crucial distinction lies in the focus of feedback: whether it is targeted at specific errors or addresses a broader range of issues. Deng et al. (n.d.) compared coded focused and unfocused written corrective feedback, finding that focused feedback significantly outperformed unfocused feedback in improving writing accuracy for specific grammar errors. This suggests that prioritizing specific areas for improvement can lead to greater learning gains than attempting to address all errors simultaneously. The study also highlights the importance of considering learner proficiency, suggesting that focused feedback combined with metalinguistic support is particularly beneficial for students with limited language skills. This finding aligns with the broader principle of providing targeted instruction, focusing on specific learning needs rather than attempting to cover all aspects of writing at once. The approach of prioritizing specific errors reflects a more strategic and efficient use of feedback, maximizing the impact of teacher intervention.

Conclusion. This literature review reveals a complex and nuanced picture of the role of teacher feedback in EFL writing development. While both oral and written feedback offer distinct advantages, the optimal approach is not a one-size-fits-all solution. The most effective strategy depends on a multitude of interacting factors, including class size, learner characteristics, error types, available resources, and specific learning objectives. Technology-mediated feedback holds significant promise for enhancing feedback delivery, but its successful integration requires careful planning and consideration of learner needs, avoiding over-reliance on automated systems. Peer feedback, when implemented effectively through appropriate training and guidance, can foster collaborative learning and enhance critical thinking skills. Finally, the choice between direct and indirect, focused and unfocused feedback necessitates thoughtful consideration, with evidence suggesting that a targeted, strategic approach can maximize the impact of feedback on learner progress.

References:

1. Kkali, E. (2017). The effect of oral vs. written feedback in EFL writing. None. <https://doi.org/None>
2. Peungcharoenkun, T. & Waluyo, B. (2024). Writing pedagogy in higher education: the efficacy of mediating feedback with technology. None. <https://doi.org/10.4102/rw.v15i1.487>
3. Hamtaei, B. & Rahimy, R. (2015). The effect of oral versus written error feedback on the paragraph writing ability of Iranian low-intermediate EFL learners. None. <https://doi.org/None>
4. Susanti, R., Mallya, M., & Indawan, (2020). The effective feedback practices in a large EFL writing class in Indonesia. None. <https://doi.org/None>
5. Astrid, A. & Manalullaili, (NaN). Implementing teacher written feedback and oral writing conferences. None. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210715.072>
6. Tursina, P., Susanty, H., & Efendi, Z. (2021). Teacher corrective feedback vs Cambridge English Write and improve (cewi) in improving EFL students writing performance. None. <https://doi.org/10.32672/elaste.v2i1.3337>
7. ER, H. K. & Kkali, E. (2024). The effects of face-to-face vs. digital feedback in an EFL writing context: comparison of two Turkish state universities. Abant Izzet Baysal University. <https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2024.-1340007>
8. Putri, W. A., Lestari, I. W., & Wafa, K. (2024). Exploring English students' perception of lecturer's corrective feedback in writing class. None. <https://doi.org/10.31605/ilere.v1i1.3893>
9. Smyth, P. (NaN). Contextual influences on student perceptions of teacher written feedback: the case of a legal research and writing (lrw) course in Hong Kong. None. <https://doi.org/None>