Journal of Social Science Humanities and Literature, Vol.8, Issue 4, (Apr)
ISSN 2277-842X **2025**
DOI: 10.53469/jsshl.2025.08(04).13

An Integrated Feedback Model for English Writing Instruction in Vocational Colleges

Zhai Yan[1,2], Nalini Arumugam[2]

[1]Henan Polytechnic Institute, Nanyang, 473000, China
[2]SEGi University, Kota Damansara, Petaling Jaya, Selangor, 47810, Malaysia

Abstract: ***Drawing on Hattie and Timperley's (2007) feedback theory and sociocultural theory (SCT), this study proposes an integrated feedback model tailored for English writing instruction in vocational colleges. This model incorporates teacher feedback, peer feedback, and automated writing evaluation, emphasizing the progressive nature of feedback levels and learners' cognitive development through social interaction. The study explores the roles of different feedback types at the task level, process level, self-regulation level and self-level, and introduces an optimization strategy based on the principle of scaffolding fading and internalization. The proposed model aims to enhance students' meta-cognitive awareness and foster their long-term writing development. Finally, the paper analyzes the model's applicability and future directions for improvement, providing both theoretical and practical insights for English writing instruction in vocational education.***

Keywords: Integrated feedback; Feedback levels; Vocational college English writing; Sociocultural theory; Scaffolding fading.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Background

In English writing instruction at vocational colleges, feedback plays a crucial role in improving students' writing proficiency (Wu, 2020). Traditional teacher feedback, while authoritative, is often limited by the heavy grading workload, resulting in delays that hinder students from making timely revisions and improvements (Thirakunkovit & Chamcharatsri, 2019). With advancements in educational technology, peer feedback and AWE feedback have been gradually introduced into writing classrooms, offering students diverse perspectives on their writing (Luo & Liu, 2017). However, relying solely on a single feedback source remains problematic. For instance, peer feedback may lack expertise, while AWE feedback tends to focus on linguistic and structural aspects while overlooking content and logical coherence. Therefore, optimizing an integrated feedback model that effectively enhances students' writing skills has become a pressing research issue (Tian & Zhou, 2020).

1.2 Research Objectives

This study aims to construct an Integrated Feedback Model suitable for English writing instruction in vocational colleges. The research theoretically explores how to optimize the integration of teacher feedback, peer feedback, and Automated writing Evaluation (AWE) feedback to improve students' writing quality. Based on existing feedback theories, this paper analyzes the mechanisms of different feedback types and proposes a new feedback model to address the limitations of current approaches.

1.3 Research Questions

This study investigates the following key questions:

1) How can a more effective integrated feedback model be developed to meet the needs of English writing instruction in vocational colleges?

2) How can this model optimize the integration of different feedback types to enhance students' writing proficiency?

1.4 Research Methodology

This study adopts a theoretical exploration and model construction approach, drawing on sociocultural theory

(Vygotsky, 1978), Hattie's feedback model (Hattie & Timperley, 2007), and relevant empirical research to develop a new integrated feedback model. Logical reasoning is applied to evaluate the model's feasibility in vocational college English writing instruction, focusing on feedback effectiveness and students' acceptance of feedback.

1.5 Research Significance

The theoretical significance of this study lies in deepening the understanding of integrated feedback mechanisms and offering new insights into feedback strategies for English writing instruction in vocational colleges. The practical significance is to provide theoretical guidance for vocational college educators, helping them integrate teacher, peer, and AWE feedback more effectively to enhance students' writing abilities and improve feedback application in teaching practices.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The Role of Feedback in Writing Instruction

The core role of feedback in writing instruction is to facilitate learners' revision, reflection, and improvement (Han & Hyland, 2015). Effective feedback not only helps students identify deficiencies in language and content but also guides them in adjusting their writing strategies, thereby enhancing overall writing proficiency (Mandouit & Hattie, 2023). Research has shown that feedback has a profound impact on students' writing quality, particularly in areas such as text structure, argumentation logic, and linguistic accuracy (Ajabshir & Ebadi, 2023; Noroozi et al., 2018).

In writing instruction, feedback can be categorized based on presentation, and focus, with different types of feedback influencing students' writing acquisition in various ways. Regarding presentation, feedback can be categorized into explicit and implicit feedback, direct and indirect feedback. Explicit feedback directly points out errors and provides corrective suggestions or rule explanations, making it particularly beneficial for low-proficiency learners (Suzuki et al., 2019). Implicit feedback, on the other hand, guides students to discover errors through repetition, hints, or questioning, making it more suitable for advanced learners. Moreover, direct feedback, in which teachers or reviewers directly mark errors and provide corrections, reduces cognitive load and improves revision efficiency (Mirzaii & Aliabadi, 2013). In contrast, indirect feedback, which only marks the location of errors without offering corrections, stimulates students' independent thinking and is more conducive to long-term writing skill development (Ng & Ishak, 2018).

From the perspective of focus, feedback can be focused feedback or unfocused feedback. Focused feedback targets specific types of errors, enhancing learners' attention and mastery of particular language rules, making it suitable for targeted teaching goals (Sheen, 2007). In contrast, unfocused feedback addresses various errors in writing. While it can improve overall writing quality, it may also increase students' cognitive load and negatively affect learning outcomes (Negahi et al., 2022).

2.2 Main Types of Feedback and Their Characteristics

In writing instruction, different types of feedback have distinct characteristics, and their effectiveness largely depends on the provider. As the primary instructional guide, teachers play a crucial role in feedback, providing not only accurate language and content corrections but also adapting feedback strategies to individual student differences (Yu & Yang, 2021).

2.2.1 Teacher Feedback

Teacher feedback is the most common feedback method in writing instruction due to its professionalism and authority. Research indicates that teacher feedback significantly contributes to optimizing language accuracy, content depth, and logical structure (Yu & Yang, 2021). However, due to heavy teaching workloads, timely and personalized teacher feedback is often challenging, limiting its practical effectiveness (Tai et al., 2015).

2.2.2 Peer Feedback

Peer feedback emphasizes interaction among learners, allowing students to develop writing awareness and critical

thinking skills by reviewing others' work (Thirakunkovit & Chamcharatsri, 2019). This feedback model not only compensates for the limitations of teacher feedback but also enhances students' writing autonomy and sense of responsibility (Lam, 2021). However, the effectiveness of peer feedback depends on the language proficiency of the reviewers and the clarity of evaluation criteria. Low-quality feedback may undermine its value.

2.2.3 Automated Feedback

With advancements in artificial intelligence, AWE feedback has become increasingly prevalent in writing instruction. Studies have shown that automated feedback systems can provide immediate correction suggestions, particularly in grammar, spelling, and syntactic structures (Fu et al., 2022). However, automated feedback is still limited in evaluating logical organization and content depth, making it difficult to fully replace human feedback (Liaqat et al., 2021).

2.3 Feedback Mechanism from the Perspective of Sociocultural Theory (SCT)

2.3.1 Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and Feedback

Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) theory (Vygotsky, 1978) suggests that learners can exceed their current cognitive abilities with external support (such as feedback), reaching higher developmental levels. Within this framework, different types of feedback play distinct roles within the ZPD. Teacher feedback serves as high-level guidance, pushing students toward the upper limits of their ZPD (Lantolf & Aljaafreh, 1995). Peer feedback facilitates collaborative learning, enabling learners to gradually approach the upper boundary of their ZPD through interactive communication (Bitchener & Storch, 2016). AWE feedback provides immediate, low-level language support, allowing students to acquire fundamental skills within their ZPD (Stevenson & Phakiti, 2019). The integration of different feedback types helps learners progressively develop their writing proficiency.

2.3.2 Scaffolding Theory and Feedback Models

Scaffolding Theory (Wood et al., 1976) highlights that learners can gradually develop autonomous learning abilities when provided with appropriate support. In the context of writing feedback, teachers, peers, and automated systems serve as different levels of scaffolding.

Teacher feedback primarily provides high-level cognitive support, such as guidance on writing logic and argumentation strategies, helping students comprehend complex writing techniques. Peer feedback functions as mid-level support, fostering students' self-revision abilities through interactive collaboration. Automated feedback offers low-level support, delivering instant corrections for linguistic accuracy, helping students reinforce basic writing skills. These different layers of feedback form a dynamic support system, ensuring that students receive appropriate guidance at different learning stages, thereby enhancing their writing abilities.

2.3.3 Interactive Learning and Feedback Exchanges

Sociocultural Theory (SCT) emphasizes that learning is a socially interactive process (Thorne & Lantolf, 2006), in which feedback plays a crucial role in facilitating cognitive processing and improving learning outcomes (Hyland & Hyland, 2019). In this context, peer feedback is particularly valuable, as it enhances learners' critical thinking skills and fosters their ability to revise independently. Furthermore, teacher feedback provides deeper cognitive processing guidance, helping students understand and apply more advanced writing strategies (Biber et al., 2011). With technological advancements, AWE feedback has increasingly become part of interactive learning, offering students instant, data-driven, and personalized feedback, further enriching the learning experience (Waer, 2023). Within this interactive framework, the effective integration of multiple feedback sources can maximize the effectiveness of writing instruction.

2.4 Hattie's Feedback Model (Hattie & Timperley, 2007) and Feedback Level Analysis

Hattie and Timperley (2007) proposed the feedback levels model, emphasizing that the effectiveness of feedback depends on the level it targets. The model consists of four levels: Task Level, Process Level, Self-regulation Level, and Self Level. These levels reflect the different roles of feedback in learners' cognitive development. Among them, the first three levels can directly promote learning progress, whereas Self Level feedback is generally

considered ineffective due to its lack of actionable guidance.

From the perspective of Sociocultural Theory (SCT), feedback is not merely an evaluation of learners' performance but a socially interactive process that facilitates cognitive development (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Writing proficiency does not develop in isolation but improves progressively through interactions with teachers, peers, and intelligent systems. Therefore, effective feedback should transition from lower-order feedback (focusing on surface-level errors) to higher-order feedback (promoting self-regulation) and provide scaffolding to help learners progress within their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) toward more advanced writing skills (Vygotsky, 1978). This progressive approach not only enhances feedback effectiveness but also ensures that learners can gradually internalize feedback strategies, making them an integral part of autonomous learning.

2.4.1 Functions and Progression Mechanism of Feedback Levels

Although Task Level feedback plays a crucial role in reducing writing errors, if feedback remains solely at this level, learners often struggle to develop holistic writing competence (Shute, 2008). In contrast, Process Level feedback helps learners focus on aspects such as writing logic, paragraph cohesion, and argument depth, thereby improving the overall coherence of their text (Hyland & Hyland, 2019).

Feedback Level	Main Function	Typical Feedback Mode	Function from the SCT Perspective (Internalization)
Task Level	Feed-up Understand writing objectives and task requirements	● AWE Basic structure check ● Teacher direct feedback Assessment criteria, Task requirements ● Peer collaboration Brainstorming	Scaffolding: External support within the ZPD at the stage of "Other-regulation"
Process Level	Feedback Focuses on writing logic, paragraph organization, argument structure, and improving textual coherence	● Teacher feedback Argument suggestions ● Peer feedback Multiple perspectives ● AWE feedback Structural adjustments	Co-construction: Facilitates knowledge development within the ZPD through interactive communication,
Self-regulation Level	Feed forward Enhances students' ability for self-revision and meta-cognitive awareness	● Teacher feedback Reflective prompts ● Peer feedback Experience sharing	Internalization: Flexibly apply feedback, transforming feedback into personal competence.
Self Level	Feed forward Focuses on writing confidence, motivation, emotional experience, and reducing writing anxiety	● Teacher feedback Encouragement ● Peer feedback Emotional support	Appropriation: Internalize feedback, developing an autonomous writing identity and fostering long-term writing development

Process-level feedback fosters greater interactivity. Research indicates that teacher feedback is more effective than AWE feedback in helping learners understand writing strategies, while peer feedback encourages multi-perspective thinking (Hoa & Lap, 2021). From the perspective of Sociocultural Theory (SCT), effective feedback is not just about teachers providing corrective suggestions; rather, it involves co-construction, where learners actively identify problems and generate solutions through interaction.

For example, during peer feedback, learners must comprehend their peers' arguments, negotiate, adjust, and reconstruct writing strategies through discussion. This process itself serves as a cognitive development mechanism. Therefore, teachers can design structured peer feedback tasks, such as analyzing model essays or comparing different argumentative strategies, to encourage students to construct a more comprehensive writing cognition framework through interaction. This not only enhances the effectiveness of feedback but also promotes knowledge sharing and intellectual engagement, leading to deeper improvements in writing skills.

However, the effectiveness of process-level feedback depends on whether learners can transform feedback into long-term writing strategies. This requires the intervention of self-regulation level feedback, which plays a crucial role in developing learners' metacognitive abilities, enabling them to monitor, evaluate, and adjust their writing strategies autonomously.

In the SCT framework, learners do not passively receive feedback. Instead, they gradually internalize external information through social interaction (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), ultimately achieving independent writing competence.

When teachers or peers guide students to identify weaknesses in their argumentation logic and propose targeted

revisions, this external regulation gradually transforms into learners' internal self-regulation. Over time, students no longer rely on external feedback but instead develop their own evaluation criteria and proactively revise and refine their writing. This shift indicates that feedback is not merely an instructional tool but an intrinsic mechanism driving cognitive development (Nassaji & Swain, 2000)

Hattie and Timperley (2007) argued that self-level feedback mainly involves general evaluations of learners' overall performance, such as *"You are smart"* or *"You did well."* They believe that such feedback lacks specificity and actionable guidance, making it ineffective in improving learners' writing skills. Instead, they emphasize task-level, process-level, and self-regulation-level feedback, which are more targeted and help learners refine their writing strategies.

However, some researchers disagree with this perspective. For instance, Dweck (2006) suggests that self-level feedback plays a vital role in boosting learners' confidence and motivation, particularly in language learning, where positive self-recognition influences learner engagement. Additionally, Lipnevich and Smith (2009) found that in certain cases, moderate self-level feedback (e.g., encouraging comments) can enhance learners' motivation, especially in high-anxiety learning environments.

Of course, ineffective self-level feedback fails to provide scaffolding, making it difficult for students to reach higher levels of competence. For example, a comment like *"You're smart, and your writing is good."* does not offer any concrete help for improvement. Effective self-level feedback, however, integrates elements of task, process, and self-regulation feedback, providing both emotional support and skill development. For instance, *"Your argumentation logic in this essay is clearer than last time, showing that you are thinking about how to make your ideas more accessible to the reader."* This type of feedback acknowledges specific progress while also boosting confidence.

In the integrated feedback model, teacher, peer, and AWE feedback progressively focus on task, process, and self-regulation levels, guiding learners from external feedback dependency to independent revision. This forms a structured skill development path, where learners gradually transition from relying on external input to autonomously monitoring and adjusting their writing.

This progressive framework not only enhances skill acquisition but also improves cognitive abilities while fostering learners' emotional engagement.

2.4.2 Feedback Optimization Strategies: Scaffolding Fading and Multimodal Feedback

From the perspective of SCT (sociocultural theory), feedback optimization should follow the principle of scaffolding fading. This principle emphasizes providing strong external support in the early stages of learning (such as detailed task-level feedback from teachers) and then gradually reducing intervention, allowing learners to independently apply feedback strategies.

Automation and Optimization of Task-Level Feedback: AWE feedback is highly efficient in grammar and spelling detection, which can reduce teachers' workload on lower-level feedback, allowing them to focus on higher-level feedback (Ajabshir & Ebadi, 2023).

Enhancing the Interactivity of Process-Level Feedback: Studies have shown that teacher feedback is more effective than AWE feedback in helping learners understand writing strategies, while peer feedback facilitates multi-perspective thinking (Tian & Zhou, 2020). Therefore, structured peer review tasks guided by teachers should be implemented to enhance the interactivity of process-level feedback.

Long-Term Development of Self-Regulation Feedback: Teachers can use prompting questions such as *"Does your argument have sufficient support?"* or *"Is your viewpoint clearly articulated?"* to encourage students to engage in self-reflection, gradually improving their self-regulation abilities.

Autonomous writing identity of Self-level feedback: feedback should reinforce learners' writing identity by acknowledging their progress and encouraging self-reflection. Instead of vague praise, effective feedback highlights specific improvements, such as writing clarity or argument structure, helping students see themselves as evolving writers. Encouraging self-assessment, like asking "What do you think improved the most in this essay?", fosters autonomy and motivation, making feedback a tool for long-term development rather than just evaluation.

2.5 Research Gaps

2.5.1 Limitations of Hattie's Feedback Model

Although Hattie's feedback levels model provides a clear framework for hierarchical writing feedback, it still has the following limitations, insufficient consideration of individual differences among feedback recipients. Different learners have varying abilities to receive and utilize feedback. Future research could explore personalized feedback strategies to better match students with different cognitive levels. Moreover, limited research on the adaptability of multimodal feedback is another aspect. With the advancement of AI technology, optimizing the integration of AWE feedback with teacher and peer feedback remains an area worth exploring.

2.5.2 Limitations of Existing Feedback Models

Although recent studies have attempted to integrate teacher, peer, and AWE feedback, existing integrated feedback models still have some shortcomings, some studies focus only on the combination of two feedback types without fully exploring the complementary role of all three (Demirel & Enginarlar, 2016; Zhang & Hyland, 2018). Some studies failed to establish a systematic feedback process, making it difficult for students to effectively utilize diverse feedback resources (Astrid et al., 2021).

2.6 Research Innovations

Building on existing feedback theories and research findings, this study proposes an Integrated Feedback Model, which incorporates teacher feedback, peer feedback, and AWE feedback while integrating Sociocultural Theory (SCT) and Hattie's feedback model to improve feedback effectiveness and operability. This study constructs a feedback integration framework, introduces a new feedback integration model, and optimizes the division and collaboration among different feedback methods. Additionally, the proposed feedback model is specifically tailored to the writing needs of vocational college students, refining the implementation strategies of the feedback model.

3. CONSTRUCTION OF THE INTEGRATED FEEDBACK MODEL

3.1 Process of the Integrated Feedback Model

This study, based on sociocultural theory (SCT) and Hattie's feedback model, constructs a multi-level, highly interactive integrated feedback model. This model centers on the synergistic effect of teacher, peer, and AWE feedback, integrating task-level feedback, process-level feedback, self-regulation-level feedback, and self-level feedback to form a comprehensive multi-stage feedback cycle. Additionally, it incorporates Hattie's Feed Up, Feedback, and Feed Forward principles to ensure that feedback not only helps students understand their current writing proficiency but also clarifies their writing goals and guides future improvements. This ultimately promotes students' writing ability, cognitive development, and emotional growth.

At the task level, the primary function of feedback is Feed Up, helping students clearly define their writing goals and task requirements. The key question at this stage is: "What goal am I trying to achieve?" Teachers provide detailed scoring criteria, exemplary essays, and writing templates to ensure that students are well-prepared before writing. Peer feedback, through brainstorming and discussions, helps students expand their writing ideas and establish an initial writing framework. Additionally, AWE feedback at this stage mainly functions as a language-checking tool, allowing students to use platforms such as Grammarly and ETS Criterion to check spelling and grammar to ensure basic linguistic accuracy. Teacher feedback in this phase is primarily direct, explicitly communicating writing requirements to minimize students' confusion and deviation from the task.

At the process level, the focus of feedback shifts to evaluating students' drafts, helping them identify issues and optimize text structure. The core questions here are: "How well am I writing? How can I improve my text?" Teacher feedback goes beyond language accuracy, emphasizing textual coherence, argumentation quality, and writing strategies. To encourage deeper thinking, teachers employ a combination of direct and indirect feedback, offering specific revision suggestions when necessary while guiding students to identify problems independently. Peer feedback is also crucial at this stage, as peer review allows students to examine their writing from different perspectives and strengthen their control over text coherence. Additionally, AWE feedback continues to be useful for checking language use and suggesting vocabulary and syntactic improvements, although its role in logical text

adjustments is limited. Therefore, process-level feedback primarily relies on teacher and peer engagement to enhance writing quality.

At the self-regulation level, feedback transitions to Feed Forward, guiding students to reflect on the feedback received, enhance their self-regulation skills, and independently improve future writing. The core question at this stage is: "How can I improve? How can I avoid the same mistakes in the future?" Teachers may require students to write reflection reports summarizing which feedback they applied, what uncertainties remain, and their next improvement strategies. Peers can share their feedback application experiences and discuss different revision methods to deepen their understanding of the writing process. AWE feedback can assist by providing additional writing optimization suggestions, helping students refine their writing style and expressions. The goal of this phase is for students to internalize feedback information and transform it into long-term writing competence rather than simply completing a single writing task.

Self-level feedback is not an independent stage but rather an emotional support mechanism throughout the writing process. It primarily focuses on students' writing motivation, emotional experiences, and confidence-building. Teachers can use encouraging evaluations and positive feedback to help students reduce writing anxiety and develop an interest in writing. For example, at the task level, teachers can emphasize that writing is not merely an assessment task but a process of expressing ideas, thereby reducing students' over-reliance on finding the "correct answer." At the process and self-regulation levels, teachers and peers can provide affirmative feedback, such as "Your argument is very original" or "This section is logically clear," to boost students' writing confidence. Additionally, teachers can encourage students to reflect on their progress in feedback application reports, fostering a sense of long-term writing development.

In summary, the integrated feedback model proposed in this study integrates teacher, peer, and AWE feedback through multi-level interactions, combining task-level, process-level, and self-regulation-level feedback in a progressive cycle. By incorporating Feed Up, Feedback, and Feed Forward, this model forms a complete feedback loop that enhances students' language accuracy, textual coherence, and argumentation quality while developing their self-regulation skills. Ultimately, this model enables students to actively apply their acquired knowledge in future writing practices and maintain long-term learning motivation.

3.2 Advantages of Integrated Feedback

Compared with single-source feedback, the integrated feedback model has advantages in comprehensiveness, interactivity, personalization, and sustainability, making it more adaptable and effective in writing instruction.

First, comprehensiveness is reflected in the multi-dimensional coverage of feedback. Single-source feedback is often limited to a particular aspect, whereas integrated feedback integrates the strengths of teacher, peer, and AWE feedback, providing comprehensive guidance from language accuracy to logical argumentation, from writing strategies to self-regulation skills (Zhang & Hyland, 2022). For instance, AWE feedback offers instant grammar correction, teacher feedback focuses on text structure and argumentation quality, and peer feedback fosters critical thinking and expression skills, collectively enhancing students' overall writing ability (Latifi et al., 2021; Zhang & Hyland, 2018).

Second, interactivity transforms feedback into a dynamic exchange process, preventing students from passively accepting and mechanically revising their work. Peer feedback encourages students to view their writing from a reader's perspective, teacher feedback provides in-depth guidance, and AWE feedback ensures immediate correction. This multi-directional interaction enhances students' understanding and application of feedback, reinforcing their writing reflection and revision strategies.

Additionally, personalized feedback meets the needs of students at different proficiency levels. Beginners may rely more on direct feedback (such as teacher-provided corrections), while advanced learners can benefit from indirect feedback (such as peer discussions and guiding questions) to develop independent thinking skills. Feedback methods can also be adjusted based on writing stages—structural suggestions during the drafting phase and language precision in the revision phase—to ensure targeted and effective feedback.

Finally, sustainability enables feedback to function as a long-term learning mechanism rather than a one-time revision task. Through pre-feedback AWE checks, teacher and peer guidance during feedback, and post-feedback reflection and adjustments, students gradually develop self-regulation skills, transitioning from "relying on

feedback" to "independent improvement" (Tian & Zhou, 2020). Moreover, integrated feedback enhances students' awareness of feedback utilization, helping them integrate suggestions from different sources for deeper understanding and long-term writing improvement.

In conclusion, the integrated feedback model not only integrates multiple advantages to provide systematic support but also fosters students' active thinking and long-term development, making it particularly suitable for learners with diverse writing proficiency levels by offering targeted improvement opportunities (Shi, 2021).

3.3 Potential Challenges

Despite its advantages, the integrated feedback model faces several challenges in practical teaching applications. Compared to traditional single-source feedback, integrated feedback requires teachers to invest more time and effort in designing feedback tasks, guiding peer feedback, and evaluating students' feedback application. Additionally, teachers must train students on how to provide effective peer feedback and monitor the accuracy of AWE feedback, which can be particularly challenging in large class settings.

Second, students' acceptance of different feedback types varies. Some students may rely heavily on teacher feedback while underestimating the value of peer and AWE feedback, reducing the overall effectiveness of the integrated feedback model (Cheng & Zhang, 2022). Additionally, when faced with conflicting feedback suggestions, students may struggle to determine which advice is most effective, potentially impacting the application of feedback. Therefore, instructional support is needed to help students integrate and apply various types of feedback effectively.

Finally, technological dependence is another challenge. AWE feedback relies on natural language processing and artificial intelligence, but existing systems still have limitations in semantic understanding, discourse structure analysis, and argumentation evaluation (Xu & Baharum, 2024). Over-reliance on AWE feedback may cause students to overlook its limitations, affecting their actual writing improvement (Wu, 2020).

3.4 Optimization Strategies

To ensure the effectiveness of the integrated feedback model, this study proposes four optimization strategies focused on feedback quality, feedback levels, feedback interactivity, and feedback sustainability.

Enhancing Feedback Quality: Teachers should ensure feedback is targeted and actionable, avoiding overly general corrections and instead focusing on key issues affecting writing quality, such as text logic, argument depth, and structural coherence. Providing model essays can help students better understand how to improve their writing.

Optimizing Feedback Levels: The study adopts a progressive feedback structure (task → process → self-regulation) to gradually enhance students' writing independence. Based on the scaffolding principle, teachers provide more guided feedback initially and gradually reduce external support, allowing students to develop independent revision strategies.

Improving Feedback Interactivity: Teachers should use guiding questions (e.g., "Does your argument address all counterpoints?") to encourage active thinking rather than passive acceptance. Group discussions and online feedback tools (e.g., Google Docs comments) can also enhance collaboration.

Ensuring Feedback Sustainability: Implementing multiple rounds of feedback (draft-revision-final submission) ensures long-term impact. Longitudinal tracking of students' progress can further evaluate the model's effectiveness.

By integrating SCT and Hattie's feedback model, this integrated feedback model offers a structured, multi-layered feedback system that enhances writing skills, self-regulation, and independent learning.

4. CONCLUSION

This study, grounded in Sociocultural Theory (SCT) and Hattie's feedback model, explores the application value of the integrated feedback model in English writing instruction. The findings indicate that integrtaed feedback, by

integrating teacher, peer, and AWE feedback, can effectively enhance students' writing abilities. Additionally, the study analyzes the advantages of integrated feedback, such as personalization, immediacy, and multidimensional support, as well as its application strategies in vocational college English writing instruction. However, the implementation of the integrated feedback model still faces challenges, including increased teacher workload, student acceptance, and reliance on technology. These challenges require optimization through well-designed instructional strategies and technical support.

4.1 Potential Contributions of the Model

The integrated feedback model proposed in this study offers significant contributions at both theoretical and practical levels. From a theoretical perspective, the model builds upon Sociocultural Theory (SCT) and Hattie's feedback model to construct a multi-level, highly interactive feedback system, providing a new perspective for research on feedback in writing instruction. It not only emphasizes the integration of teacher, peer, and AWE feedback but also employs a progressive structure consisting of Task-Level, Process-Level, and Self-Regulation Level feedback, ensuring the continuity and deepening of feedback effects, particularly in the development of self-regulation skills. Furthermore, the multi-stage feedback mechanism aligns with the concept of dynamic writing development, offering a highly operational framework for feedback research.

From a practical perspective, the model has broad applicability, especially in college English writing courses, academic writing training, and online writing platforms. In college English writing courses, teachers can use this model as a guiding framework, integrating it with classroom activities such as group discussions and peer review to make feedback more systematic and actionable. In academic writing training, this model helps students improve their argumentative skills, ensuring greater logical coherence and evidence-based reasoning in research papers and reports. Additionally, the model is well-suited for online writing platforms, including AI-assisted writing tools and MOOC courses. By integrating automated AWE feedback with interpersonal interactive feedback, the model enhances the personalization and accuracy of feedback in large-scale online courses, ultimately improving learners' writing proficiency.

Overall, the integrated feedback model not only addresses the limitations of existing feedback models in terms of interactivity and self-regulation development but also significantly enhances students' writing quality and independent learning abilities.

4.2 Future Research Directions

In future teaching practices, the integrated feedback model can be further integrated with Learning Analytics to analyze students' feedback utilization patterns through big data, exploring data-driven feedback optimization strategies to improve adaptability and personalization. For instance, automated data mining techniques can be employed to identify the types of feedback that students find most accessible and applicable, thereby refining feedback design.

Moreover, improving students' feedback uptake remains an essential area for further research. Future studies can design various feedback application tasks and employ experimental research methods to assess their impact on students' writing skills. Additionally, the development of the integrated feedback model can leverage Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Adaptive Learning technologies to create more intelligent and personalized writing feedback systems that cater to students at different proficiency levels.

In summary, while the integrated feedback model holds great potential for English writing instruction, further advancements in theoretical refinement, practical optimization, and technological integration are necessary. Continued research and innovation will ensure that this model adapts to diverse teaching environments, fostering its ongoing development and application in English writing education.

REFERENCES

[1] Ajabshir, Z. F., & Ebadi, S. (2023). The effects of automatic writing evaluation and teacher-focused feedback on CALF measures and overall quality of L2 writing across different genres. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *8*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-023-00201-9

[2] Astrid, A., Rukmini, D., Fitriati, S. W., & Syafryadin. (2021). Experiencing the Peer Feedback Activities with Teacher's Intervention through Face-to-Face and Asynchronous Online Interaction: The Impact on

Students' Writing Development and Perceptions. *Journal of Language and Education, 7*(2), 64–77. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2021.10585
[3] Biber, D., Nekrasova, T., & Horn, B. (2011). THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FEEDBACK FOR L1-ENGLISH AND L2-WRITING DEVELOPMENT: A META-ANALYSIS. *ETS Research Report Series, 2011*(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2333-8504.2011.tb02241.x
[4] Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development* (Vol. 96). Multilingual Matters. https://books.google.com/books?hl=zh-CN&lr=&id=ewKkCwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT7&dq=Written+corrective+feedback+for+L2+development&ots=MhxHt2UqWw&sig=XgLMvKTfNs3RHQd7PxbwpnQcrLg
[5] Cheng, X., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). Teachers Helping EFL Students Improve Their Writing Through Written Feedback: The Case of Native and Non-native English-Speaking Teachers' Beliefs. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 804313. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.804313
[6] Demirel, E., & Enginarlar, H. (2016). Effects of combined peer-teacher feedback on second language writing development. 31, 4, 657–675.
[7] Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random house.
[8] Fu, Q.-K., Zou, D., Xie, H., & Cheng, G. (2022). A review of AWE feedback: Types, learning outcomes, and implications. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2033787
[9] Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.002
[10] Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487
[11] Hoa, N. T. N., & Lap, T. Q. (2021). INVESTIGATING THE IMPACT OF PEER FEEDBACK AND TEACHER FEEDBACK USING GOOGLE DOCS ON EFL STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE. *European Journal of Education Studies, 8*(10). https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v8i10.3926
[12] Lam, S. T. E. (2021). A web-based feedback platform for peer and teacher feedback on writing: An Activity Theory perspective. *Computers and Composition, 62*, 102666.
[13] Lantolf, J. P., & Aljaafreh, A. (1995). Second language learning in the zone of proximal development: A revolutionary experience. *International Journal of Educational Research, 23*(7), 619–632.
[14] Latifi, S., Noroozi, O., Hatami, J., & Biemans, H. J. A. (2021). How does online peer feedback improve argumentative essay writing and learning? *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 58*(2), 195–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2019.1687005
[15] Liaqat, A., Munteanu, C., & Demmans Epp, C. (2021). Collaborating with Mature English Language Learners to Combine Peer and Automated Feedback: A User-Centered Approach to Designing Writing Support. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 31*(4), 638–679. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-020-00204-4
[16] Lipnevich, A. A., & Smith, J. K. (2009). Effects of differential feedback on students' examination performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 15*(4), 319.
[17] Luo, Y., & Liu, Y. (2017). Comparison between peer feedback and automated feedback in college English writing: A case study. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 7*(4), 197–215.
[18] Mandouit, L., & Hattie, J. (2023). Revisiting "The Power of Feedback" from the perspective of the learner. *Learning and Instruction, 84*, 101718. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2022.101718
[19] Mirzaii, M., & Aliabadi, R. B. (2013). Direct and indirect written corrective feedback in the context of genre-based instruction on job application letter writing. *Journal of Writing Research, 5*(2), 191–213.
[20] Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian Perspective on Corrective Feedback in L2: The Effect of Random Versus Negotiated Help on the Learning of English Articles. *Language Awareness, 9*(1), 34–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410008667135
[21] Negahi, M., G. Shooshtari, Z., & Vahdat, S. (2022). Investigating the Impact of Unfocused Direct and indirect Written Corrective Feedback on Writing Accuracy of Iranian EFL Learners. *Two Quarterly Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning University of Tabriz, 14*(30), 180–193. https://doi.org/10.22034/elt.2022.51922.2492
[22] Ng, L. L., & Ishak, S. N. A. (2018). Instructor's Direct and Indirect Feedback: How do they Impact Learners' Written Performance? *3L The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 24*(3), 95–110. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2403-08
[23] Noroozi, O., Kirschner, P. A., Biemans, H. J. A., & Mulder, M. (2018). Promoting Argumentation Competence: Extending from First- to Second-Order Scaffolding Through Adaptive Fading. *Educational Psychology Review, 30*(1), 153–176. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-017-9400-z

[24] Sheen, Y. (2007). The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(2), 255–283. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x
[25] Shi, Y. (2021). Exploring Learner Engagement With Multiple Sources of Feedback on L2 Writing Across Genres. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 758867. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.758867
[26] Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on Formative Feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(1), 153–189. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795
[27] Stevenson, M., & Phakiti, A. (2019). Automated feedback and second language writing. *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*, 125–142.
[28] Suzuki, W., Nassaji, H., & Sato, K. (2019). The effects of feedback explicitness and type of target structure on accuracy in revision and new pieces of writing. *System, 81*, 135–145.
[29] Tai, H.-C., Lin, W.-C., & Yang, S. C. (2015). Exploring the effects of peer review and teachers' corrective feedback on EFL students' online writing performance. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 53*(2), 284–309.
[30] Thirakunkovit, S., & Chamcharatsri, B. (2019). A meta-analysis of effectiveness of teacher and peer feedback: Implications for writing instructions and research. *Asian EFL Journal, 21*(1), 140–170.
[31] Thorne, S. L., & Lantolf, J. P. (2006). Chapter 7. A Linguistics of Communicative Activity. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 170–195). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599255-009
[32] Tian, L., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Learner engagement with automated feedback, peer feedback and teacher feedback in an online EFL writing context. *System, 91*, 102247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102247
[33] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (Vol. 86). Harvard University Press.
[34] Waer, H. (2023). The effect of integrating automated writing evaluation on EFL writing apprehension and grammatical knowledge. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 17*(1), 47–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1914062
[35] Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*(2), 89–100.
[36] Wu, L. (2020). Application analysis of Iwrite platform in English writing teaching in higher vocational education. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1629*(1), 012100.
[37] Xu, X., & Baharum, H. I. B. (2024). IWrite System Blended Teaching: A Meta-Analysis of its Impact on College Students' English Writing Ability. *Journal of Ecohumanism, 3*(7), 1616–1634.
[38] Yu, R., & Yang, L. (2021). ESL/EFL Learners' Responses to Teacher Written Feedback: Reviewing a Recent Decade of Empirical Studies. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 735101. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.735101
[39] Zhang, Z., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing, 36*, 90–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004
[40] Zhang, Z., & Hyland, K. (2022). Fostering student engagement with feedback: An integrated approach. *Assessing Writing, 51*, 100586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100586