



Exploring Dialogic Feedback Practices in English Writing for Academic Purposes

Alda Fitrianingsih*, Sri Lestari

English Language Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Esa Unggul University, Jakarta, Indonesia

aldafitrianingsih1213@student.esaunggul.ac.id; sri.lestari@esaunggul.ac.id

*Correspondence author

Handphone number: +62-895-3700-00622

Abstract: Dialogic feedback has been widely discussed in EFL contexts, limited research has examined its practical implementation and students' perceptions in undergraduate academic writing classes in Indonesian higher education. Therefore, this study aims to address this gap by providing empirical evidence from a regular classroom setting. Using a qualitative case study design, data were collected through classroom observations, semi-structured interviews with one lecturer and ten students, and document analysis. The participants were selected through purposive sampling from an undergraduate English Education program to ensure relevance to the research focus. Data were analyzed using thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's framework to identify patterns across observation, interview, and document data. The implementation followed Er's (2020) three-phase framework: preparation, implementation, and follow-up. The study revealed that in the preparation phase, the teacher selected tasks aligned with learning goals and fostered an open classroom atmosphere. The implementation phase involved interactive discussions and open-ended questioning to encourage reflection and self-revision. The follow-up phase focused on monitoring students' revisions and providing additional clarification. Findings also indicate that students generally perceived dialogic feedback as supportive, interactive, and beneficial for improving writing skills, though some reported feelings of stress or anxiety. The study concludes that dialogic feedback enhances motivation, critical thinking, and academic writing quality, but requires active student engagement and consistent teacher facilitation.

Keywords: Dialogic Feedback; Academic Writing; EFL Learners; Implementation; Perception

Submitted: 30 November 2025; Received in revised form: 18 December 2025; Accepted: 23 December 2025;
Published regularly: 31 December 2025

This is an open access article under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY-SA 4.0)



To cite this article (APA Style):

Fitrianingsih, A., Lestari, S. (2025). Exploring Dialogic Feedback Practices in English Writing for Academic Purposes. *Jurnal Ilmiah Lingua Idea*, 16(2), 174-190. <https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jli.2025.16.2.18650>

Introduction

Dialogic feedback is crucial for encouraging students to participate actively in their learning process. It has been widely used by practitioners to improve understanding and retention of information (Er, 2020; Ajjawi & Boud, 2018; Maheshi et al., 2024). Dialogic feedback is an interactive process that fosters a two-way communication channel between teachers and students, enhancing engagement and learning outcomes (Maheshi et al., 2024). According to Lichtenberger-Majzikné & Fischer (2017), dialogic feedback occurs because there is a recipient of information and an informant. It aims to improve the quality of classroom conversation. This requires a classroom atmosphere that emphasizes collaboration, active listening, questioning, and critical thinking by students (Alexander, 2018). Gillies (2016) posits that the classroom environment should be friendly and collaborative, where students can speak personally and understand each other. When feedback transitions from one-way to dialogic, it fosters a richer collaborative environment between students and teachers. However, the practice of dialogic feedback remains a concern, particularly in English writing classes.

Implementing dialogic feedback in the English classroom is challenging due to various factors, especially the time and resource limitations teachers encounter. In large classes, providing meaningful and individualized feedback to each student can be a waste of time, making it difficult for teachers to engage in the deep dialogue necessary for effective learning (Carless & Boud, 2018). In addition, factors which affect the process of receiving feedback can be influenced by students' emotional and psychological factors. In this case, students perceive feedback as judgmental rather than supportive of their skills which can result in students feeling insecure and lacking motivation, so they are reluctant to engage in feedback dialogue (Hill et al., 2021). In Zhang (2023) study, the problem found was the influence of dialogic feedback in English classes which have differences in language proficiency levels. On the other hand, previous researchers have shown several benefits of dialogic feedback, such as increasing motivation and achievement (Cagliesi et al., 2023), improving the collaborative environment (Gillies, 2016), and encouraging students to consider their understanding (Maheshi et al., 2024).

The problems faced by students in writing academic texts can be overcome by dialogic feedback in producing high-quality academic texts, especially due to their lack of ability to write effectively. Kartchava (2017) points out that in academic writing classes, teacher one-way feedback is dominant, even though students need the opportunity to respond to the teacher's comments. Shyness, importing structures from their original language, lack of confidence in themselves, and a limited vocabulary are all common problems that may limit their ability to communicate effectively and clearly in English (Saeed & Al Qunayeer, 2022). These challenges are especially noticeable in the university setting, as students struggle to generate high-quality academic writing (Rahman et al., 2024). Addressing these challenges requires dialogic feedback that helps students overcome linguistic and psychological barriers, allowing them to confidently meet academic writing expectations.

Dialogic feedback in English academic writing classes is frequently used through interactive and collaborative dialogue between students and teachers. Rather than offer a one-way evaluation, teachers encourage students to reflect on their comprehension, examine their views, and explore the reasoning behind comments (Jennifer & Harry, 2020). This form of dialogic

feedback promotes critical thinking (Manalo, 2020), improves students' knowledge and understanding of their work (Steen-Utheim & Wittek, 2017), and encourages active participation in the learning process (Van der Kleij et al., 2019). Dialogic feedback is considered to be able to increase students' enthusiasm to be engaged in the learning and teaching process, and the direct discussion and evaluation of assignment drafts improve learning behavior and achievement among students (Jennifer & Harry, 2020).

Previous research on dialogic feedback is numerous, but its application in English academic writing classes for EFL students is still limited. Several research findings have shown its benefits in enhancing motivation, collaboration, and reflective thinking (Cagliesi et al., 2023; Gillies 2016; Maheshi et al., 2024). However, the practical use of dialogic feedback in academic writing classes for Indonesian university EFL students has not been widely examined. Therefore, this study aims to explore how dialogic feedback is applied in English academic writing, with a focus on teaching strategies and students' perceptions.

The Nature of Dialogic Feedback

In general, dialogue refers to a discussion between two or more people. According to Zhang (2023), dialogue affects our cognitive development because dialogue is the basis of communication that functions to shape our language and thought processes. Building on this, Filius et al. (2018) provide insight into how dialogue in feedback contexts can be deepened when students actively respond or "ask back" after receiving feedback, it strengthens the two-way interaction.

Several studies have interpreted dialogic feedback as a process that fosters communication and interaction between teachers and students. Lichtenberger-Majzikné & Fischer (2017) describe dialogic feedback as a tool used by teachers to promote active student participation through mutual information exchange. Similarly, Gillies (2016) emphasized that dialogic feedback is inherently collaborative and interactive, with a specific emphasis on the importance of active listening.

Reflective and constructive dialogic feedback consists of teachers providing remarks that support students in evaluating their work and implementing significant improvements, promoting a growth mentality (Muthukrishnan et al., 2024). As stated by Manalo (2020), feedback should be presented as a helpful dialogue that encourages students to reflect on their academic decisions, improve their skills, and accept responsibility for their learning development. The success of dialogic feedback depends on the extent to which teachers and students engage collaboratively in the learning process (Steen-Utheim & Wittek, 2017; Adie et al., 2018).

The Phases of Dialogic Feedback

In academic advancement, proper goal-setting is necessary to build effective learning environments. Er (2020) stated that dialogic feedback consists of three stages: preparation,

implementation, and follow-up. By setting these goals at the beginning, teachers are expected to create a learning environment where students are actively involved, understand the feedback given, and use it effectively to improve their academic performance.

The preparation phase is crucial for establishing clear goals and aligning feedback with learning objectives (Maheshi et al., 2024). During the implementation phase, teachers initiate feedback discussions using open-ended questions that encourage reflection, recognize strengths, and guide meaningful revisions (Manalo, 2020; Jennifer & Harry, 2020). In the follow-up phase, students' revised work is examined to ensure improvement, and additional clarification is provided when necessary to support continuous learning and academic progress (Cagliesi et al., 2023).

Challenges, Weaknesses, and Strengths of Dialogic Feedback

Implementing dialogic feedback in large classes poses a considerable challenge, especially with regard to personalized interactions. Due to the number of students and time constraints, teachers often find it difficult to provide individualized feedback, which can reduce the effectiveness of dialogic interaction (Maheshi et al., 2024; Er, 2020; Carless & Boud, 2018). The effectiveness of dialogic feedback is also influenced by the quality of interaction, student participation, and teachers' scaffolding skills (Tam, 2020; Henderson et al., 2019).

Students' emotional factors such as anxiety and fear of criticism can further hinder participation and learning progress (Rahman et al., 2024). Despite these challenges, dialogic feedback fosters active student engagement by allowing students to clarify, negotiate, and apply feedback, which improves academic skills, critical thinking, motivation, and self-confidence (Alexander, 2018; Arinda & Sadikin, 2021; Maheshi et al., 2024; Cagliesi et al., 2023).

Strategies to Implement Dialogic Feedback

Utilizing dialogic feedback requires innovative strategies that promote two-way, reciprocal interaction between teachers and students (Hibert et al., 2023; Maheshi et al., 2024). Teachers can manage time effectively by prioritizing key feedback points, using group discussions, and integrating technology such as audio recordings, videos, and digital platforms to extend dialogue beyond the classroom (Carless & Boud, 2018; Pitt & Winstone, 2020; Willis et al., 2021).

Finally, addressing emotional challenges and encouraging student engagement are essential to effective dialogic feedback. By providing preparation guides, specific prompts for assignments, and open-ended feedback activities, teachers can create a supportive learning environment (Jennifer & Harry, 2020). Positive feedback and building trust can also ease students' anxiety and increase their own self-confidence, as well as encourage them to actively participate in the feedback process (Rahman et al., 2024).

Dialogic Feedback and Motivation

Dialogic feedback is essential to increase motivation, build self-confidence, and encourage active engagement in students' learning. Involving students in the feedback process helps them feel supported rather than judged, resulting in increased self-confidence and academic performance (Cagliesi et al., 2023). Motivation influences students' persistence, effort, and response to feedback, and personalized dialogic feedback helps students focus on their academic development (Maheshi et al., 2024; Zhang, 2023).

Dialogic feedback supports students' self-efficacy by helping them achieve specific learning goals based on the relationship between motivation and approach (Cagliesi et al., 2023). Students better understand their progress and areas for improvement when they receive constructive and personalized feedback. This belief encourages them to participate more actively in the learning process. Manalo (2020) also said that students are motivated and feel more responsible for their learning when they receive dialogic feedback. Through interactive discussions, students develop critical thinking and intellectual engagement (Alexander, 2018).

Dialogic Feedback in Academic Writing

Both oral and written dialogic feedback are possible, depending on the various learning needs and teaching context. Written feedback is described by Zhang (2023) as a one-way method in which teachers provide criticism and suggestions to students through written comments. While oral feedback, according to Henderson et al. (2019), is a type of interactive feedback that allows students and educators to talk directly about real-life assessment tasks. In their findings, this approach allows students to understand their strengths and weaknesses because of the dialogue provided directly.

Dialogic feedback focuses on the interactive process between the teacher and students by implementing an interactive understanding focus. Dialogic feedback in writing assignments begins with the teacher providing feedback on students' drafts, then continues with providing revision guidance, providing examples, and clarifying misunderstandings in the form of oral feedback (Rahman et al., 2024). Similarly, Wingate (2019) emphasizes oral feedback, this process includes discussing comments given by teachers or peers and evaluating comments to improve the draft iteratively. A structured approach is needed in developing students' writing skills such as feed-up (clarifying expectations), feed-back (providing specific feedback on the draft), and feed-forward (guiding future revisions) (Schillings et al., 2018).

Methods

This study used a qualitative method to gain an in-depth understanding of teachers' use of dialogic feedback and students' perceptions in Writing for Academic Purposes. A qualitative approach allowed the researcher to analyze complex situations by examining participants'

experiences, behaviors, and opinions (Busetto et al., 2020). The study explored the dynamics of dialogic feedback and explained how teachers implemented feedback strategies, as well as the factors influencing student motivation in English academic writing. In line with the research aim stated in the introduction, this study focused on how dialogic feedback was implemented in English academic writing classes, with particular emphasis on teaching strategies and students' perceptions of the feedback process. A qualitative case study was selected because it provided a deeper understanding of how dialogic feedback was implemented in the classroom, allowing examination of teacher–student interactions and aspects that influenced students' performance. This approach offered broader insights into the educational context and highlighted the technical processes, observed effects, and challenges of dialogic feedback.

This research focused on dialogic feedback strategies used by teachers in Writing for Academic Purposes, involving both teachers and students to capture interactional processes. The teacher served as the primary feedback provider, while students acted as recipients influenced by its application. To investigate classroom dynamics, the researcher documented teacher–student interactions with a focus on dialogic feedback and its contribution to critical thinking. Interviews with the teacher explored teaching philosophies, feedback strategies, and task design aligned with academic goals. Students participated voluntarily, offering insight into their perceptions of the feedback process. Purposive sampling was used based on research purposes and logistical considerations (Mack et al., 2005).

Three data collection techniques were used: observation, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. Data validity was ensured through triangulation and thematic analysis based on Braun and Clarke (2006). Member checking and detailed field notes strengthened credibility and transparency.

Observation

Classroom observations were conducted with full participant consent and were video-recorded to capture detailed behavior, nonverbal gestures, and teacher–student interaction. Each two-hour session was reviewed twice for accuracy. Tools included a video recorder, observation checklist, and field notes. The checklist followed dialogic feedback criteria based on Er (2020), observing teacher feedback methods, student responses (Alexander, 2018; Adie et al., 2018; Steen-Utheim & Wittek, 2017), non-verbal reactions, and follow-up clarification (Cagliesi et al., 2023; Hill et al., 2021). Three observation sessions were conducted from the beginning to the end of the writing process. Consistent with Mack et al. (2005), the researcher minimized distractions by sitting quietly at the back of the classroom.

Semi-Structured Interview

Semi-structured interviews explored the application of dialogic feedback and students' perceptions in Writing for Academic Purposes. Interview questions were based on Er's phases: preparation, implementation, and follow-up. Additional exploration included open-ended

questioning, constructive feedback, and technology use. Interviews were conducted privately with the teacher and ten students, either in person or online depending on preference. With consent, all interviews were audio-recorded for accurate transcription. Each session lasted 40–60 minutes and used Bahasa Indonesia to ensure clear communication.

Document Analysis

Document analysis was used to examine classroom-related documents that provide insights into the implementation and effect of dialogic feedback. This includes lesson plans, students' notes on feedback, and students' writing results. According to Morgan (2022), qualitative document analysis is a valuable method to investigate how documents reflect practices, values, and educational processes.

The document analysis aimed to identify how dialogic feedback goals are articulated in instructional materials and how students apply teacher dialogic feedback in their revisions. Documents were selected based on relevance, authenticity, and their ability to reflect the phases of dialogic feedback (preparation, implementation, follow-up). The purpose of this document analysis was to explore how teachers planned and embedded dialogic feedback in their teaching materials, and to investigate how students internalized and applied this feedback in the process of writing for academic purposes. Overall, this document analysis enriches the data collected through observations and interviews by offering concrete evidence of dialogic feedback in practice.

Data Analysis Techniques

The selection of data analysis methodology used in this study was thematic analysis, which helped identify themes and patterns in qualitative data and understand respondents' ideas, feelings, and actions (Braun and Clarke, 2006). The analytic procedure was divided into six stages: familiarization with the data, generating initial codes, theme search, theme review, theme definition and naming, and report writing.

Thematic analysis was applied to data from classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and questionnaires, following Braun and Clarke (2006) six steps. Data familiarization involved reviewing video recordings, transcripts, and questionnaire responses multiple times to gain a comprehensive understanding of the data. During the coding phase, key elements such as teacher feedback strategies, student responses, and perceptions were labeled and categorized.

Following the familiarization stage, the researcher conducted a systematic coding process using pre-established categories derived from the student interview protocol. These categories reflect core elements of dialogic feedback and served as a lens for identifying recurring patterns in the data. The first category includes several components: emotional reactions related to goal understanding (ER-UG), behavioral reactions during interactive feedback discussions (BR-IFD),

behavioral reactions related to technology use (BR-UT), cognitive reactions when acting on feedback and seeking clarification (CR-AOF), and perceptions related to dialogic feedback (DFP).

In the theme identification phase, related codes were grouped into overarching categories. In the subsequent definition and naming phase, the themes were finalized with appropriate and descriptive labels. In the final report writing phase, these themes were synthesized into a coherent analysis, providing a comprehensive understanding of the implementation and perception of dialogic feedback in the context of English academic writing.

To ensure clarity and consistency in organizing qualitative data, a coding system was developed to identify the source of each quote during the analysis process. Each source of data was labeled according to its origin: teacher statements, actions, and feedback were coded with the letter “T”, while student contributions were coded using their initials. To preserve anonymity while still allowing the tracking of individual perspectives, each student was assigned a specific code. In addition, every data point was tagged with the session in which it was collected, indicated as S1 for Session 1, S2 for Session 2, and so forth.

Results

This study examines students' perspectives on dialogic feedback in an academic English writing course. Data were collected through six classroom observations from May to July 2025 during a Research Methods course in the English Language Education Study Program at a private university in Tangerang, Indonesia. One instructor and ten students participated. Although the course contained 16 meetings, only six sessions were observed due to time constraints.

Data Description

Classroom observations and document analysis were supported by a course lesson plan outlining objectives, instructional materials, and feedback methods. Participants provided consent for video recording, and structured checklists as well as field notes based on Er's dialogic feedback phases were used. The observations centered on three main phases—preparation, implementation, and follow-up while student responses were categorized into emotional, cognitive, and behavioral aspects.

Research Findings

This study addressed two research questions:

- (1) How dialogic feedback was implemented in the class, and
- (2) How students perceived it.

Findings from observations, interviews, and documents indicated that dialogic feedback was implemented through teacher-led questioning, writing reviews, and follow-up clarification,

especially in sessions 7, 8, and 14. Students generally responded positively, remained attentive during peer feedback, and demonstrated active engagement through listening, questioning, and participation.

Dialogic feedback was implemented in four sessions (7–10) and followed the phases of preparation, implementation, and follow-up. In the preparation phase, the teacher aligned learning tasks with students' writing progress, such as designing a literature review (S7) and developing a research design (S8). While the teacher did not explicitly state the overall feedback objectives at the start of each session, comments were made in relation to the correlation between students' writing and the session topic. For example, in S8 (research design), the teacher advised student Dn, *"When you want to use the RQ, it means there is a justification. So, write your justification in the research method."* Similarly, in S9 (previous study), the teacher told the same student, *"You already know the importance of teacher talk, just talk to the section. No need to beat around the bush. The specifics of the teacher talk strategy don't need to be written in the introduction, but in the previous study."*

Observational data showed that the teacher created a respectful and open atmosphere, while classroom environment was arranged informally, with students free to choose their seats. The teacher also instructed that those who wished to consult should come to the front of the teacher's table, creating a more personal space for dialogue. This was reflected in S7 (literature review) when student N approached the teacher and requested, *"Sir, later if you want to comment, please don't speak loudly, just speak softly so only I can hear."* In the interview, the teacher also said, *"I give myself and help those who ask. If they don't ask, I just ignore them."* Such interactions indicated a level of comfort that supported more open and individualized feedback exchanges.

In the implementation phase, feedback was interactive and guided by open-ended questions that encouraged students to explain their reasoning. For example, T-S9 gave personalized feedback to Student Nt by asking, *"Can you explain how this paragraph connects to your main argument?"* Then Nt replied, *"The second sentence continues the topic of the first sentence, sir. Oh, I forgot to add a conjunction at the beginning, sorry sir."*

The teacher's interview supported these observations, noting that his goal was to *"Make students realize what works and what does not by making them talk through it."* The teacher intentionally avoided direct correction, instead asking guiding questions or offering temporary suggestions that prompted students to self-correct or reconsider their choices. They either say *"Oh, I see"* or immediately make changes to their drafts in replies to the suggestions session.

The students either say *"Oh, I see"* and immediately make changes to their drafts in response to the suggestions session. Specifically, researchers observe that this feedback cycle is maintained during the follow-up phase. Insights in the classroom after finishing the S8 midterm, a lot of students submitted updated versions of their work based on comments received before the exam. The teacher responded to students with more remarks, highlighting my areas of

improvement. A follow-up was obviously a component of the procedure, according to the teacher, who added, "I checked it directly while being scolded... I have the standard." It reaffirms the instructor's commitment to upholding high standards in instruction and implies that feedback is given to the students as part of their classes.

The observation and interview data showed that the implementation of dialogic feedback followed three phases with distinct thematic codes. In the preparation phase, the teacher aligned tasks with students' ongoing drafts, such as designing a literature review and research design, while fostering a supportive environment through informal seating and personal consultation, which reflected the codes of PP-TR, PP-GC, and PP-CE. During the implementation phase, feedback was delivered through open-ended questions that encouraged students to explain their reasoning and revise their drafts independently (IP-DQ: Dialogic Questioning, IP-CE: Clarification of Expectation). Finally, in the follow-up phase, students revised and resubmitted their work after feedback, and the teacher provided further comments to reinforce standards (FU-RU: Revision Uptake, FU-MP: Monitoring Progress). These findings indicate that dialogic feedback was applied in a structured way that combined correction with developmental support, encouraging students to engage critically and improve their academic writing performance. The follow-up phase showed consistent revision uptake. Many students submitted updated drafts after midterm feedback, and the teacher reviewed their work directly, emphasizing standards and needed improvements. The coded data (PP-TR, PP-GC, PP-CE, IP-DQ, IP-CE, FU-RU, FU-MP) confirmed the structured use of dialogic feedback, showing that students engaged critically and improved their writing through iterative dialogue.

Using thematic analysis, five themes emerged from classroom observations and interviews with eight students and the teacher. The familiarization and coding process reflected patterns related to questioning strategies, individualized instruction, minimal technology use, and varied emotional reactions.

The first theme, Emotional Reaction in Understanding Goals (ER-UG), showed that all students received clear instructions and step-by-step guidance, supported by materials on Google Drive and explicit session objectives. This aligns with Carless (2018), who emphasizes clarity as fundamental to feedback dialogue.

The second theme, Behavioral Responses in Feedback Discussions (BR-IFD), revealed strong interaction. Students engaged in two-way discussions, asked questions, and received counter-questions using the Socratic method, supporting Steen-Utheim & Wittek (2017) but showing more consistent interaction than some earlier findings.

The third theme, Behavioral Responses in Use of Technology (BR-UT), showed limited reliance on digital tools. Only one student reported using Google Docs or Excel, and most feedback was conducted face-to-face. This differs from studies highlighting increased use of digital feedback tools but aligns with Erkan Er's (2020) emphasis on direct interaction.

The fourth theme, Cognitive Responses in Acting on Feedback (CR-AOF), demonstrated that students revised their writing, sought clarification, and received repeated explanations until they understood. This supports Adie et al. (2018), highlighting cognitive engagement as central to feedback uptake.

The fifth theme, Dialogic Feedback Perception (DFP), revealed that students viewed feedback as helpful and motivating, though some experienced stress, insecurity, or overthinking when the feedback was highly detailed. Despite emotional tension, students acknowledged its academic benefits and improvement in critical thinking, consistent with Steen-Utheim & Wittek (2017).

Most students (87.5%) found dialogic feedback motivating, while 12.5% experienced stress. All students demonstrated revision uptake and engagement. Document analysis supported these findings, showing improved topic focus, structure, and use of literature from midterm to final drafts.

Discussion

This study explored how dialogic feedback was implemented in an English writing for academic purposes class and how students perceived these practices. The findings showed that dialogic feedback played a significant role in shaping students' writing development, especially through continuous interaction across the preparation, implementation, and follow-up phases. This aligns with the study's original objectives by demonstrating that dialogic feedback not only supported students' academic writing skills but also influenced their emotional, behavioral, and cognitive engagement.

The Implementation of Dialogic Feedback in English Writing for Academic Purposes

The results revealed that dialogic feedback was implemented through structured phases that supported learning, and the Discussion highlights why these features were meaningful. The preparation phase showed that the teacher designed tasks aligned with the project-based learning method and session goals, including authentic writing assignments and a final proposal seminar. Although the teacher did not explicitly state feedback objectives, feedback was always tied directly to the writing component discussed that day. This mattered because students could immediately link comments to their ongoing drafts, making feedback more purposeful and context-based.

Examples from classroom dialogue, such as the teacher's discussion with Dn in S8 about research justification and the conversation with N about sentence cohesion, illustrate how feedback served as a clarification tool rather than evaluation. These interactions show why dialogic feedback was effective in this setting: it guided students to recognize gaps in reasoning or structure through questioning, not correction. This supports the idea that dialogic feedback in this class served as a process of co-construction in meaning-making rather than passive reception.

The implementation phase demonstrated the significance of open-ended questioning and personalized comments. The teacher intentionally adopted a Socratic approach, prompting students to think through their choices. Students' statements such as Student D's description of "direct dialogue, comments to the point with the solutions" show why this method influenced their writing: it pushed them to engage metacognitively, interpret writing decisions, and adjust based on reasoning rather than memorization. However, proactive students benefited more, which suggests that dialogic feedback may not be equally accessible to quieter learners. This difference highlights the contextual challenge of dialogic practices: they rely strongly on students' willingness to engage.

The follow-up phase showed that students revised their drafts and made visible improvements in structure, clarity, and critical organization. This is significant because it demonstrates feedback uptake, showing that dialogic exchanges were not isolated moments but part of a continuous learning cycle. Students' comments such as F stating that feedback was "explained repeatedly until I understood" show why the iterative process helped deepen comprehension. The teacher's note that students who engaged more were "better but also more stressed" demonstrates that dialogic feedback carries emotional weight, which can support improvement but also create pressure. This duality is important because it highlights both the benefits and emotional demands of dialogic feedback.

Document analysis supported the significance of this process: students' drafts showed clear improvement, indicating not only understanding but also behavioral action. Therefore, implementation of dialogic feedback in this class met the research objectives by uncovering a feedback process that was interactive, reflective, and improvement-oriented, even though challenges remained with student participation and emotional readiness.

A notable point is that students' cultural respect for authority influenced how feedback was received. Even within a dialogic approach, some students accepted teacher comments without negotiation. This difference suggests that cultural context shapes the interaction, meaning dialogic feedback may function differently across learning environments.

Students' Perception of Dialogic Feedback

Students' perceptions demonstrated why dialogic feedback was valued and how it shaped their learning. Students felt more involved when assignments were discussed regularly, showing that dialogic feedback supported engagement, consistent with project-based learning expectations. They also indicated that clear focus and guidelines such as materials on Google Drive—helped them understand the purpose of each task and anticipate feedback, reducing uncertainty.

The environment established by the teacher contributed to students' perceptions. Students described the class as respectful and inclusive, enabling active exchange of ideas. For example, student A noted "two-way discussion with the teacher and frequent exchange of opinions," showing that dialogic feedback supported confidence and participation. However, several students still felt pressured during discussions, demonstrating that emotional responses were

part of the feedback experience. The significance of this finding is that emotional readiness influences how deeply students engage with dialogic feedback.

During implementation, students appreciated interactive questioning, perceiving the teacher as a guide rather than an evaluator. This perception is important because it explains why they were willing to revise their work: they felt supported rather than judged. Students also showed cognitive engagement by asking for clarification, reconsidering topics, and revising structure. Their behaviors recording feedback, bringing annotated drafts, and sharing writing samples highlight why dialogic feedback worked effectively in this class: it encouraged students to take responsibility for their improvement.

In the follow-up phase, students applied feedback by revising drafts, identifying weaknesses, and improving argumentation. Student F's statement that explanations were repeated until they understood shows that dialogic feedback helped clarify writing concepts more deeply than written comments alone. This demonstrates how dialogic practices strengthened comprehension and supported higher-order thinking. Overall, students perceived dialogic feedback as constructive, supportive, and academically useful. Although some experienced stress, they still viewed the process as essential to improving their writing skills. These perceptions relate directly to the research questions by revealing why dialogic feedback was impactful and how it shaped students' emotional and cognitive engagement with writing.

Conclusion

This study sought to investigate the application of dialogic feedback and how students view its usage in an English writing for academic purposes class. The primary aim of the study was to explore both the instructional practices of dialogic feedback and students' responses to its implementation within an Indonesian EFL context. The research focused on understanding not only how dialogic feedback was carried out in the classroom but also how it influenced students emotionally, cognitively, and behaviorally. The findings demonstrate that while dialogic feedback aligns with international theories of equal participation, in practice, cultural respect for authority shapes how learners engage with teachers' feedback. These insights suggest that dialogic feedback models must be adapted to local contexts rather than applied uniformly across different educational cultures.

In terms of practice, the study offers feasible classroom strategies such as aligning tasks with students' drafts, using open-ended questioning, and providing ongoing follow-up support. These strategies can help teachers implement dialogic feedback in a structured and supportive manner. Overall, the conclusion addresses the research aim and questions by demonstrating that dialogic feedback, when implemented consistently and responsively, can enhance students' academic writing development while also fostering engagement and reflective learning.

Limitation of the Study

Although dialogic feedback was shown to be effective, student engagement varied depending on their willingness to approach the teacher. This indicates that dialogic feedback may not equally

benefit all students, particularly those who are less confident or hesitant to initiate interaction. Additionally, the findings are context-specific and based on a limited number of participants, which may affect the generalizability of the results.

Author Contribution Statement

Alda Fitrianingsih: Conceptualization and Research Design; Data Curation and Investigation; Methodology; Project Administration; Writing - Original Draft; Writing - Review & Editing. **Sri Lestari:** Writing - Review & Editing; Validation, Visualization.

REFERENCES

- Adie, L., Kleij, F. Van Der, & Cumming, J. (2018). *The development and application of coding frameworks to explore dialogic feedback interactions and self-regulated learning*. 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3463>
- Ajjawi, R., & Boud, D. (2018). Examining the nature and effects of feedback dialogue. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(7), 1106–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1434128>
- Alexander, R. (2018). Developing dialogic teaching: genesis, process, trial. *Research Papers in Education*, 33(5), 561–598. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2018.1481140>
- Arinda, P., & Sadikin, I. S. (2021). *Dialogic Feedback To Promote Deep Learning For Efl Speaking Learners In Online Learning Environment : Students ' Voices*. 4(5), 803–813.
- Busetto, L., Wick, W., & Gumbinger, C. (2020). How to use and assess qualitative research methods. *Neurological Research and Practice*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42466-020-00059-z>
- Cagliesi, G., Batishcheva, L., & Sanmartin, A. (2023). Designing Feedback Spirals To Motivate And Promote Student Learning. *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice*, 11(2), 47–61. <https://doi.org/10.56433/jpaap.v11i2.536>
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Djalilova, S. (2019). *Dialogic feedback and its effects on English language learners ' writing development : a case study*.

- Enita, S., & Sumardi, S. (2023). Dialogic Feedback on Graduate Students' Thesis Writing Supervision: Voices of Indonesian Graduate Students. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(1), 487–496. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v15i1.2614>
- Erkan Er, Y. D. & D. G. (2020). *A Collaborative Learning Approach to Dialogic Peer Feedback: A Theoretical Framework*. 1–15.
- Filius, R. M., de Kleijn, R. A. M., Uijl, S. G., Prins, F. J., van Rijen, H. V. M., & Grobbee, D. E. (2018). Strengthening dialogic peer feedback aiming for deep learning in SPOCs. *Computers and Education*, 125(December 2017), 86–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.06.004>
- Gillies, R. M. (2016). Dialogic interactions in the cooperative classroom. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 76, 178–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2015.02.009>
- Henderson, M., Ryan, T., & Phillips, M. (2019). Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education The challenges of feedback in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 0(0), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1599815>
- Hibert, A, Phillips, M, Gasevic, D, Pantic, N, Maclean, J & Tsai, Y.-S. 2023. (2023). *Dialogic feedback in online teaching: Implications for teacher education*.
- Hill, J., Berlin, K., Choate, J., Cravens-Brown, L., McKendrick-Calder, L., & Smith, S. (2021). Exploring the emotional responses of undergraduate students to assessment feedback: Implications for instructors. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 9(1), 294–318. <https://doi.org/10.20343/TEACHLEARNINQU.9.1.20>
- Ishraga Bashir Mohammed Elhassan, M. I. A. (2017). *The Impact of Dialogic Teaching on English Language Learners' Speaking and Thinking Skills*. 8(December), 49–67.
- Jennifer, H., & Harry, W. (2020). Improving the student learning experience through dialogic feed-forward assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(1), 82–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1608908>
- Kartchava, H. N. and E. (2017). Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning. In *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning: Research, Theory, Applications, Implications*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315621432>
- Lichtenberger-Majzikné, K., & Fischer, A. (2017). The Role of Feedback in Developing Reflective Competence. *Practice and Theory in Systems of Education*, 12(3), 119–127. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ptse-2017-0012>
- Maheshi, B., Dai, W., Martinez-Maldonado, R., & Tsai, Y. S. (2024). Dialogic feedback at scale: Recommendations for learning analytics design. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, May, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.13034>

- Manalo, E. (2020). Deeper Learning, Dialogic Learning, and Critical Thinking. In *Sustainability (Switzerland)* (Vol. 11, Issue 1). http://scioteca.caf.com/bitstream/handle/123456789/1091/RED2017-Eng-8ene.pdf?sequence=12&isAllowed=y%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2008.06.005%0Ahttps://www.researchgate.net/publication/305320484_SISTEM_PEMBERTUNGAN_TERPUSAT_STRATEGI_MELESTARI
- Marlies Schillings, Herma Roebertsen, Hans Savelberg, D. D. (2018). *A Review of Educational Dialogue Strategies to Improve Academic Writing Skills*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787418810663>
- Morgan, H. (2022). Conducting a Qualitative Document Analysis. *Qualitative Report*, 27(1), 64–77. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5044>
- Muhammad Reza Pahlevi. (2024). *A Doctoral Student's Journey And Experiences In Writing A Research Article Through Dialogic Feedback: An Autoethnographic Self-Reflection*. 2(1), 306–312.
- Muthukrishnan, P., Lan, L. F., Anandhan, H., & D, P. S. (2024). *The Role of Growth Mindset on the Relationships between Students' Perceptions of English Language Teachers' Feedback and Their ESL Learning The Role of Growth Mindset on the Relationships between Students' Perceptions of English Language Teachers' Fee*. October. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14101073>
- Nabinur Rahman, Sharifa Chowdhury, and D. M. (2024). *Undergraduate students' voices on the role of tutorial-based dialogic feedback in developing academic writing skills*. 1–18.
- Natasha Mack, Cynthia Woodson Kathleen M. MacQueen, Greg Guest, E. N. (2005). *Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guide*.
- Pitt, E and Winstone, N. (2020). *Kent Academic Repository*.
- Saeed, M. A., & Al Qunayeer, H. S. (2022). Exploring teacher interactive e-feedback on students' writing through Google Docs: factors promoting interactivity and potential for learning. *Language Learning Journal*, 50(3), 360–377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2020.1786711>
- Steen-Utheim, A. T. (2019). *Students' sense making of feedback Dialogue, interaction and emotions*.
- Steen-Utheim, & Wittek, L. (2017). *Title: Dialogic feedback and Potentialities for Student Learning Author names and affiliations*.
- Tam, A. C. F. (2020). Undergraduate students' perceptions of and responses to exemplar-based dialogic feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(2), 268–284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1772957>

- Thamrin, N. S., Madya, S., & Putro, N. H. P. S. (2024). Employing multimodal dialogic feedback on EFL tertiary students' writing: Formative assessment framework. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 11(2), 124. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v11i2.20393>
- Van der Kleij, F. M., Adie, L. E., & Cumming, J. J. (2019). A meta-review of the student role in feedback. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 98(September), 303–323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.09.005>
- Virginia Braun, and V. C. (n.d.). *Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology*. 1–41.
- Willis, J., Gibson, A., Kelly, N., Spina, N., Azordegan, J. M., & Crosswell, L. (2021). *Towards faster feedback in higher education through digitally mediated dialogic loops*. 37(3), 22–37.
- Wingate, U. (2019). Journal of English for Academic Purposes 'Can You Talk Me Through Your Argument'? Features of Dialogic Interaction in Academic Writing Tutorials. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 38, 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.01.001>
- Yang, L., Chiu, M. M., & Yan, Z. (2021). The power of teacher feedback in affecting student learning and achievement: insights from students' perspective. *Educational Psychology*, 41(7), 821–824. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2021.1964855>
- Zhang, J. (2023). *A Study on the Effectiveness of Dialogic Feedback in English Writing*. 2(3). <https://doi.org/10.56397/JLCS.2023.09.11>
- Zhu, Q., & Carless, D. (2018). Dialogue within peer feedback processes: clarification and negotiation of meaning. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 37(4), 883–897. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2018.1446417>