

WAYS TO IMPROVE WRITING SKILLS

Manav Kaizen Mylathara Rajesh¹, Prof. G. Anburaj²

¹School of Computer Science and Engineering Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore-632014, Tamil Nadu, S. India.

²Assistant Professor of English Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore-632014, Tamil Nadu, S. India.

anburaj.g@vit.ac.in

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.58257/IJPREMS37231>

ABSTRACT

This essay addresses the critical issue of limited feedback loops in writing development, a significant barrier to writers' progression in academic and professional settings. While writing skills are foundational to communication and expression, many writers struggle to improve due to infrequent and narrowly focused feedback. Limited feedback not only restricts writers' understanding of their strengths and weaknesses but also hinders their ability to make consistent, targeted improvements. This paper proposes solutions to improve feedback opportunities, including peer review circles, digital feedback tools, mentorship programs, and collaborative writing groups. Each method has unique advantages and challenges, contributing to a comprehensive feedback ecosystem. Implementing these solutions allows for a more iterative, accessible, and dynamic approach to writing development, equipping writers with the tools and insights they need to progress continuously. By addressing the shortcomings of traditional feedback methods, this paper seeks to foster a culture of ongoing learning and growth in writing proficiency.

Keywords: Feedback Loops, Writing Development, Peer Review, Digital Feedback Tools, Mentorship Programs, Collaborative Writing Groups, Iterative Improvement, Writing Proficiency, Continuous Growth, Student Engagement, Writing Skills

AIM

The primary aim of the paper is to address the limitations of traditional feedback methods in writing development by proposing a more comprehensive, multi-layered feedback system. This expanded feedback model involves integrating peer review circles, digital tools, mentorship programs, and collaborative writing groups. The goal is to create a supportive and iterative feedback environment that promotes continuous growth in writing skills, thereby equipping writers with the tools and insights needed to improve their clarity, coherence, and adaptability in various writing contexts.

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is a crucial skill across academic, professional, and personal spheres, yet developing proficiency in writing remains challenging for many. A major hurdle in writing development is the lack of frequent and meaningful feedback. In traditional academic settings, feedback is often provided infrequently, primarily by instructors, and typically arrives at the end of an assignment. This approach limits a writer's opportunity to iterate and improve during the writing process, leading to a cycle of frustration and stagnation. Feedback, when provided consistently and thoughtfully, enables writers to identify areas needing improvement and make targeted changes, refining both their style and substance.

This essay explores ways to address the limitations in feedback loops by employing a combination of peer-based reviews, digital tools, mentorship, and structured collaborative groups. These approaches foster a supportive environment where writers receive timely, diverse feedback that encourages continuous growth. By implementing these methods, educational institutions and professional organizations can create robust feedback systems, empowering writers to improve steadily and adapt to various writing contexts and audiences. Furthermore, fostering an atmosphere of collaborative learning can lead to not just individual improvement but also a collective enhancement of writing standards within educational and professional frameworks.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Infrequent feedback in traditional writing instruction often leaves writers without sufficient guidance to make meaningful improvements. Feedback is essential for helping writers develop clarity, coherence, and style, which are crucial for effective communication. However, in many educational environments, students receive feedback only at the end of assignments, limiting the potential for growth between drafts. This practice often results in students feeling unprepared for the next task, as they are not given the opportunity to learn from their mistakes in real time. Additionally, feedback from a single source, such as an instructor, may lack the diversity needed to address the complexities of different writing tasks. This narrow feedback loop restricts writers from understanding how their work might be perceived by varied audiences or how to adjust their style and content to suit specific contexts.

Thus, expanding feedback opportunities is crucial for fostering continuous development. Addressing this problem requires a multifaceted approach that incorporates feedback from diverse sources and provides timely input throughout the writing process. This can involve integrating peer assessments, utilizing technology, and engaging in mentorship relationships that enrich the writing experience and ultimately lead to improved outcomes for writers at all levels.

3. RESEARCH GAPS

1. Frequency and Quality of Feedback in Educational Settings

The paper notes that while feedback is essential for writing improvement, many educational settings provide it infrequently and often only at the end of assignments. There is a need for more research on the impact of providing feedback at multiple stages of the writing process, especially in formative rather than summative assessments.

2. Diversity of Feedback Sources

Traditional feedback is typically instructor-centered, which lacks the diverse perspectives that could benefit writers. The research gap here involves understanding how feedback from multiple sources—such as peers, digital tools, and mentors—could create a richer feedback ecosystem.

3. Long-Term Impact of Expanded Feedback Loops

Although studies indicate short-term benefits of peer and digital feedback, there is limited research on the long-term effects of these methods. A gap exists in assessing how consistent exposure to diverse feedback methods impacts writers' development over time, especially regarding resilience and adaptability in writing.

4. Effectiveness of Digital Feedback Tools in Complex Writing Tasks

While digital tools are widely used for technical corrections, their efficacy in addressing higher-order writing issues (e.g., argument structure, thematic depth) is under-researched. The paper suggests a need to evaluate how digital feedback can be combined with other forms to better support complex writing tasks.

4. LITERATURE REVIEW

Feedback is a key component of learning, particularly in writing. According to research, effective feedback is timely, specific, and allows for iterative improvements (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). For writing, feedback that highlights strengths, identifies weaknesses, and suggests improvements can lead to substantial progress over time. The impact of feedback on writing proficiency has been extensively studied, revealing that specific, constructive critiques can enhance a writer's ability to analyze their work and make necessary adjustments. However, research shows that feedback is often limited in academic settings, reducing its potential effectiveness (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006).

Feedback from multiple sources, including peers and digital tools, has been shown to enhance writers' ability to engage with feedback and improve their work iteratively. Peer feedback, in particular, is effective because it enables writers to view their work through diverse perspectives, fostering self-reflection and critical thinking (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009). Such collaborative environments allow writers to explore various approaches to the same problem, broadening their understanding and skill set.

Studies on digital feedback tools reveal that automated systems can provide rapid, objective feedback on surface-level issues like grammar and readability, though they may lack the nuance needed for more complex aspects of writing (Bai, 2014). Meanwhile, mentorship programs provide writers with personalized guidance from experienced mentors, who can address high-level concerns such as structure, coherence, and rhetorical strategies (Daloiz, 2012). Collaborative learning environments, like writing groups, also enhance feedback by creating a supportive space for writers to experiment and refine their skills. Overall, the literature emphasizes the need for a diversified feedback ecosystem to support writers at various stages of their development.

5. METHODOLOGY

This essay draws on a range of sources, including case studies, surveys, and meta-analyses on various feedback methods. The effectiveness of peer review systems, digital feedback tools, mentorship programs, and collaborative writing groups is evaluated in terms of their impact on writing quality, student engagement, and feedback satisfaction. These findings are then synthesized to develop recommendations for implementing an effective, multifaceted feedback system in educational and professional settings. Data was gathered from academic journals, educational research, and testimonials from participants in various feedback programs to evaluate their effectiveness. Surveys conducted among students and instructors provided insights into their experiences with different feedback methods. This comprehensive approach allows for a thorough understanding of how each method contributes to writing development and how they can be integrated into existing educational frameworks.

6. PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

Peer Review

Peer review is one of the most accessible forms of feedback, offering writers the opportunity to receive insights from multiple perspectives. In academic settings, peer review circles can be formalized within course curricula, creating a structured environment where students can review and critique each other's work. This method enables writers to view their work through the eyes of diverse readers, which can help identify issues in clarity, engagement, and argument strength that they may not recognize on their own. Additionally, engaging in peer review promotes self-assessment skills, as students develop the ability to critique their own writing by evaluating others' work. This reciprocal learning fosters a supportive community among writers, creating a network for collective improvement.

Peer review can be easily integrated into classes through platforms like Google Docs or learning management systems, allowing for real-time feedback. Instructors can use structured rubrics to guide the feedback process, ensuring that comments are constructive and aligned with specific learning objectives. This structured approach not only enhances feedback quality but also provides students with a clear understanding of goals and expectations. However, some students may initially lack the experience or confidence to provide detailed feedback, which can limit the effectiveness of peer review. To address this, instructors can offer training on how to deliver constructive, respectful feedback, helping students develop critical assessment skills. Furthermore, fostering a culture of trust and openness within peer review groups can significantly enhance the outcomes of this feedback method.

Digital Tools

Digital feedback tools, such as Grammarly, Hemingway Editor, and ProWritingAid, provide immediate, objective feedback on technical aspects of writing, including grammar, syntax, and readability. These tools allow writers to make improvements in real time as they draft, correcting technical errors without waiting for instructor comments. Many of these digital tools also offer insights into tone, style, and readability, making them particularly valuable for refining the mechanical aspects of writing. Studies show that using digital tools can significantly improve writers' grammatical accuracy and style consistency, fostering a sense of independence by giving them greater control over their writing process.

While digital feedback tools are highly effective for surface-level improvements, they may not be as effective in addressing more complex issues, such as argumentation, coherence, or audience engagement. Therefore, writers should use these tools as part of a broader feedback strategy, combining them with peer or mentor feedback for a more holistic improvement approach. Recognizing the limitations of digital tools helps writers focus on areas that require deeper, more nuanced feedback, which automated systems cannot provide. By using these tools during the drafting and revision stages to address grammar, style, and readability, writers can save their energy for higher-order revisions later in the writing process. Encouraging writers to reflect on the feedback from digital tools and seek additional perspectives can further enhance their learning experience.

Mentorship Programs

Mentorship programs provide writers with detailed, personalized feedback from experienced mentors who can help them navigate complex aspects of writing, such as structuring arguments, developing narratives, and engaging readers. In addition to technical writing improvement, mentors offer emotional support, fostering a positive, growth-oriented mindset in their mentees. This mentor-mentee relationship can inspire greater motivation and accountability, as writers work towards specific goals and benchmarks under the guidance of a knowledgeable mentor.

Establishing effective mentorship programs involves pairing writers with suitable mentors, such as faculty members, advanced students, or professionals with relevant expertise. Regular meetings allow mentors to review drafts, discuss progress, and set achievable writing goals, ensuring that mentees receive consistent support while encouraging their independence in writing practice. Although mentorship programs require a significant time commitment, institutions can support these programs by establishing clear objectives and maintaining regular communication to ensure mentees' needs are met effectively. Creating a structured mentorship framework, including regular check-ins and feedback loops, can significantly enhance the overall effectiveness of these programs.

Collaborative Writing Groups

Collaborative writing groups or workshops offer a structured environment where writers can share work, receive feedback, and learn from each other. Typically led by an instructor or facilitator, these groups provide guidance to ensure that discussions remain productive. Writing groups encourage writers to actively engage with feedback, helping them develop resilience as they revise and refine their work. Additionally, the collaborative setting fosters accountability, as participants are motivated to contribute high-quality work for group review. Research has shown

that collaborative groups can enhance critical thinking and analytical skills, providing an added layer of motivation and creativity as writers exchange ideas and explore various perspectives.

Writing groups can be integrated into classes or organized as extracurricular activities. Participants meet regularly to share and critique each other's work, with structured activities to maintain focus. Facilitators guide discussions, ensuring that feedback remains constructive and relevant. Establishing clear objectives and goals for each session can help maintain momentum and ensure continuous progress. Moreover, setting ground rules for respectful, constructive feedback encourages group members to set personal writing goals that can be tracked over time. Incorporating structured exercises, such as focused writing prompts or themed discussions, further enriches the collaborative experience and keeps participants engaged throughout the process.

7. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Each proposed feedback solution addresses a distinct need within the feedback loop, creating a more comprehensive system for writing development. Peer review systems, for instance, offer a range of perspectives, helping writers identify issues with clarity or logic that they may not notice on their own.

Digital tools provide real-time, objective feedback on technical accuracy, allowing writers to correct errors before they become ingrained. Mentorship programs, with their personalized feedback, help writers develop nuanced skills like argumentation and coherence, which may not be addressed by peer feedback or digital tools. Collaborative writing groups further enhance feedback by creating a supportive space for experimentation, allowing writers to test new approaches and ideas.

Studies reveal that combining these methods yields the best outcomes, as writers benefit from a balanced mix of immediate, personalized, and communal feedback. For example, a writer who uses digital tools for grammar, peer review for initial feedback, and mentorship for guidance on structure can achieve more holistic improvement. Writing groups also add value by fostering a sense of community and resilience, qualities that are essential for long-term success in writing.

The synthesis of findings indicates that a multi-layered feedback approach not only aids in skill acquisition but also boosts writers' confidence and engagement levels. Continuous, diverse feedback creates an environment where writers feel supported and encouraged to take risks in their writing, leading to greater innovation and creativity.

8. DISCUSSION

While these solutions offer substantial benefits, implementing a comprehensive feedback system requires careful planning and resources. Digital tools and peer review systems are relatively accessible and can be scaled to accommodate large groups, making them practical for educational institutions. However, mentorship and collaborative writing groups require more time and support, as they depend on regular interaction and engagement.

Combining different feedback mechanisms in educational settings can help mitigate the limitations of individual methods. For instance, while digital tools may not address thematic depth, peer reviews can provide subjective insights into reader engagement. Mentorship programs offer the personalized, in-depth support that can be particularly beneficial for advanced writers. By using a variety of feedback sources, writers receive more rounded, constructive input, helping them develop their skills in a supportive environment.

Furthermore, the incorporation of feedback loops into the writing curriculum should be approached as a dynamic, ongoing process rather than a static component. This requires fostering a culture that values feedback not just as a means of evaluation, but as an integral part of the learning and writing experience. By promoting openness to feedback and encouraging writers to view critique as an opportunity for growth, educational institutions can significantly enhance their writing programs.

9. UNEXPECTED FINDINGS

1. Peer Feedback's Impact on Self-Assessment

One unexpected finding is that participating in peer review circles not only helps writers receive feedback but also enhances their self-assessment skills. Reviewing others' work allows writers to develop a more critical eye for their own writing, which was not initially anticipated as a primary outcome.

2. Digital Tools' Influence on Writer Independence

Although digital tools are designed to provide real-time technical feedback, an unexpected benefit is that they foster greater independence in writers. By enabling writers to identify and correct their own mistakes, these tools encourage self-reliance and a proactive approach to revision.

3. Collaborative Writing Groups Enhancing Creativity

The paper also found that collaborative writing groups contribute not only to technical skill improvement but also to heightened creativity and motivation among writers. The group setting allows for the sharing of diverse ideas and perspectives, leading to more innovative approaches to writing than initially expected.

10. CONCLUSION

Expanding feedback opportunities is essential for effective writing development, as it provides writers with continuous, meaningful input that supports steady improvement. By integrating peer review systems, digital tools, mentorship programs, and collaborative writing groups, educators and organizations can create an inclusive, iterative feedback environment that caters to writers' diverse needs. This multi-pronged approach empowers writers to develop not only technical proficiency but also adaptability, resilience, and self-confidence—skills that are critical for academic and professional success.

11. SCOPE OF FURTHER RESEARCH

Further research could explore the long-term impact of these methods on writing quality and confidence, as well as how to implement these approaches on a larger scale within institutions. This could involve longitudinal studies to assess the effects of feedback integration over time, as well as exploring various models of mentorship and collaboration to determine best practices.

By fostering a supportive, feedback-rich environment, educational institutions and professional organizations can help writers reach their full potential, equipping them with the skills needed to thrive in a world where effective communication is essential. As the demands of the writing landscape evolve, so too must the approaches to feedback, ensuring that writers are not only competent in their skills but also confident and prepared to tackle the challenges of their respective fields.

12. REFERENCES

- [1] Bai, H. (2014). "The Effectiveness of Automated Feedback in Writing Instruction." *Computers and Composition*, 34, 60-75.
- [2] Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. (2012). "Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing." *Language Teaching*, 45(4), 483-507.
- [3] Bruffee, K. (1984). "Collaborative Learning and the Conversation of Mankind." *College English*, 46(7), 635-652.
- [4] Crisp, G., & Cruz, J. (2009). "Mentoring in Higher Education." *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 1(1), 14-24.
- [5] Daloz, L. A. (2012). *Mentor: Guiding the Journey of Adult Learners*. Wiley.
- [6] Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). "The Power of Feedback." *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- [7] Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). "To Give Is Better Than to Receive: The Benefits of Peer Review to the Reviewer's Own Writing." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8(1), 6-23.
- [8] Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). "Formative Assessment and Self-Regulated Learning: A Model and Seven Principles of Good Feedback Practice." *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218.
- [9] Schunk, D. H. (2003). "Self-Efficacy for Reading and Writing: Influence of Modeling, Goal Setting, and Self-Evaluation." *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 159-172.
- [10] Shute, V. J. (2008). "Focus on Formative Feedback." *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153-189.
- [11] Topping, K. J. (1998). "Peer Assessment Between Students in Colleges and Universities." *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276.
- [12] Andrade, H. G., & Du, Y. (2007). "Student Responses to Criteria-Referenced Assessment: A Study of Peer and Self-Assessment." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32(2), 179-203.
- [13] Elbow, P. (1997). *Collaborative Learning: Underlying Principles and Practices*. In *Collaborative Learning: A Sourcebook for Higher Education* (pp. 51-66).
- [14] Fong, A. (2013). "The Impact of Peer Review on Student Engagement and Learning Outcomes." *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 10(2), 1-17.
- [15] Zawacki, T. & Cox, M. (2011). "Writing Centers and Peer Review: A Discussion of Issues, Approaches, and Future Directions." *Writing Center Journal*, 31(1), 23-44.
- [16] Albin, C. J. (2017). "Writing with Feedback: Encouraging Reflective Practices." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 44(2), 153-161.
- [17] Chan, C. K. Y. (2015). "The Role of Feedback in Improving Academic Writing." *English Language Teaching*, 8(5), 85-95.

- [18] Cavanagh, M. (2011). "The Importance of Feedback in Learning and Assessment." *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(1), 103-114.
- [19] DeLuca, C., & Bellara, A. (2013). "Formative Assessment in a Writing Context: A Review of the Literature." *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policies and Practices*, 20(2), 173-194.
- [20] Frey, N., & Fisher, D. (2011). "Student-Centered Coaching: A Guide for K-8 Coaches and Principals." Corwin Press.
- [21] Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). "A Meta-Analysis of Writing Instruction for Adolescent Students." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3), 445-476.
- [22] Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). "The Power of Feedback." *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- [23] Huot, B. (2002). "The 'Public' Nature of Assessment: An Argument for a Return to the Public Sector." *Assessing Writing*, 8(3), 173-194.
- [24] McCarthy, L. P. (1987). "A Writer's Choice: The Effect of a Workshop Environment on Revision." *Research in the Teaching of English*, 21(4), 329-342.
- [25] Mohr, M. (2010). "Digital Feedback Tools: Finding the Right Fit." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 37(1), 44-50.
- [26] Mulligan, A., & Garofalo, J. (2008). "Peer Review as a Tool for Learning." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 35(4), 399-411.
- [27] Olivares, G. (2015). "Peer Feedback in the Writing Classroom." *The English Journal*, 104(4), 66-70.
- [28] Pawley, A. (2007). "The Role of Peer Review in the Writing Classroom." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 34(1), 25-36.
- [29] Phillips, M. (2010). "Online Peer Review: A New Tool for College Writing Courses." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 38(1), 47-54.
- [30] Raimes, A. (1983). "Techniques in Teaching Writing." Oxford University Press.
- [31] Reynolds, J. (2011). "Writing Groups: A New Approach to Professional Development." *The English Journal*, 100(6), 31-37.
- [32] Richards, J. C. (2008). "Teaching Listening and Speaking: From Theory to Practice." Cambridge University Press.
- [33] Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Sandilos, L. E. (2011). "Teacher-Student Relationships: An Emerging Focus for Social, Emotional, and Academic Learning." *Handbook of Social and Emotional Learning: Research and Practice*, 1, 89-105.
- [34] Saito, K. (2016). "Peer Feedback in Writing: A Study of the Effects of Peer Review on Writing Improvement." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 32, 1-12.
- [35] Santos, M. (2001). "The Effects of Group Work on Student Learning." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(3), 622-629.
- [36] Shaughnessy, M. P. (1977). "Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing." *The College Composition and Communication*, 28(2), 126-133.
- [37] Topping, K. J. (2003). "Peer Assessment Between Students in Colleges and Universities." *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276.
- [38] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.
- [39] Wang, Y., & Waller, A. (2016). "The Role of Feedback in Academic Writing: Perceptions and Experiences of Students." *Writing & Pedagogy*, 8(1), 73-88.
- [40] Whipple, T. (2010). "A Study of the Impact of Peer Review on Writing Performance." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(4), 509-523.
- [41] Williams, J. D. (2003). "Peer Feedback in the Writing Process: A Model for Training and Implementation." *The English Journal*, 92(5), 36-43.
- [42] Yancey, K. B., & Huot, B. (2004). *Assessing Writing Across the Curriculum*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- [43] Zeng, X., & Zhang, D. (2016). "The Role of Technology in Writing Instruction: A Review of Literature." *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(1), 94-106.
- [44] Zinsser, W. (2006). *On Writing Well: The Classic Guide to Writing Nonfiction*. Harper Perennial.
- [45] Bandura, A. (1997). "Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control." Freeman.
- [46] Boud, D., & Falchikov, N. (2006). "Aligning Assessment with Long-Term Learning." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(4), 399-413.

- [47] Boud, D., Cohen, R., & Sampson, J. (2001). "Evaluating Student-Centered Learning." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 26(1), 55-68.
- [48] Davis, H. A. (2003). "Conceptualizing the Role of Student-Teacher Relationships in Academic Motivation." *Educational Psychologist*, 38(4), 219-229.
- [49] Ferris, D. R. (2003). "Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students." Routledge.
- [50] Garrison, D. R., & Anderson, T. (2003). *E-Learning in the 21st Century: A Community of Inquiry Framework for Student Engagement*. Routledge.
- [51] Geller, A. (2010). "Collaborative Learning: A Case for Writing Instruction." *English Journal*, 99(6), 78-83.
- [52] Geisler, C. (2001). "Feedback in the Writing Classroom." *College Composition and Communication*, 53(2), 164-177.
- [53] Hamari, J., Koivisto, J., & Sarsa, H. (2016). "Does Gamification Work? A Literature Review of Empirical Studies on Gamification." 2014 47th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (pp. 3025-3034). IEEE.
- [54] Jordan, A. (2013). "The Effect of Peer Review on Student Writing." *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 8(1), 55-68.
- [55] Kagan, S. (1994). "Cooperative Learning." Kagan Publishing.
- [56] Langer, J. A., & Applebee, A. N. (1987). *How Writing Shapes Thinking: A Study of Teaching and Learning*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- [57] Murphy, S. (2010). "Peer Feedback: A Key Component of Writing Assessment." *The English Journal*, 100(2), 69-75.
- [58] National Writing Project. (2007). "Because Writing Matters: Improving Student Writing in Our Schools." Jossey-Bass.
- [59] Pritchard, R. & Honeycutt, J. (2007). "The Importance of Peer Review in the Writing Classroom." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 34(4), 343-354.
- [60] Reigeluth, C. M. (1999). "What Is Instructional-Design Theory?" *Instructional-Design Theories and Models: Vol. 2. A New Paradigm of Instructional Theory*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [61] Rudd, T., & Young, C. (2010). "Collaborative Learning in the Classroom: The Benefits of Group Writing." *The Teaching Professor*, 24(5), 3-5.
- [62] Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Doubleday.
- [63] Stiggins, R. J. (2005). "From Formative Assessment to Assessment for Learning: A Path to Success in Standards-Based Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(4), 324-328.
- [64] Swain, M. (2000). "The Output Hypothesis and Beyond: Mediating Acquisition through Collaborative Dialogue." In *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford University Press.
- [65] Walvoord, B. E., & Anderson, V. J. (2010). *Effective Grading: A Tool for Learning and Assessment in College*. Jossey-Bass.
- [66] Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by Design*. Pearson Education.
- [67] Williams, J. D. (2010). "The Role of the Writing Center in Supporting Writing Across the Curriculum." *Writing Center Journal*, 29(1), 5-21.
- [68] Wright, S. (2012). "Creating a Feedback Culture in the Writing Classroom." *The English Journal*, 101(1), 40-46.
- [69] Xu, Y., & Hu, X. (2016). "Peer Feedback and Teacher Feedback in EFL Writing Classes." *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(5), 963-971.
- [70] Young, A. (2006). "The Role of Feedback in Student Learning." *Educational Psychology Review*, 18(3), 277-290.