



Chinese international students' identity (re)construction mediated by teacher feedback: Through the lens of academic discourse socialisation



Fangfei Li ^a, Ye Han ^{b,*}

^a School of Languages and Cultures, Shanghai University of Political Science and Law, Shanghai, China

^b School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Harbin Institute of Technology (Shenzhen), Shenzhen, China

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Academic discourse socialisation
International student
Teacher feedback
Identity
Investment

ABSTRACT

While feedback has been found to serve multiple functions, how feedback socialises master's students into the academic discourse community remains under-investigated. The current study aims to enrich this discussion by focusing on the self-reported, feedback-related experiences of two Chinese MA TESOL students at a UK university. Multiple-sourced data were analysed to investigate (a) the identity categories into which teacher feedback (written and oral) attempted to socialise the focal students; (b) if positioned into undesirable identity categories, how the students reacted to such challenges; and (c) how their reactions to identity challenges affected their investment in feedback-related academic literacy practice. Teacher feedback was found to socialise the students into three identity categories with differential legitimacy in the academic discourse communities. Both students encountered identity challenges, which prompted them to reconfigure power relations, claim more powerful identities, and adjust investment in feedback-related academic literacy practice accordingly. However, they took different approaches to reframing power relations, and their reconstructed identities also differed in terms of congruence. The findings call for more research on the sociocultural and sociopolitical dimension of teacher and student feedback literacy, and suggest the necessity for teachers to provide identity-empowering feedback to facilitate students' academic discourse socialisation.

1. Introduction

As feedback research has shifted its paradigm from a one-way knowledge transmission model focusing on learners' linguistic or cognitive outcomes (e.g., [Butler & Winne, 1995](#)) to two-way teacher-student social construction (e.g., [Boud & Molloy, 2013](#); [Handley, Price, & Millar, 2011](#)), feedback has been theorised from a wider range of conceptual perspectives, including academic discourse socialisation ([Duff, 2010](#)). From this perspective, teacher feedback not only offers students access to norms, rules, ideologies, and practices of a new academic culture ([Elliot & Kobayashi, 2019](#); [K. Hyland, 2013](#)), but simultaneously socialises students into a range of identity categories ([Bronson, 2004](#); [Eraut, 2006](#)) that may influence their short-term and long-term involvement in academic literacy practice ([Séror, 2008](#)).

* Corresponding author. Building T2, Room 715D, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Harbin Institute of Technology (Shenzhen), University Town, Xili, Nanshan District, Shenzhen, Guangdong Province, 518055, China.

E-mail addresses: lifangfei@shupl.edu.cn (F. Li), hanye@hit.edu.cn (Y. Han).

Viewing feedback experiences as part of an academic discourse socialisation process is highly relevant to feedback on academic writing in degree programmes, for its compatibility with academic literacy research in conceiving academic discourse, including writing practice and interactions around writing (e.g., [Anderson, 2017](#)), as socioculturally and sociopolitically situated in nature ([Coffin & Donohue, 2012](#)). Furthermore, feedback as an academic discourse socialisation tool becomes even more prominent in the study-abroad context, where international students, often English as additional language (EAL) novice writers new to the country and to the host culture, probably encounter more difficulties in seeking membership to the host discourse community. They have been found to struggle with navigating feedback and experimenting with, embracing, and resisting new identities ([Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003](#)) imposed on or implicitly expected from them ([Benson, Barkhuizen, Bodycott, & Brown, 2012](#); [Y. Li, 2021](#)).

Notably, previous academic discourse socialisation research investigating international students' feedback experiences focused mostly on undergraduate or doctoral students (e.g., [Anderson, 2017](#); [Séror, 2008](#)), rendering master's students relatively underexplored. However, master's students, most of whom are taught postgraduate students (243,460 students, 40.2% of international higher education students in the UK in 2021, [Higher Education Student Agency, 2022](#)), constitute a major proportion of international students pursuing degrees in the UK. Looking into how the feedback experiences of international master's students interact with their identity construction through the lens of academic discourse socialisation thus not only allows for a detailed account of their complex identity construction process, but also reveals how feedback empowers (or disempowers) individual students' identity construction and their investment ([Norton, 2013](#)) in academic literacy. This line of research also helps to heighten local teachers' awareness of EAL post-graduate students' literacy challenges, and suggests possible avenues for enhancing the feedback process, which in turn facilitates EAL students' academic discourse socialisation.

To address this research gap, this paper reports on a multiple-case study on the feedback-mediated academic discourse socialisation experience of two Chinese EAL postgraduate students at a UK university, particularly into which identity categories that they believed teacher written and oral feedback had positioned them, and how they (re)constructed identities through reacting to teacher feedback, when assigned to undesirable identity categories.

2. Feedback and identity through the lens of academic discourse socialisation

Academic discourse socialisation refers to the process in which novices gain competence, confidence, and legitimate membership to engage with the host academic community ([Duff, 2010](#)). This theoretical stance a) highlights the critical role of old-timers or experts in supporting new-arrivals, who need to adjust their 'think[ing], feel[ing], and act[ing] in accordance with the values, ideologies, and traditions of the group' ([Duff, 2007, p. 311](#)); and b) recognises the complexity and non-linearity of socialisation ([Duff et al., 2013](#)).

From this perspective, feedback on students' writing is conceived as socialising individual students to norms, ways of knowing, and the social and cultural practices well-received in the host discourse community ([Elliot & Kobayashi, 2019](#)), as well as to a range of identity categories with different degrees of legitimacy as new members ([Anderson, 2021](#)). Empirical research has found that teacher feedback can mediate students' egos ([Sutton & Gill, 2010](#)) and their identities through invoking their emotions ([Olave-Encina, Moni, & Renshaw, 2021](#)). Moreover, when students enter higher education, their professional identities are not only shaped by the specific feedback they receive ([Eraut, 2006](#)), but are also deeply embedded in layers of different feedback contexts that interact with one another ([Chong, 2021](#); [Han, 2019](#); [Li & Han, 2022](#)).

Like any socialisation process and identity construction process, feedback-mediated academic discourse socialisation is far from smooth and linear, especially in the study-abroad context (e.g., [Duff, 2010](#); [Séror, 2008](#)). While there are successful cases who receive encouragement from the supervisor, seize the opportunity to develop academic literacy, or construct self-identity as legitimate members of the academic community ([Anderson, 2017](#)), other students may have much less positive experiences. In a Canadian university, [Séror \(2008\)](#) found that undergraduate students from Japan repeatedly received teacher feedback that fixated on linguistic issues and offered unrealistic solutions. Such feedback ignored the students' keen anticipation for participating in content-based, intellectually intriguing conversations. It also socialised them into the beliefs that a) linguistic forms override content and idea in academic writing in the host institution, b) L2 users of English are unlikely to write as proficient as the L1 users, and c) they could and should improve their L2 writing abilities outside content courses simply by taking more time to practice. Although native speakerism and linguistic imperialism have been problematised and criticised (e.g., [Kumaravadivelu, 2016](#)), this tendency to marginalise the intellectual contribution of L2 users of English and pay disproportionate attention to linguistic quality of L2 output has not fundamentally changed ([Phillipson, 2018](#)). If imbued with the native-speakerism, feedback may widen the gap between new and established members and reinforces students' positions as peripheral members of the academic discourse community.

Further complexifying the relationship between feedback and identity construction is the issue of learner agency. Students are not *tabula-rasa* ready to accept all teacher feedback, but are agentic beings with different levels of feedback literacy (i.e., understanding, capacities, and dispositions necessary to make sense of feedback and enhance learning, [Carless & Boud, 2018](#); [Niemenen & Carless, 2022](#)). Informed by their prior knowledge and driven by their own goals (S. [Yu & Liu, 2021](#)), students are in constant search of new social and linguistic resources to reconstruct self-identities ([Cheng, 2013](#); [Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004](#)) in feedback contexts. For instance, the case of a Chinese doctoral student in Australia, Xiaoli, documented in [Wang and Parr's \(2021\)](#) study suggests that EAL students often strive to reconcile between what they intend to write (i.e., often a manifestation of their identity as an autonomous writer and a legitimate academic) and what they are expected to write (as conveyed in teacher instruction and feedback), rather than uncritically adhering to their teachers' input. However, since students' sense of agency and ownership differ, to what extent one can reconfigure teacher-student power relation through agentic actions (e.g., initiating and engaging with teacher-student discussion and debate, [Wang & Parr, 2021](#)), as well as to what extent one can balance between one's desired identity and the assigned or imposed identity, also tend to vary, which points to the need for more studies to capture and understand this complexity.

3. International students' identity and investment in academic literacy practice

Academic discourse socialisation as a theoretical lens has much relevance to international postgraduate students relocating to Anglophone countries. Most of them are EAL users new to the host country and the host academic culture (Elliot & Kobayashi, 2019), and very often, new to a disciplinary community (Li, Hyland, & Hu, 2017). While linguistic and academic communities enable so-journers to explore, transform, and construct identities, as newcomers in multiple senses, they are often placed in a less powerful position (Cheng, 2013), confronting greater barriers (Aitchison, Catterall, Ross, & Burgin, 2012) than their L1 counterparts in gaining legitimate membership. More importantly, deep-seated unequal power relations in the communities (e.g., how much one has the social capital accepted by a community) may not be easily reframed, which in turn restricts international students' identity construction and their investment in language learning practice (Peng & Patterson, 2022).

As this intricate relationship between identity, investment, power, and academic discourse community has been recognised (Duff, 2010), any discussion of international students' academic discourse socialisation and identity construction cannot overlook the notion of investment (Norton Peirce, 1995). Investment, as a sociological complement to motivation, is commensurate with language learners' desires, commitment and the effort expended on L2 learning and related community practices (Norton Peirce, 1995). Hence, learners often invest in specific language and literacy practice in expectation of greater material and symbolic resources that enhance the exchange value of their cultural capital (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977) and thus social power (Norton, 2013) in particular contexts with which language learners intend to engage. In turn, investment (or lack thereof) is the way through which individual learners constantly figure out their identities (i.e., who one is) and their positions (e.g., how one relates to the group and the world) (*ibid.*). A learner can be highly motivated to learn a language, but may have little investment (and even resist participating) in the language practices of a given community if he or she felt marginalised or illegitimatised (Norton & Toohey, 2001).

By extension, international students may withdraw their investment in academic literacy practice, if they are disempowered by the feedback yielding limited return on tangible and/or intangible cultural capitals (and by implication, social power), such as reduced ownership of their writing, low grades, impoverished opportunities for career development, and illegitimate membership to the target academic discourse community. However, only a few empirical studies have explored the potential of academic discourse socialisation in illuminating international students' identity construction and investment in feedback-mediated academic literacy practice (e.g., Anderson, 2017, 2021; Séror, 2008).

In addition to the overall paucity of research along this line of inquiry, even less attention has been allocated to master's students. Compared to undergraduate students, postgraduate students are mandated to develop 'advanced academic literacy' that privileges knowledge transformation (critical argumentation) over knowledge telling (review of reading) (Salter-Dvorak, 2019). However, master's students are less advantaged than doctoral students, due to their less exposure to academic research literature and less experience communicating with academics (Y. Li et al., 2017). The situation becomes more complex for EAL master's students who, despite fulfilling the standardised English language proficiency test requirements, still confront the dual-challenge of language barriers and unprofessionalism in disciplinary academic writing (Salter-Dvorak, 2019).

Bringing the aforementioned research together, we argue that the academic discourse socialisation perspective on feedback can offer new insights to the complexity in international students' identity construction. This framework highlights the impact of feedback on students' investment in academic literacy, and thus on their trajectories toward legitimate membership of the target discourse community; this perspective also conceives students' use of feedback as an agentic process of (re-)negotiating identity, making (or reducing, even withdrawing) investment, and reconfiguring power relations (e.g., Wang & Parr, 2021). However, except for a few pioneering studies (e.g., Anderson, 2017; Bronson, 2004; Séror, 2008), little research has taken the academic discourse socialisation approach to understanding students' feedback experiences in relation to their evolving identities, especially if the students are new to the discipline, to the academic community, as well as to the host country. To address these issues, the current study investigated the feedback experiences of two Chinese master's students in the UK academic community through the lens of academic discourse socialisation, more specifically, as to how their feedback experiences interact with their identity construction and investment in academic literacies. The study was guided by three research questions:

- 1) What identity categories do the focal students perceive teacher feedback places them into?
- 2) How do the students address the identity challenges, if any, brought about by teacher feedback?
- 3) How do the students' strategies to address identity challenges embedded in teacher feedback affect their investment in academic literacy practice?

4. Methodology

4.1. Context and participants

The current study took place in an MA TESOL (taught) programme at a UK university, where international postgraduate students who had not yet met the university's English language requirements (overall score of 7 and no less than 6.5 in any sub-test) were required to attend a five-week pre-sessional language programme prior to their master's studies. In the pre-sessional language programme, they received feedback from a writing course tutor on multiple drafts of an essay. In the first term of the MA programme, they took four courses and completed five end-of-term essays. Table 1 presents the writing tasks and arrangement of feedback.

The end-of-term papers were graded by five course tutors (Tutor A to E), all of whom had doctorates and three to fifteen years' tertiary-level teaching experience. Three of the five tutors were native speakers of English, and others were advanced EAL users

originally from non-English speaking countries. When assigning papers, they informed students that written and oral feedback throughout topic selection, paper outlines, to full drafts could be obtained at Q&A sessions and tutorials, or by email.

The first author approached 76 international students enrolled in the MA TESOL (taught) programme. Six of these students agreed to voluntarily participate after understanding the research aim and procedures. After an informal interview to understand their prior experience with feedback in EAP writing, two Chinese students, Chloe and Sue, were purposively selected and invited to participate because of (a) their minimal prior experience with feedback on English academic writing, (b) their relatively greater exposure to teacher feedback in the UK than those who did not attend the pre-sessional language programme, and (c) their willingness to participate. Although both students held a bachelor's degree in English-related disciplines, they had marginal subject knowledge of applied linguistics or TESOL. Neither had study-abroad experience nor teaching experience before MA studies. The perceived mid- or high-achieving performance of the students were drawn from the evidence of their marks in the MA programme. [Table 2](#) presents profiles of the focal students.

4.2. Data collection

Following previous research tapping into the relationship between feedback and socialisation (e.g., [Anderson, 2017, 2021](#); [Séror, 1998](#)), the current study took a case study approach, which allows for a detailed, contextualised understanding of two focal students' feedback experiences in the UK academic community in relation to their investment into academic literacy practice and their discursive constructions of identities ([Duff, 2014](#)). The two cases help to exemplify the phenomenon regarding the identity challenges that EAL students may encounter when dealing with teacher feedback in a host academic community and the agency they exert in reconstructing identities. Before data collection, ethics approval had been obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of the university. We conducted semi-structured background interviews, retrospective interviews, and stimulated recall sessions to gain an emic perspective on participants' lived feedback experiences in relation to their identity (re)construction. Inspired by [Bronson's \(2004\)](#) study, in addition to asking participants to recall and reflect on their overall feedback experiences, we invited them to elaborate on the important 'moments' or 'incidents' related to feedback that prompted them to perceive feedback, the teacher, and themselves in a different way. All interviews and recall sessions were on a one-on-one basis, audio-recorded, and conducted in Mandarin Chinese, the participants' first language. The recordings were transcribed verbatim before data analysis. [Table 3](#) presents the schedule of interviews and recall sessions.

In addition, written texts, including student writing and tutors' written feedback, were obtained during interviews with the approval of the participants. Since the written texts were provided by the participants voluntarily, we did not have access to all the written feedback mentioned in interviews. However, the five feedback reports of MA course papers, which generated the large proportion of textual data excerpts relevant to the current inquiry, were well-archived. This bulk of data served as prompts in recall sessions and interviews, enriched our understanding of the contexts, and facilitated the case narratives. They also allowed for triangulating findings that had emerged from the self-reported data.

4.3. Data analysis

The data were first compiled by cases before content analysis ([Patton, 2002](#)). Since the study focused mainly on students' self-reported experience, rather than an etic account of feedback provision and feedback-elicited revision, the data analysis began with a repeated reading of the interviews and recall transcripts to identify each participant's critical feedback experiences, i.e., the feedback-related experiences that they considered to imprint their memory, activate their emotions, and shape their self-perceptions over the research period. Informed by [Patton's \(2002\)](#) content analysis approach, we firstly open-coded the data excerpts that could inform each RQ, assigned initial labels, and then recursively revised the codes and categories through (a) carefully scrutinising the fit between data excerpts and codes, (b) constantly comparing between codes, between categories, and between cases, (c) consulting literature.

To enhance the trustworthiness of the coding and establish a more contextualised understanding of the students' experiences with

Table 1
Academic writing tasks and feedback arrangements.

Pre-sessional language programme (five weeks)	
Assignment	Feedback
1. A 2000-word essay on an education-related topic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formative comments on the essay outline, the first and the final draft; - Feedback on content, structure, referencing conventions, and language
MA TESOL programme (a 12-week term)	
Assignment	Feedback
Five end-of-term essays (2000 to 5000 words) on the subjects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Optional, upon students' request: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Course tutors' oral feedback in Q & A sessions; - Tutorials with course tutors; - Tutors' email responses to essay enquiries; (2) Mandatory: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An individualised feedback report on each submitted assignment, including a grade and comments
1. Second Language Acquisition	
2. English Teaching Methodology	
3. Research Methods	
4. Language Awareness - Literature review	
5. Language Awareness – Spoken discourse analysis	

Table 2

Participants' profile.

Pseudo-nym	Age	Sex	IELTS writing score	Degree obtained in the home country	Performance in MA TESOL programme
Chloe	25	F	6.5	B.A. in English-Chinese translation	Mid-achieving
Sue	24	F	6.0	B.A. in English literature	High-achieving

Table 3

Schedule of interviews and recall sessions.

	Schedule	Interview type	Interview duration
Pre-sessional language programme (PS)	Week 1 Beginning of the programme	Background interview (BI – I)	15–20 min
	Week 3 Teacher feedback on outlines	Stimulated recall (SR – II)	25–37 min
	Week 5 Final draft of the 2000-word essay submitted; teacher feedback on the finalised essay distributed	Stimulated recall (SR – III)	30–55 min
	Week 4 Course essay topics assigned in Q & A sessions; Teachers' suggestions at the pre-writing stage	Retrospective interview (RI – I)	17–58 min
MA TESOL programme (MA)	Week 8 First drafts of all course essays submitted	Retrospective interview (RI – II)	22–40 min
	Week 10 Final drafts of all course essays submitted	Retrospective interview (RI – III)	24–45 min
	Week 12 Teacher feedback reports on course essays distributed	Stimulated recall (SR – IV)	35–60 min

feedback, 28 excerpts of teacher feedback and student writing, which were mentioned in the participants' self-reported data, were identified and cross-referenced to the transcripts. To understand the characteristics of these feedback excerpts, [Anderson's \(2021\)](#) feedback categorisation was adapted to establish a coding scheme of the textual data, according to the feedback focus and the criteria of empowering feedback (see Appendices). The self-reported data excerpts and the cross-linked written feedback excerpts were compared to triangulate the students' perceived identity categories indexed in the feedback. After the codes and categories were finalised, we developed detailed case narratives. [Table 4](#) presents examples of initial codes, categories established, and example narrative excerpts, to address each research question.

To enhance the validity of data analysis, the second author was invited to code all the data, reaching 80% initial inter-coder

Table 4

Examples of initial codes and established categories.

RQ	Examples of initial codes	Categories	Examples
RQ1	Appreciated feedback acknowledging intellectuality of the text;	(1) An illegitimate EAL writer with limited right to make her voice heard because of her linguistic inaccuracy;	e.g., Tutor A's feedback on Chloe's and Sue's Task 1
	Irritated and upset by the feedback overemphasising language deficit;	(2) A peripheral EAL writer who ought to figure out the linguistic intricacies with minimal teacher support;	e.g., The pre-sessional EAP teacher's feedback on Sue's writing assignment
	Bewildered by feedback that pointed out language intricacies but lacked explicit explanation	(3) An emerging EAL writer with potential to make intellectual contribution	e.g., Tutor B's feedback on Chloe's Task 2
RQ2	'cannot agree', 'convinced', 'long way to go', foregrounding L2 user identity, triangulating feedback, etc.	Overarching strategy to address identity challenge (category): claiming a more powerful identity	e.g., Sue acknowledged the value of teacher feedback in informing her how far she was from being a competent L2 writer
		(1) Accepting the temporarily less powerful position but aiming for an empowered one	e.g., resisting Tutor A's exceedingly high expectations of linguistic accuracy either by (a) highlighting one's own NNS status (Chloe); and (b) drawing upon positive comments from other tutors (Sue)
RQ3	Approaching teachers to negotiate meaning;	(2) Resisting the disadvantaged position through reconfiguring teacher-student power relation	e.g., Chloe's decision to outsource the editing work
	Seeking proofreading help;		e.g., Sue's frequent proactive negotiation with teachers to justify her writing-related decisions
	Discarding feedback	(1) Superficial and short-circuited investment	
		(2) Sustaining, long-term investment	

agreement and later greater than 95% after discussion. Finally, these categories and data were reviewed again to check if all data had been mapped to the cases or if any new category might emerge.

5. Findings

This section presents two case narratives of the focal students' feedback experiences that had a bearing on their identity reconstruction.

5.1. Chloe: making contrasting investment in academic literacy as positioned differently by teacher feedback

The grades on her pre-sessional project and her MA assignments showed that Chloe was a medium-achieving learner in the programme. She reported that the feedback which struck her most was on two writing tasks of the course *Language Awareness*, provided by two different local teachers, Tutor A and Tutor B. Although both assignments received low grades (58 points and 56 points, respectively), the feedback reports from two tutors contrasted with each other and elicited different reactions from Chloe. Fig. 1 shows Tutor A's feedback report.

Fig. 1 revealed that, despite some comments on rhetorical issues (*i.e.*, organisation, content, and argument), the tutor paid disproportionately greater attention to linguistic issues (*i.e.*, grammar, citations, and mechanics) (L. Yu, 2020). His lengthiest comment was on 'presentation', especially linguistic accuracy; and his comments on grammatical and citation problems even spilt over into the 'content' and 'structure' sections. Admittedly, one may argue that Chloe's language errors might have been so prevalent that the tutor had to prioritise these errors over content issues; but if this had been the case, the tutor could have provided more elaborate feedback to indicate which and how linguistic errors had caused confusion. However, the specific linguistic errors exemplified in the written feedback barely interfered with comprehension.

This contrast between the emphasis on trivial linguistic errors and the intimidating, negative comment on the severity of these

Marker's Comments (including strengths, improvement areas and corrective advice)	
Overall	In this assignment you make a good effort to apply Reader Response Theory to the analysis of the short story.
Content	You use too many direct quotations from the source text.
Structure	Overall, the assignment is clearly structured. The problems are more at the sentence level, <i>i.e.</i> syntactical.
Presentation	There are quite a lot of English language errors' These sometimes make it difficult for the reader to follow your argument. Some errors, such as spelling mistakes (<i>e.g.</i> 'truely', <i>sic</i>) could easily have been avoided. The heading 'References' # should be plural. You list several of them.
Analysis	You make a number of useful observations on the source text. You also finish with a series of viable applications for the EFL classroom.
Use of sources	You cite a range of appropriate literature.
Provisional grade	58

Fig. 1. Tutor A's feedback report on Chloe's *Language Awareness* task 1.

errors ('quite a lot of English language errors ... difficult ... to follow'), as well as the contrast between the overall low grade (58 out of 100) and a lack of well-justified, meaning-centred, content-based feedback, prompted Chloe's strong disagreement over and resistance to the tutor's evaluation.

'The tutor said that there are quite a lot of language errors. I don't think there are a lot. He said the reader can't understand my essay. I don't think my written language was as bad as he said. He gave me such a low grade but did not point out where was not good. This is what I can't accept.'

(Chloe, MA, SR-IV)

More importantly, Chloe's disagreement and resistance was also influenced by her long-held beliefs about academic writing under

Marker's Comments

(Including strengths, areas for improvement and corrective advice)

Overall

A depth of awareness of the subject matter is apparent, and adequate breadth of coverage is provided within the limitations of the task. While some aspects should have been more carefully considered, in general the assignment shows at least some insight, materials are fairly well controlled, and claims are well argued and supported.

Content

The identification of the Chinese contextual preference for inner circle varieties of English, namely British and American English, is good, with a clear plan laid out for the development of the argument in order to clarify a gradual acceptance of Chinese English. However, while the discussions logically develop the argument, it's not clear how this all links to the acceptance of Chinese English, which appears to be based on a few claims from new literature. Indeed, the development of the argument does everything to challenge this conclusion, rather than support it.

Structure

Arguments are developed logically, but there is a disconnect between the overarching themes of prejudices against and more recent acceptance of a legitimate Chinese variety of English. No conclusion is provided so it's unclear how these arguments were intended to develop within a single conceptual framework.

Presentation

The writing and presentation of ideas are of a good standard. No errors impede reader comprehension. Please do note appropriate font size (12) for assignments.

Analysis

Some claims are unsubstantiated, bringing down the strength of the argument. The problem begins at the start, with some generalizations attributed to a very out-dated source. Otherwise, the line of argumentation is clear and generally well supported, putting a great deal of emphasis on clarifying the prejudices that favour British and American English in China. There is then a jump from that line of argumentation to a seemingly new one that Chinese English "has come into public recognition" (rather vague, not sure what this really means). The argument seems to be that since there is academic discussion of Chinese English as a legitimate variety, this means it is accepted. But this is a leap in logic, relying on Kirkpatrick and Xu for the only claim of acceptance, rather than explaining *how* it is accepted. Certainly it is agreeable that the status of Chinglish is improving in China, but you needed to clarify how and why, and if, in your context, it is having an actual impact on curriculum and pedagogical practices.

Use of sources

The wide range of sources gives a good impression in the long reference list, but the use of sources is sometimes superficial, lacking a depth of familiarity with the content. Be very cautious of the selection of sources, particularly the age and prominence of empirical research found in academic journals. I think you'll find ideas have evolved a great deal since Gorlach (1988). Regional varieties of English aren't usually described as "easier regionally recognized and implemented standard"...

Provisional grade

56

Fig. 2. Tutor B's feedback report on Chloe's *Language Awareness Task 2*.

the ELF framework (MacKenzie, 2015) and her self-perceived, expected legitimacy in making intellectual contribution to the academic discourse community.

'I was thinking, as long as my ideas and logical structure are fine, it is quite normal having some grammatical problems, particularly for a non-native English speaker.'

(Chloe, MA, SR-IV)

However, Tutor A's over-emphasis on surface-level linguistic errors foregrounded language forms as a gate keeper to legitimate membership in the target discourse community, and further imposed on Chloe a less powerful identity as an incompetent EAL writer. Perceiving herself as being unfairly marginalised and disempowered, Chloe 'over-defended' her legitimacy as an EAL writer. She continued in the same interview:

'If I wrote something spotless, I would assume whether the tutor would doubt that some native speaker wrote the assignment for me.'

(Chloe, MA, SR-IV)

This excerpt indicates that, rather than submitting to this disadvantaged position, Chloe strived to claim a more powerful identity, i.e., being an ethical and independent student that she believed the target community prefers (as opposed to a dishonest one), through questioning the validity and fairness of the teacher's expectation and requirement of linguistic accuracy. She even ventured a sweeping generalisation that L2 writers who produce impeccable written texts would be suspected of cheating. By legitimising linguistic errors in EAL student writing, she implied that local tutors should focus more on content and logic but much less on language quality.

Despite her effort to reconfigure the power inequality by drawing upon the native speaker - non-native speaker (NS-NNS) dichotomy, Chloe paradoxically aligned part of herself with the less powerful, less legitimate identity that Tutor A imposed on her. Notably, this alignment was not entirely negative and self-deprecating, since Chloe became more aware of the high expectations of the academic discourse community:

'I did not realise that this [the language issue] is a serious problem before I saw the feedback. Now I know good language is required in assignments.'

(Chloe, MA, SR-IV)

However, Chloe's enhanced awareness of language quality did not trickle down to any concrete plan of enhancing her self-editing skills or language abilities, but a plan to 'outsource' proofreading:

'Next time I will invite a British friend to proofread my work.'

(Chloe, MA, SR-IV)

As a temporary reconciliation of the tension between her self-identity and the position imposed by the tutor, Chloe's plan to enlist external help paradoxically placed her into the very position that she had resisted: a less capable, less legitimate newcomer of the discourse community in urgent need of rescue by an L1 writer.

In contrast to her mitigated investment in written accuracy in response to Tutor A's feedback, Chloe was enthusiastic about enhancing content development and organisation of her writing after receiving Tutor B's feedback (Fig. 2).

Different from Tutor A, Tutor B focused mostly on rhetorical issues, providing brief and encouraging feedback on language quality. Such feedback practice corresponds with Chloe's belief that EAL student writers' texts should be assessed based on content instead of language. Furthermore, instead of giving brief and generic praise for rhetorical organisation, Tutor B made a detailed step-by-step analysis on Chloe's argumentation, together with constructive suggestions (e.g., 'you needed to clarify ...'). Tutor B also occasionally hedged his assertiveness by showing trust and encouragement ('I think you'll find ideas have evolved ...').

Tutor B's meticulous analysis on the rhetorical issues did not threaten Chloe's identity as a new member of the community. Rather, his acts, i.e., appreciating her insights and efforts, pinpointing rhetorical problems, and offering constructive solutions, convinced Chloe that the teacher had carefully read the texts, treated her as a valuable new comer with potential, and willingly helped her to seek recognised membership of the academic community (Kiely, 2009). Chloe thus perceived herself having an accessible, intellectual conversation with the tutor and obtaining a clearer vision of trajectories to align her academic literacy practice with that of the discourse community.

'I can make sense of what he [the tutor] said, even though I didn't get a high mark. He gave detailed feedback pointing out my strengths and some logical problems. He also said 'if your argumentation is to be more powerful, I advise you to do this, this, and this'. The feedback convinced me. I know how to improve it.'

(Chloe, MA, RI-VII)

5.2. Sue: sustaining investment in academic literacy by overcoming identity challenges embedded in teacher feedback

Like Chloe, Sue attached much importance to her identity as a contributor of the target discourse community, firmly holding onto the ownership of her writing: 'I think writing is subjective. I have my own ideas and reasons' (Sue, PS, BI-I). While Chloe passively anticipated the tutors to approve her final draft, Sue proactively approached tutors to discuss multiple versions of outline at the pre-

writing stage. She was also determined to negotiate with the tutors if disagreement occurred, even at the early stage of her study-abroad sojourn: '*I always have discussion with teachers when I don't agree with their opinions [in feedback]*' (Sue, PS, SR-II). These quotations reveal no evidence of being worried, concerned, or restricted by her identity as a new arrival to the UK culture or to the host academic community.

Sue's proactive approach had yielded positive experiences in her master's programme, which further strengthened her confidence, legitimised her membership in the host academic discourse community, and placed her on a footing more equal to that of the teacher.

'Once in an email, I asked Tutor C if I can write some background information about Chinese education, but the tutor replied negatively. But I still believed this part was necessary. Later, in a face-to-face Q&A session, I explained my idea to her. She eventually came round and agreed to my plan.'

(Sue, MA, RI-III)

Marker's Comments

(including strengths, improvement areas and corrective advice)

Overall

This is an interesting discussion on the topic of whether 'the monolingual native speaker should not be regarded as a norm to be emulated'.

Content

Your content is relevant to the task throughout. But in the final sections of your essay you focus only on the pros and cons of NESTs and NNESTs. In doing so you ignore a number of other very significant issues. Taking 'the monolingual native speaker ...as a norm to be emulated' includes issues such as whether learners of English should follow dictionaries containing 'native speaker' vocabulary (e.g. Oxford English Dictionary, Webster's); whether they should use grammar books featuring 'native speaker' structures (e.g. British grammar, American grammar); whether they should learn to pronounce English like 'native speakers' (e.g. Received Pronunciation, General American); whether they should study course books written by 'native speakers'; whether they should take tests that involve 'native-speaker' forms of English (e.g. IELTS, TOEFL), etc. The alternative would be to follow dictionaries containing the vocabulary of World Englishes (e.g. Chinese English); to use grammar books featuring 'non-native-speaker' structures (e.g. Indian English grammar); to learn to pronounce English with a 'non-native' accent (viz. Jenkins' Lingua Franca Core); to study course books written by 'non-native speakers' (e.g. Singaporean authors); to take tests designed by 'non-native speakers' (e.g. Chinese people), etc.

Structure

The assignment is clearly structured.

Presentation

Your English is inaccurate in a number of places. This sometimes makes it difficult for the reader to follow your message.

Take care to spell the names of authors correctly, e.g. Liurda [sic].

Analysis

You offer a balanced critique of the literature.

However, you could be more thorough in your comparative evaluation of the different sources.

Use of sources

You cite a good range of relevant literature.

But you also make a large number of unsupported assertions. For example, the opening paragraph of your essay contains few references. As a general rule, every single statement that you make must be punctuated by a reference to the published literature.

Provisional grade

62%

Fig. 3. Tutor A's feedback report of Sue's Language Awareness Task 1.

However, Sue was not free from harbouring doubts about her identity. When a tutor of the pre-sessional course pointed out nuanced differences between synonyms that Sue had presumed interchangeable, she noticed the wide gap between her current writing competence and the expected. She started to question her identity as a proficient, teacher-approved EAL writer, which had been constructed upon years of hard-earned positive evaluation in China. She even became fearful for such nuanced feedback, which implied her ‘incompetence’.

‘I was confident in my English writing because I always got good marks in my undergraduate English writing classes. [...] But here I feel scared when the teacher closely scrutinises my wording. For example, here, the comment said, when I cite someone’s [claim], I can’t use “demonstrates” but have to use “argues”. I didn’t notice the difference. The feedback makes me feel that I am not competent in academic writing and still have a long way to go.’

(Sue, PS, SR-II)

Without further explanations of the word choice problem, the feedback might neglect the level of challenge of this seemingly minor problem for a high-achieving EAL student like Sue. This feedback therefore positioned her at the periphery of the community, suggesting that (a) she had not yet gained the knowledge and skills that legitimate members should have been equipped with, and (b) she should be able to solve the problem independently with minimal teacher explanation.

However, the identity-threatening effect of the negative appraisal was buffered by Sue’s strong will to make her voice heard and approved in the host discourse community. Rather than escaping from or othering herself in the host community, she decided to stay and plan for longer-term positive investment into the literacy practices (*[I] still have a long way to go.*).

After officially embarking on her master’s studies, Sue encountered a big blow upon the receipt of Tutor A’s feedback report on her discourse analysis assignment (see Fig. 3).

Compared with Tutor A’s feedback on Chloe’s Task 1, this feedback report did not over-emphasise linguistic accuracy, but foregrounded the teacher’s critique and suggestions regarding the topic coverage of the assignment. Tutor A also provided more balanced comments in the sections of ‘analysis’ and ‘use of sources’. Nonetheless, Sue barely mentioned these comments in the interview. She instead articulated her disagreement over Tutor A’s written corrective feedback (WCF): *‘I can’t agree with his judgments on my language issues’* (Sue, MA, SR-IV).

At the textual level, Tutor A’s WCF irritated Sue because it failed to justify why and how the identified errors and typos had weakened meaning conveyance, as his feedback also failed to do so in Chloe’s case. In addition, the wording ‘your English’ is particularly threatening at the personal level, negatively indexing her deficiencies (and differences) as an EAL student writer and as an outsider unprepared to access dominant discourse practices (Duff, 2002).

However, Sue attributed her resistance to the dissonance between Tutor A and other tutors in their attitudes toward Sue as a new member of the community. Before encountering Tutor A, Sue had repeatedly received praise for her written language from three subject tutors in the MA programme, which had gradually rebuilt her confidence and identity as a competent EAL writer.

‘Tutor B, C, and D commented that I had good language presentation. [...] Only Tutor A said that my writing has serious language deficits.’

(Sue, MA, SR-IV)

Given Sue’s confidence in triangulating and critically synthesising feedback from multiple sources, she tended to consider Tutor A’s WCF as a minor voice that could be discarded. This is also the very strategy Sue employed to address the identity challenge and to reconfigure the teacher-student power relation – critically navigating the tensions between different voices from multiple tutors and from herself (Y. Zhang & Hyland, 2021a) and incorporating the most widely shared opinion to empower herself.

‘[I] negotiated with different tutors, [...] synthesised their suggestions, [...] and thought about which suggestion is more appropriate in my context or how to take up something that they all shared.’

(Sue, MA, RI-I, emphasis added)

6. Discussion

This multiple case study explored two international postgraduate students’ self-reported experiences in receiving and using local teachers’ feedback in relation to their identity construction and investment in academic literacy practice. Regarding the first research question, i.e., into which identity categories students perceive that teacher feedback socialises them, the data revealed three identity categories: (a) an illegitimate EAL writer with limited right to make her voice heard because of linguistic errors; (b) a peripheral EAL writer who ought to cope with the linguistic intricacies with minimal teacher support; and (c) an emerging EAL writer with potential to make intellectual contribution.

Among the three identity categories, the first two had an excluding and disempowering effect, whereas the third had an including and empowering effect. Feedback placing the students in the first two identity categories often constructed a deficit discourse that highlighted their limited language competence, therefore restricted their access to the target discourse community. On the other hand, feedback that positioned the students in the third identity category often signalled the tutors’ genuine interest in the students’ intellectual contribution and their commitment to scaffolding the students’ literacy development (and therefore legitimacy in the discourse community). The students were convinced by the feedback that their current L2 writing competence needed to be developed,

and more importantly, that the teacher's suggestions could help them to become more legitimate members of the community.

Adding to the identity-mediating function of feedback (e.g., Anderson, 2017, 2021; Eraut, 2006; Olave-Encina et al., 2021; Séror, 2008), the identity categories indexed by teacher feedback revealed in the current study also uncover the complex relationship between discursive features of feedback and the identity categories that students believe feedback socialises them into. While feedback featuring poorly justified over-emphasis on linguistic accuracy, scarce constructive suggestions, and harsh criticism bordering on personal attack ('your English ... ') (Séror, 2008) probably excluded and disempowered EAL students, feedback on rhetoric issues might also be perceived as excluding and marginalising. Compared with his feedback on Chloe's writing, Tutor A's feedback given to Sue was more content-oriented, more balanced between positive and negative comments, and more constructive. However, Tutor A's WCF still registered in Sue's mind more than feedback on rhetorical issues, probably due to two co-existing reasons: (a) inadequate justifications of WCF, and (b) the contradiction between Tutor A's criticism of Sue's linguistic competence and other tutors' approval. This finding extends Eraut's (2006, p. 118) argument by showing that the identity-mediated function of feedback is not solely dependent on the feedback *per se*, but deeply embedded in layers of feedback contexts that interact with one another (Chong, 2021; Han, 2019).

The second question investigated whether teacher feedback entailed identity challenges and how these challenges were addressed by the students. Both participants encountered the dissonance between identity categories assigned by teacher feedback and self-perceived roles as a student writer, when they received excluding, or even disempowering, feedback. These identified challenges were addressed in mixed and changing ways. While both Chloe and Sue considered identity challenges as a wake-up call urging them to close the gap between their current competence and the expected, this positive interpretation was more of a sensible reflection emerging later after the students progressed beyond their initial emotional turmoil. Their more immediate reactions, often imbued with irritation, confusion, and upset, were to resist the imposed, disadvantaged position (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003). They also strived to claim and legitimise a more powerful identity through reconfiguring teacher-student power relation, with the help of linguistic and social sources at their disposal (Cheng, 2013; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004; Y. Zhang & Hyland, 2021a). Sue used two strategies to earn a more equal footing in relation to the teacher: (a) proactively approaching teachers to negotiate meaning, and (b) strategically 'appealing to the majority'—leveraging on other tutors' voices to override Tutor A's. Sue's proactivity bears similarities with Xiaoli's case in Wang and Parr's (2021) study in terms of striking a balance between her intended meaning and the meaning expected from the supervisor. In addition, Sue's case illustrated that the power-gaining process (Y. Zhang & Hyland, 2021a, p. 44) can take place even without the teacher's explicit explanation or encouragement for negotiation, if the student (in our case, Sue) has a very strong agency and sees herself as the ultimate arbiter of academic performance and academic discourse socialisation (also see A-Ming's case in Anderson, 2017). Her second strategy, *i.e.*, drawing upon other tutors' voices, illustrates feedback as a multi-voice system in the academic community (Y. Zhang & Hyland, 2021b) and suggests that EAL students might be more easily exposed to contradictory voices due to teachers' diverse beliefs about academic literacy. While adding to challenges for EAL students, conflicting feedback from different sources, if strategically harnessed, may serve as a window of opportunities for students to exercise agency in selectively utilising these voices to construct identities (*ibid.*).

On the other hand, probably because Tutor A's feedback on Chloe's writing is more identity-threatening and implying an even less equal teacher-student, expert-novice, and NS-NNS power relation, Chloe tended to 'overdo' her resistance by negating all the 'game rules' conveyed in Tutor A's feedback, distancing herself from L1 users of English or near-native academic community, and aligning herself with EAL scholars working in the ELF-oriented framework of academic discourse (e.g., MacKenzie, 2015). However, her decision to obtain proofreading help paradoxically effected the very position that Tutor A had imposed on her— an L2 novice writer unable to express herself properly if without extra help from L1 users of English. Thus, Chloe's reconstructed identity was more fragmented than Sue's. Part of Chloe's writerly self, *i.e.*, as a knowledge contributor, became strengthened, since she decided to focus solely on issues beyond linguistic accuracy; however, the other part of her writerly self, *i.e.*, as a student writer who needs to continuously develop academic literacy, including linguistic competence, was mitigated, or even abandoned.

The third research question investigated how the students' strategies to address identity challenges embedded in teacher feedback affected their investment in academic literacy practice. Aligned with Norton's (2013) conceptualization of the interlocking, dialogic relationship between identity and investment, our data converged in showing that students tended to sustain and enhance their investment when their self-identities were appreciated and scaffolded, *i.e.*, when the students' expected identity as a legitimate new member to the discourse community is approved and empowered. However, their investment was jeopardised when identity challenges arose. They became irritated, confused, and easily discarded the feedback, along with the possible learning opportunities. When Chloe and Sue indeed strived to claim a more powerful identity, some specific strategies that they took, *i.e.*, distancing, denial, and resistance to feedback, resulted in reduction and withdrawal of genuine investment in academic literacy practice. Moreover, in line with the fragmented nature of Chloe's reconstructed identity, she decided to focus on content and recruited an NS peer to act as her proxy in improving the language quality of her future writing; this decision can have long-term consequences on her academic discourse socialisation, especially given that Chloe was not a high-achiever in the programme.

However, we do notice the possibility that students could overcome the identity challenge and sustain investment in the face of excluding, disempowering feedback. Sue's case illustrated two conditions under which students might be able to resist the negative impact of identity-threatening feedback: (a) the student firmly held onto the ownership of her writing and academic work (also in Anderson, 2017), seeing teachers as facilitators and resource providers, rather than authority figures; (b) the student had accumulated abundant positive learning experiences and affirmative, confidence-boosting feedback elsewhere, which reinforced her identity as an L2 competent user and allowed the student to dismiss sporadic negative feedback (especially without justification).

The focal students' self-reported experiences of being positioned (often unfavourably) into different identity categories, as well as struggling to claim a more powerful identity and adjust their investment, also provide insights into feedback literacy research.

Although feedback literacy was originally conceptualised largely based on academic literacies paradigm (Sutton, 2012), this construct has been continuously enriched and refined in the light of social constructionist paradigm (S. Yu & Liu, 2021); and although student feedback literacy research has consistently foregrounded learner agency (Carless & Boud, 2018; S. Yu & Liu, 2021), the impact of feedback on students' identities, as well as the role of feedback literacy in mediating such impact, should receive more scholarly attention (also see Nieminen & Carless, 2022). The current findings thus contribute to feedback research by helping to revive the academic literacy-informed research on teachers' and students' feedback literacy, so as to more thoroughly and critically consider the sociocultural and sociopolitical dimension of feedback practice in higher education and even beyond (*ibid.*).

7. Conclusion

Through the lens of academic discourse socialisation, the current case study explored two international postgraduate students' self-reported experiences of receiving and using feedback in relation to their identity (re)construction and their investment in academic literacy practice. On the one hand, our data revealed that poorly justified, unconstructive, and face-threatening language feedback tends to disempower and marginalise students as new arrivals of the community and further mitigates their investment. On the other hand, the findings also extend the current understanding of feedback by highlighting the complexity of and the non-linearity between these discursive features of feedback, students' identity work, and their investment in academic literacy. This complexity emerges largely because (a) students have their own interpretations of the identity categories that feedback assigns them into; (b) individual students may take different strategies to reconfigure power relations and claim more powerful identities; (c) students are exposed to conflicting feedback from different sources. However, our findings suggest that, regardless of how students reconstruct their identities after encountering feedback-mediated identity challenges, they tend to align their investment in academic literacy practice with the identities that they attempted to reconstruct.

Although the study exclusively focused on Chinese master's students in the UK and had a small sample size, the findings can generate several pedagogical recommendations and research implications. When providing feedback to EAL students, teachers should keep subtle and sensitive to students' learning needs, personal goals, and self-concepts as a better writer, so as to empower students to exercise their agency to gradually progress toward the core of the academic community. Teachers need to blend and balance multiple roles in the feedback process: a fair assessor evaluating student writing, a keen reader genuinely engaged with the content, and a facilitator placing trust on students' growing academic literacy and emerging identity as a responsible writer, particularly when students are still at an early stage of a degree programme. The blended roles can be reflected through well-justified, content-based, and constructive comments, whereas assertive tones should be used very cautiously. Teachers should also be aware that some international students may still be reluctant to attend tutorials or seek further explanations of feedback, even though they feel confused and dissatisfied; therefore, more explicit instruction and even multiple trials of writing conferences are needed. Also, instructors of different courses within a programme should communicate more openly and frequently about their evaluation criteria to reduce radically contradictory feedback, especially regarding the language quality of international students' texts. In addition, teachers and course developers should be aware that although degree programmes have offered formative feedback informing students' subsequent learning (e.g., the refining of drafts), international students, especially those with little positive experience using feedback, might still perceive feedback (e.g., the feedback report) in the light of summative assessment, which can have a considerable impact on their identity (re-)construction.

Future research can continue exploring the conditions under which feedback might impose challenges on students' identities or help students to become a more competent and independent writer. Given the long-term, ongoing nature of identity transformation, longitudinal studies lasting over a year are recommended to trace the evolution of students' identities through the lens of feedback-mediated socialisation. Since our study used interview data and textual data, future studies on the relationship between feedback and identity negotiation can expand the data sources to involve teacher-student conversations naturally taking place in writing tutorials.

CRediT author statement

Fangfei Li: Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Data Curation, Visualization, Writing—Original draft, Writing—Review & Editing. **Ye Han***: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Writing—original draft, Writing—Review & Editing, Funding acquisition.

Funding

This work was supported by Chinese Foundation of Social Science [Grant Number #19CYY052].

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

We sincerely thank the editor and the reviewers for their close reading and constructive feedback on the earlier version of this paper. We are also very grateful for all the participants.

Appendix A. Categories of feedback focus

Category	Sub-category	Sample data in feedback artefacts
Language and presentation	Grammar	The heading 'references' # should be plural.
	Mechanics	You have a serious problem with verb tenses.
	Formatting	Please do note appropriate font size (12) for assignments.
Rhetoric and structure	Meaning conveyance at syntactical level	The problems are more at the sentence level.
	Essay structure	
Academic conventions	Evidence-based argumentation	You divide your essays into sections and subsections and these have informative headings, which is very reader-friendly.
	Reasoning and logic	You have consulted a number of sources and were able to clearly link their findings and ideas to your context.
	Referencing and citation	Some claims are unsubstantiated, bringing down the strength of the argument.
Content	Theory description and analysis	There is then a jump from that line of argumentation to a seemingly new one.
	Content development and appropriateness	Your discussion of motivation is centred around the self-determination theory and the intrinsic/extrinsic divide.
	Depth and breadth in use of literature resources	The wide range of sources gives a good impression in the long reference list, but the use of sources is sometimes superficial, lacking a depth of familiarity with the content.

Appendix B. Criteria of empowering feedback

Criteria	Coding description	Sample data in feedback artefacts
Specificity	Feedback is generic and groundless. Feedback is specific to the details and issues of students' text;	There are quite a lot of English language errors. But this is a leap in logic, relying on Kirkpatrick and Xu for the only claim of acceptance, rather than explaining how it is accepted.
Justification	Identify problems but not exemplify them in students' texts; lack justification about why the problem matters Identify problems locating in students' texts; give sufficient justification about why the problem matters.	You use too many direct quotations from the source text.
Constructiveness	(Im)balanced comments in each section (language, content, use of sources, etc.) (Im)balance of proportion between positive and negative feedback;	You make a large number of unsupported assertions. For example, the beginning paragraph contains few references. No conclusion is provided so it's unclear how these arguments were intended to develop within a single conceptual framework.
	Identify problems but lack practical solutions or instruction for future improvement	While some aspects should have been more carefully considered, in general the assignment shows at least some insight. You could be more thorough in your comparative evaluation of the different sources.
	Identify problems with practical solutions and instruction for future improvement	It is agreeable that the status of Chinglish is improving in China, but you needed to clarify how and why, and if, in your context, it is having an actual impact on curriculum and pedagogical practices.
Face saving/threatening	Feedback has a risk in personal/ego attack, wording from the second person point of view when giving negative comments; Feedback protects students' ego, commenting on writing issues rather than ego; using an impersonal tone and mitigating the assertiveness when commenting.	Your English is inaccurate in a number of places. A depth of awareness of the subject matter is apparent, and adequate breadth of coverage is provided within the limitations of the task.
		I think you'll find ideas have evolved a great deal since Gorlach (1988).

References

- Aitchison, C., Catterall, J., Ross, P., & Burgin, S. (2012). Tough love and tears": Learning doctoral writing in the sciences. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 31(4), 435–447. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2011.559195>
- Anderson, T. (2017). The doctoral gaze: Foreign PhD students' internal and external academic discourse socialization. *Linguistics and Education*, 37, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2016.12.001>
- Anderson, T. (2021). The socialization of L2 doctoral students through written feedback. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 20(2), 134–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1726758>
- Benson, P., Barkhuizen, G., Bodycott, P., & Brown, J. (2012). Study abroad and the development of second language identities. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 3(1), 173–193. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applrev-2012-0008>
- Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(6), 698–712. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2012.691462>
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bronson, M. D. (2004). *Writing passage: Academic literacy socialization among ESL graduate students, A multiple case study*. Davis: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California.

- Butler, D., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 65(3), 245–281. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543065003245>
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43, 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Cheng, R. (2013). A non-native student's experience on collaborating with native peers in academic literacy development: A sociopolitical perspective. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12, 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.10.003>
- Chong, S. W. (2021). Reconsidering student feedback literacy from an ecological perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(1), 92–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1730765>
- Coffin, C., & Donohue, J. P. (2012). Academic Literacies and systemic functional linguistics: How do they relate? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(1), 64–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.11.004>
- Duff, P. A. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 289–322. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.3.289>
- Duff, P. A. (2007). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching*, 40, 309–319. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508>
- Duff, P. A. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 169–192. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048>
- Duff, P. A. (2014). Case study research on language learning and use. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34, 233–255. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000051>
- Duff, P. A., Anderson, T., Ilnyckyj, R., Lester, E., Wang, R., & Yates, E. (2013). *Learning Chinese: Linguistic, sociocultural, and narrative perspectives*. New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Elliot, D. L., & Kobayashi, S. (2019). How can PhD supervisors play a role in bridging academic cultures? *Teaching in Higher Education*, 24(8), 911–929. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2018.1517305>
- Eraut, M. (2006). Feedback. *Learning in Health and Social Care*, 5, 111–118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-6861.2006.00129.x>
- Han, Y. (2019). Written corrective feedback from an ecological perspective: The interaction between the context and individual students. *System*, 80, 288–303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.12.009>
- Handley, K., Price, M., & Millar, J. (2011). Beyond 'doing time': Investigating the concept of student engagement with feedback. *Oxford Review of Education*, 37(4), 543–560. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2011.604951>
- Higher Education Student Agency. (2022). Where do HE students come from?. Retrieved <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/students/where-from>. (Accessed 28 November 2022). from.
- Hyland, K. (2013). Student perceptions of hidden messages in teacher written feedback. *Studies In Educational Evaluation*, 39(3), 180–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2013.06.003>
- Kiely, R. (2009). Observing, noticing, and understanding: Two case studies in language Awareness in the development of academic literacy. *Language Awareness*, 18 (3–4), 329–344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410903197298>
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The decolonial option in English teaching: Can the subaltern act? *Tesol Quarterly*, 50(1), 66–85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.202>
- Li, Y. (2021). I had so many conflicts in my mind": Navigating the doctoral journey across languages and cultures. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2021.1972804>
- Li, F., & Han, Y. (2022). Student feedback literacy in L2 disciplinary writing: Insights from international graduate students at a UK university. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(4), 1087–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1908957>
- Li, Y., Hyland, F., & Hu, G. (2017). Prompting MED students to engage with academia and the professional world through feedback. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 26, 52–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2017.02.005>
- MacKenzie, I. (2015). Rethinking reader and writer responsibility in academic English. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applrev-2015-0001>
- Nieminen, J. H., & Carless, D. (2022). Feedback literacy: A critical review of an emerging concept. *Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00895-9>
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *Tesol Quarterly*, 29(1), 9–31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587803>
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2001). Changing perspectives on good language learners. *Tesol Quarterly*, 35(2), 307–322. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587650>
- Olave-Encina, K., Moni, K., & Renshaw, P. (2021). Exploring the emotions of international students about their feedback experiences. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 40(4), 810–824. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1786020>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (2004). *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Peng, A., & Patterson, M. (2022). Relations among cultural identity, motivation for language learning, and perceived English language proficiency for international students in the United States. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 35(1), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2021.1938106>
- Phillipson, R. (2018). Linguistic imperialism and NNESTs. In J. I. Lontas (Ed.), *8 volume setThe TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–7). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0023>
- Salter-Dvorak, H. (2019). Proofreading: How de facto language policies create social inequality for L2 master's students in UK universities. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 39, 119–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.03.004>
- Séror, J. (2008). *Socialization in the margins: Second language writers and feedback practices in university content courses*. Vancouver, Canada: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- Sutton, P. (2012). Conceptualizing feedback literacy: Knowing, being, and acting. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, 49(1), 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2012.647781>
- Sutton, P., & Gill, W. (2010). Engaging feedback: Meaning, identity and power. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 4(1), 3–13. Retrieved June 5, 2022, from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1130410.pdf>.
- Sveningsson, S., & Alvesson, M. (2003). Managing managerial identities organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations*, 56(10), 1163–1193. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267035610001>
- Wang, M., & Parr, G. (2021). A Chinese doctoral student's experience of L2 English academic writing in Australia: Negotiating practices and identities. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100944>
- Yu, L. (2020). Investigating L2 writing through tutor-tutee interactions and revisions: A case study of a multilingual writer in EAP tutorials. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 48, Article 100709. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100709>
- Yu, S., & Liu, C. (2021). Improving student feedback literacy in academic writing: An evidence-based framework. *Assessing Writing*, 48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aw.2021.100525>
- Zhang, Y., & Hyland, K. (2021a). Advice-giving, power and roles in theses supervisions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 172, 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpragma.2020.11.002>
- Zhang, Y., & Hyland, K. (2021b). Elements of doctoral apprenticeship: Community feedback and the acquisition of writing expertise. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100835>

Fangfei Li is a lecturer in the School of Languages and Cultures at Shanghai University of Political Science and Law, Shanghai. Her research interests include teacher feedback, learner identity, English for Academic Purposes writing and higher education.

Ye Han is an associate professor in School of Humanities and Social Sciences at Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen. Her research interests include second language writing, student feedback literacy, student engagement, academic emotions, and postgraduate student supervision.