Revisiting writing feedback: Using teacher-student writing conferences to enhance learners' L2 writing skills

Kumneger Chenekew Goshu , Hailay Tesfay Gebremariam [*]

College of Social Science and Humanities, Arba Minch University, Arba Minch, Ethiopia

A B S T R A C T

Previous studies have largely overlooked teacher feedback, which plays a significant role in the social construction of knowledge within educational ecosystems worldwide. While written corrective feedback has been the focus of writing feedback research, oral feedback in teacher-student L2 writing conferences has not received as much attention, especially from an ecological lens. To address this research gap, this study investigated how writing training, including teacher-student conferences, can improve learners' L2 writing skills, with a specific focus on Ethiopia. The study explores how these conferences can help students enhance their L2 writing skills through constructive criticism and encouragement. To achieve this, 63 students (aged 15 to 23; 38 male and 25 female) were divided into experimental and control groups using a quasi-experimental design. The students underwent pre- and post-tests during an eight-week intervention. MANOVA was used to evaluate the pre-test data, while ANCOVA was used for the post-test analysis. The post-test results show that teacher-student conferences can effectively improve three writing skills: organization, vocabulary, and mechanics. The greatest impact on students' understanding of the writing process was seen in mechanics (43.4%), vocabulary (36.9%), and organization (11.5%). However, the intervention did not have a statistically significant impact on two other writing skills: content and language usage or grammar. Recommendations for future research and strategies for integrating teacher-student conferences into writing instruction are provided.

1. Introduction

Teacher-student writing conferences are widely regarded as one of the most effective strategies for teaching writing to challenging students in second language (L2) writing skills (Alfalagg, 2020). During these sessions, students can present their written work to the teacher for feedback on development and correction. Writing conferences are private one-on-one sessions between instructors and students regarding their writing process and skills (Alfalagg, 2015). According to Murray et al.'s (1985) study, these conferences are professional discussions in which the teacher and student evaluate the student's work to identify areas of effectiveness and areas for improvement. Regardless of how these sessions are described, writing conferences between instructors and students serve a purpose (Sarvestani and Pishkar, 2015), follow a predictable format, and establish a collaborative relationship between students and their teachers. Several studies (Alharrasi, 2019; Kang and Han, 2015; Gebremariam and Asgede, 2023; Sahle et al., 2023) have found that writing conferences help students learn more effectively and improve their writing abilities.

Over the past three decades, academics have focused on the utility of writing criticism, which can be challenging for teachers (Dinsa, 2023; Gebremariam, 2024; Hyland and Hyland, 2006; Alharrasi, 2019). Teacher-student writing conferences were initially used and studied in first language (L1) writing pedagogy before being incorporated into L2 writing education (D. R. Ferris, 2004, 2010). While some research focuses on the methodological framework rather than the impact of feedback on second language learners' writing (Khanlarzadeh and Nemati, 2016; Sahle et al., 2023), others may be concerned about their behavior during writing conferences (Algrim, 2013; Sarvestani and Pishkar, 2015). These one-on-one, in-person discussions between teachers and students about the writing process, completed works, and upcoming projects, along with standard feedback patterns, provide students with precise feedback, help them set learning objectives, and enhance their motivation, writing skills, and critical thinking. Research indicates that writing conferences, when combined with direct written feedback, have a greater impact on improving L2 writing accuracy than direct written feedback alone (Al Harrasi, 2023; Jang, 2022; Rahimi, 2019). Teachers may struggle to engage with students during the writing

process and evaluate their writing achievements (Dinsa, 2023; Polio, 2012; Troia et al., 2015), even though writing is a crucial language skill that is sometimes overlooked (Teo et al., 2023).

Although studies suggest that instructors should reassess their teaching writing instructions and feedback processes for writing skills (Rahmat et al., 2022), writing conference instruction has not received much attention in Ethiopian general education, particularly in secondary school writing classrooms (Hiluf et al., 2024; Wendimu and Gebremariam, 2024; Yu, 2020). According to Wendimu and Gebremariam (2024), writing challenges such as language use, organization, and content problems may arise during L2 writing. Language and cognitive issues, such as a limited vocabulary and improper essay structure, can often present internal writing obstacles for secondary school students, as demonstrated in local studies (Sahle et al., 2023). Particularly, Wendimu and Gebremariam (2024) noted a decline in the writing proficiency of Ethiopian secondary school students over time. Many secondary school students encounter difficulties with writing assignments, particularly those who already struggle with writing. Unfortunately, the improvement of writing skills through writing conferences, especially in terms of writing sub-skills, requires further investigation (Ferris, 2003; Woreta and Gebremariam, 2023). Despite ample research on teacher-student interactions during writing conferences, there is still a gap in understanding these interactions over time. Therefore, it is crucial to explore how writing conferences can provide feedback to help students' writing become more sophisticated (Algrim, 2013), particularly as many students lack technical and practical writing skills (Carless and Boud, 2018; Shrestha, 2022). Specifically, the study aims to answer the following research questions: How do teacher-student writing conferences improve learners' L2 writing skills in terms of content, organization, language usage, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics in pre-tests?

2. Literature review

2.1. Theoretical background

The current study utilizes Vygotsky's sociocultural theory to explore teacher-student writing conferences as a mediating strategy to support learners' writing processes. According to Vygotsky, an individual's environment and interactions with more knowledgeable people influence their learning and cognitive development. The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), defined as the gap between what students can do independently and with assistance from an expert, is where this process occurs (Vygotsky, 1978). Experts believe that teacher-student conferences promote positive interactions and strengthen social and emotional bonds. To better understand students' interests, goals, and perspectives, instructors build rapport with them (Suthipiyapathra, 2021). Additionally, Kim (2012) suggests that conferences create a relaxed and enjoyable atmosphere where students can relax and absorb the teacher's feedback.

An expert instructor or tutor works one-on-one with a student in a conference format tailored for L2 writing. This format establishes a structured feedback system (Nazerian et al., 2021; Werani, 2018; Yang, 2022). Through writing conferences, students address challenges in their writing skills, such as selecting appropriate vocabulary, organizing content, developing themes, and correcting language and syntax issues. Gebremariam and Hiluf (2023) argue that writing in a L2 is a fundamental skill that requires proficient execution, involving processes of thinking, drafting, and revising. L2 writers differ from L1 writers by having access to a wider array of languages (Fonkamo and Zeru, 2022; Gebremariam, 2023; Werani, 2018). Writing is also a social activity that necessitates communication between the instructor and the writer (student) in a specific setting, like teacher-student writing conferences. To excel in L2 writing, students must acquire the sub-skills needed to produce coherent sentences, paragraphs, and essays, akin to the majority of learners. Therefore, teachers must enhance writing proficiency, while students must improve their L2 writing skills (Liu et al., 2024).

Teacher-student writing conferences are an ongoing practice in writing sessions. Passive contemplation is less effective than actively engaging with information and experiences (Gebremariam and Asgede, 2023). Despite being linked to better comprehension and application of knowledge, writing conferences have not received much attention in recent research (Golpour et al., 2019; Dinsa, 2023). However, when students engage in writing conferences throughout the writing process, teachers may be inspired to design their writing lessons and draw connections between their students' writing experiences and their own expertise as educators (Fonkamo and Zeru, 2022). Through writing conferences between teachers and students, knowledge is shared, providing the student with multiple opportunities to process it while effectively completing the current task. In these conferences, the expert (such as a teacher) and the student collaborate to create knowledge using language, which serves as a mediating tool in human interaction (Golpour et al., 2019; Vygotsky, 1978). Effective writing conferences require experts to understand the learner's background, especially in terms of language proficiency, and adjust their support based on ongoing assessments of the student's writing skills (Bayraktar, 2013; Yang, 2022). As a result, writing conferences enable educators to gain a deeper understanding of students' concepts and challenges.

2.2. Teacher-student writing conferences

One way to enhance learners' writing education is through teacher-student writing conferences (Suthipiyapathra, 2021). Writing courses are believed to benefit the most from these conferences (Shvidko, 2016). The main goal of teacher-student conferences is to help students develop their writing abilities by providing feedback on their drafts. During the conferences, the teacher gives oral feedback on the students' writing skills while the students discuss their initial drafts (Fonkamo and Zeru, 2022). In these conferences, the instructor may offer quick advice on the paper's topic, content, sources, and strategies for improving the writing. However, the primary focus is on work-in-progress, analyzing the current draft and providing suggestions for improvement (Galloway-Speight, 2021). Teacher-student conferences are a reflection of the socio-constructivist approach, emphasizing deeper interaction between educators and learners to address challenges students face when interpreting feedback from teachers (Bayraktar, 2013; Shvidko, 2016). According to Yang (2022), teacher-student writing conferences are valuable strategies for helping EFL students write paragraphs more effectively. Research indicates that students often struggle to understand writing standards, so instructors can offer teacher-student writing conferences to provide individualized feedback and guidance, helping students identify and address their writing weaknesses (Rahmat et al., 2022; Al Zahrani and Chaudhary, 2020).

By having one-on-one sessions with their professors, students can receive specialized assistance tailored to their specific needs (Gebremariam and Sisay, 2024), leading to improved writing skills and a better understanding of the writing process (Widiati et al., 2023; Yusuf et al., 2019). Despite the various labels for writing conferences, researchers consistently define the method and purpose of these conferences, emphasizing their goal, structured format, and positioning of students as active communication partners (Suthipiyapathra, 2021; Galloway-Speight, 2021).

During writing conferences, teachers play a crucial role in encouraging students to think critically, generate unique ideas (Kocaman and Maral, 2022), and engage in meaningful dialogue by asking questions, providing feedback, and introducing new concepts (Al Zahrani and Chaudhary, 2020; Solhi and Eğinli, 2020; Yüce and Aksu, 2019). Including teacher-student writing conferences in language learning courses can create a collaborative and supportive learning environment where students feel comfortable sharing their work and receiving feedback, ultimately boosting their confidence and motivation to write in a second language (Bayraktar, 2013). Moreover, teacher-student writing conferences can help instructors gain a deeper understanding

of their students' writing strengths and weaknesses, enabling them to provide more targeted instruction and support (Rahmat et al., 2022).

2.3. Related studies on writing conferences

It is widely recognized that writing conferences are essential for writing education. However, in comparison to studies on peer and teacher-written feedback in students' work, particularly in second language writing education, there is a lack of information available on teacher-student writing conferences. The limited literature on this topic has explored various writing-related subjects in conferences. Examples include the effects of revision and the importance of intimacy (Bayraktar, 2013), teacher talk (Yoshida, 2010), students' paragraph writing (Solhi and Eğinli, 2020), the structure and content of students' writing (Widiati et al., 2023), and the frequency and accuracy of students' writing (Alfalagg, 2020). Research consistently shows connections between the type of conference interaction and students' progress in improving their writing skills. Writing poses challenges for many EFL students, especially in vocabulary, grammatical structures, and mechanics (Ÿepni, 2016; Yoshida, 2010). Gebremariam and Hiluf (2023) used self-reflection to identify the difficulties students face in their writing, attributing these challenges to factors such as lack of motivation, improper language use, lack of practice, inadequate feedback, and lack of subject knowledge. This study suggests that students should carefully select the writing conferences they participate in to enhance their L2 writing skills.

Furthermore, a teacher's prior teaching experiences and background influence how they conduct conferences, either as an authoritative figure or a collaborative facilitator (Yoshida, 2010). Interaction patterns are also influenced by students' self-selected revision goals, which are tied to their level of proficiency in the target language, the topic they choose to discuss, and the teacher's educational objectives (Solhi and Eğinli, 2020; Widiati et al., 2023). Yoshida (2010) noted that when students propose solutions to issues in their writing assignments, the teacher typically responds more directly by asking questions about the proposed solutions. Conferences help students articulate their writing challenges and obstacles, while also teaching them how to address them. Interaction patterns in writing conferences can change as teachers and students gain knowledge and adjust their involvement in L2 writing exchanges (Huisman et al., 2018).

Scholarly investigations have also analyzed the choices made by educators and learners during composition seminars. For instance, Yoshida (2008) discovered that in the Australian setting, teachers frequently choose to offer recasts - utterances that include the rephrasing of learners' mistakes - due to time constraints, while students prefer the opportunity to review errors and make corrections before receiving feedback. Conversely, Adawiyah (2019) investigated how a lecturer at an Indonesian university taught students how to create process essays through writing conferences. The instructor emphasized word choice, structure, and substance in writing abilities, but did not offer detailed corrections for grammatical or technical issues. It is unclear, however, if interactions between educators and learners may eventually influence conversation topics and participation in different learning exercises and writing conferences.

Conferences between teachers and students can be used to address the limitations of one-way textual feedback (Yang, 2022). Through these discussions, students become more aware of the pros and cons. Moreover, conferences provide a safe space for students, especially those who are more vocal, to ask questions or express their concerns. Through these interactions, students can come up with innovative ideas and solutions to their writing challenges, helping them reach their full potential. Therefore, it may be beneficial to prioritize writing literacy in the curriculum for these students to enhance their understanding and writing skills. Lastly, a review of the literature suggests that there is limited research on the impact of writing conferences between instructors and students on the abilities of L2 writers, especially on each writing sub-skill in the context of L2 learning.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research design

This research investigated how teacher-student writing conferences helped improve the L2 writing abilities of Ethiopian ninth-grade high school students. The study utilized a quasi-experimental research design, including pretest, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test assessments as data collection tools. Two study groups were involved in the study, with the aim of determining if the writing abilities of the comparison groups were similar to those of the treatment group at baseline. The intervention involved an experimental group, a control group, and two intact groups.

3.2. Context and participants

Initially, 63 Ethiopian ninth-grade students enrolled in a nine-week academic writing course at Abaya Secondary School in Arba Minch City during the second semester of the 2022–2023 academic years were the participants in the quasi-experimental study design. The students were selected using a random selection methodology. After completing a signed agreement form, the students were invited to take part in the study. They were divided into two groups, with 34 students in the experimental group and 35 students in the comparison group. Out of the participants, 38 were male and 25 were female, with ages ranging from 15 to 23. In the initial phase, the students were informed of the research goal and their role in the investigation.

3.3. Writing skills instruments and assessment tasks

Lessons were held twice a week in the afternoon, using a ninth-grade textbook as the main instructional tool for pre- and post-tests, as well as therapy. A grade-appropriate lesson plan was also developed. The study utilized pre- and post-test writing tasks on application letters as the main assessment tools. These tasks were used to evaluate the students' writing skills based on the ninth-grade curriculum established by the Ethiopian Ministry of Education. The Ministry authorized the writing assignments from the first semester's textbook and the ninth-grade curriculum, which formed the basis for the test's content and structure. Since the writing projects were integrated into regular classroom activities, the students were already familiar with the test's format and content, aligning with the themes they were required to learn in ninth grade. The exams focused on composing an application letter for a new business position, with students expected to write a self-narrative letter of application for employment:

> Think about the following as you write your application letter. The following details should be included in a letter: the name and address of the sender, the name and address of the receiver, a salutation or greeting, the message (which may contain an introduction, commentary, and conclusion), a closing, the writer's signature, and your name.

> Based on work ethic, experience, and areas of interest (special abilities), a firm in Arba Minch City is hiring. For the purpose of applying for a job, write an application letter that summarizes your skills, experience, and interests.

The Flower and Hayes (1981) cognitive process model for writing was used to evaluate the participants' writing assignments after they were provided with information on writing development in each assessment. According to Flower and Hayes (1981), writing involves arranging various cognitive processes that writers go through. Each writing assignment carefully organizes the writing process into a hierarchical framework. The written assignments collected from the

pre-test, post-test, and treatment sessions were assessed using Ferris's (2003) writing rubrics. The researchers developed a scoring system to evaluate students' written texts in a context-based approach, inspired by Ferris's (2006) writing composition rubrics. Evaluation criteria included content, structure, language use, mechanics, grammar, and vocabulary (Refer to Appendix A).

3.4. Data collection procedures

To ensure safety, the intervention was implemented by the same instructor, who had been trained by researchers. The instructor used teacher-student writing conferences for the experimental group and daily feedback for the control group. The selected course met twice a week for nine weeks, with each session lasting 80 min during an alternative shift. The timing was communicated to the participants, the school, and the teacher before the study started. The authorized teacher who conducted the practice task and the study participants from the target school received training on how to teach writing before the study began. A copy of the text was sent to the designated teacher to maintain the integrity of the study.

The intervention in the targeted class was implemented for 12 consecutive lessons, excluding the pre- and post-treatment sessions, In the experimental group, students received writing conferences and language-focused workshops. The instructor provided orientation and theoretical background for each writing assignment, followed by oral conversations to enhance writing abilities. For example, students and the teacher met individually to discuss the initial draft of the writing exercise and offer interactive oral feedback. These face-to-face sessions took place in a well-prepared conference room in a deliberate manner. This involved teaching one day a week for 160 min, totaling 12 h.

The activities in the textbook of the targeted course were designed to help students improve their L2 writing skills. The syllabus for the targetd grade course was served as the basis for the writing conferences practice. The teacher's main role was to ask guided questions about the students' potential writing skills based on their strengths, aiming to help them discover and improve their abilities. During the meetings, students had at least 5 min to evaluate their writing skills and make necessary adjustments to address any difficulties. After the writing conferences, each student was responsible for editing their initial draft and submitting an updated version.

3.5. Instruments and their validity and reliability

Instruments were used in both pre-tests and post-tests to collect data for this investigation. The writing assignments were not specifically created for this study, but were part of the L2 writing syllabus that the students were following. For the pre-test and post-test, participants were required to complete job application letters. Each student was assigned four different writing projects to complete in class over the nine-week intervention. Students had to write a minimum of 150 words in their application letter within 60 min for each assignment, which included a scenario for cover letter writing practice.

There are various types of validity that fall under construct validity. The validity test in this study was used to evaluate the instruments' construct validity. At various points during the data collection process, it was considered that construct validity could be assessed as it is a psychological and affective concept that cannot be verified by statistical measurement. Therefore, if the data collection instrument includes the necessary information to write an essay, construct validity may be considered maintained. Thirty papers were randomly selected from the written papers that pilot project participants submitted to assess the inter-rater reliability of the data collection tool. Each essay was scored three times to accommodate the three raters. Subsequently, a correlation coefficient of 0.89 was calculated to determine inter-rater reliability. This indicates that the data collection instrument is both acceptable and reliable.

3.6. Data analysis

The independent variable in the study was the writing conferences between teachers and students, while the dependent variables were L2 writing skills, specifically content, organization, language usage, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. Two stages of data collection were conducted to investigate the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variables. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to determine if the outcomes of L2 writing skills were normal. The significance levels for the pretest and post-test scores for L2 writing abilities were 0.39 and 0.34, respectively, both above 0.05. The Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was used to evaluate whether the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables were the same for all groups. The results showed no significant difference in covariance matrices in the post-test ($F(15) = 1.317$; $p = 0.182$) and pre-test ($F(15) = 1.029$; $p = 0.421$), respectively. Therefore, the research questions addressed in this study were analyzed using the parametric process of Multivariate Analysis of Variances (MANOVA). This study aimed to identify variations in mean scores between the pretest and posttest and determine if the treatments had a statistically significant impact on Ethiopian high school students' L2 writing abilities.

3.7. Ethical consideration

The data in the manuscript is original and accurately depicts the impact of teacher-student writing conferences on the L2 writing proficiency of Ethiopian high school students. This work has not been published anywhere in any form or language, in full or in part. The results are presented honestly, concisely, and without any erroneous data modification. Any knowledge or ideas that have been represented as the author's own are properly credited to the works of others and used with permission. Additionally, before the study began, signed consent forms with informed consent were collected from all participating students and their parents. With permission from their parents, the students participated voluntarily. They were informed that the information they provided would be kept private and used solely for the study.

4. Findings

The main goal of the data analysis portion was to find the answers to the research questions of the study. The dependent variable (L2 writing skills; content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics) and the independent variables (teacher-student writing conference) of the two groups (experimental and control) were examined throughout the data analysis process. The research topics were explored using the pre- and post-test results, as outlined below.

4.1. The pre-test results of writing skills

The first research issue of the study was addressed using pre-test data. An analysis was conducted to determine the comparability of participants before treatment, using descriptive statistics such as mean values and standard deviations of L2 writing skills scores. Writing abilities were evaluated based on three specific components: grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics; content; and organization. The methodology for this study, as outlined in Table 1, was MANOVA. Mean values and standard deviations were used to assess participants' competency in content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics.

The descriptive statistics of L2 writing abilities, including means and standard deviations, are shown in Table 1 from a research study that examined the linguistic backgrounds of high school students in relation to their pre-test writing abilities. The mean and standard deviation for each writing skill in the pre-test for the experimental and control groups were as follows: language use or grammar (M = 6.59; SD = 1.00 and M = 7.16; SD = 0.94), vocabulary (M = 6.64; SD = 1.43 and M = 6.77; SD = 1.22), content (M = 6.43; SD = 0.71 and M = 6.74; SD = 0.67),

Table 1
Descriptive statistics of pre-test writing skills.

Writing skills	Groups	N	M	SD
Content/Idea	Experimental	33	6.43	0.71
	Control	30	6.74	0.67
	Total	63	6.58	0.70
Organization	Experimental	33	6.60	1.02
	Control	30	7.00	0.94
	Total	63	6.79	1.00
Language use or Grammar	Experimental	33	6.59	1.08
	Control	30	7.16	0.94
	Total	63	6.86	1.05
Vocabulary	Experimental	33	6.64	1.43
	Control	30	6.77	1.22
	Total	63	6.70	1.32
Mechanics	Experimental	33	6.55	1.28
	Control	30	6.67	0.99
	Total	63	6.60	1.14

organization (M = 6.60; SD = 1.02 and M = 6.67; SD = 0.94), and mechanics (M = 6.55; SD = 1.28 and M = 6.67; SD = 0.99), respectively. However, it cannot be determined if there are statistically significant differences between the two groups in the pre-test session based on mean values and standard deviations alone. To evaluate any statistically significant variations in the between-subjects effects of students' writing assessments, a MANOVA test was performed. The Wilks' Lambda statistical result was not significant (F(61) = 1.452, p = 0.220, η2 = 0.115), and MANOVA statistics were used to analyze the overall findings of the research participants. The elements of writing proficiency were computed, as indicated in Table 2.

According to Table 2, a statistically significant level of 0.05 was used to guide the MANOVA analysis of the writing skills calculated findings. This indicates that, prior to the teacher-student writing conference intervention, language use or grammar shows a significant difference (F (1,61) = 4.269, p = 0.043, η2 = 0.066), but content (F(1,61) = 2.90, p = 0.094, η2 = 0.046), organization (F(1,61) = 2.88, p = 0.095, η2 = 0.046), vocabulary (F(1,61) = 0.10, p = 0.756, η2 = 0.002), and mechanics (F(1,61) = 0.21, p = 0.650, η2 = 0.003) do not significantly differ between the experimental and control groups of the study. As indicated by p > 0.05 at the 0.05 significance level or 95% confidence level, the pre-test results in Table 2 show that there is a significant difference in one L2 writing skill but no statistically significant differences between the control and experimental groups in the other four L2 writing skills. This indicates that although language usage and grammar varied significantly between the two research groups, the other four writing abilities of high school students did not differ statistically before the intervention. The pre-test results showed that, although there was a difference in one writing skill (language use or grammar), L2 writing students had similar language backgrounds in their four writing skills (content, organization, vocabulary, and mechanics) prior to treatment. This suggests that the study's findings would not be impacted by the

students' prior language proficiency. The language usage or grammar variable's eta effect size (η2), as noted before, may be regarded as a medium effect size (6.6%) based on the Hair et al. (2013) benchmark, which designates 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 as small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively.

4.2. The writing skills results of posttest

The intervention was carried out, and ANCOVA and descriptive analysis were used to examine the L2 students' writing test outcomes. This was carried out due to the fact that Table 3 indicates a substantial difference in the pre-test results between the experimental and control groups, namely in language use and grammar.

According to Table 3, the post-test results of the experimental and control groups revealed descriptive statistics for the L2 writing abilities of the students, including content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. The metrics showed the following results: content (M = 10.15, SD = 2.36 and M = 9.01, SD = 2.72); organization (M = 11.00, SD = 2.44 and M = 9.23, SD = 2.68); vocabulary (M = 10.21, SD = 2.32 and M = 6.92, SD = 1.77); grammar/language use (M = 6.54, SD = 1.46 and M = 6.47, SD = 0.66); and mechanics (M = 10.52, SD = 2.46 and M = 6.98, SD = 1.58). To determine if there were statistically significant differences between the two groups during the pre-test session, mean values and standard deviations alone were not enough. An ANCOVA test was conducted to investigate if there were any statistically significant variations in the students' writing, as shown in Table 4.

Even though the Wilks' Lambda statistical result (F(1,61) = 52.000, p = 0.000, η2 = 0.524) was not statistically significant, Table 4 findings showed that the three L2 writing skills components exhibited a statistically significant difference in the pre-test results. The results revealed significant differences at the 0.05 alpha level in the following areas:

Table 3
Descriptive statistics of pat-test writing skills.

Writing skills	Groups	N	M	SD
Content/Idea	Experimental	33	10.15	2.36
	Control	30	9.01	2.72
	Total	63	9.61	2.58
Organization	Experimental	33	11.00	2.44
	Control	30	9.23	2.68
	Total	63	10.16	2.69
Language use or Grammar	Experimental	33	6.54	1.46
	Control	30	6.47	0.66
	Total	63	6.50	1.15
Vocabulary	Experimental	33	10.21	2.32
	Control	30	6.92	1.77
	Total	63	8.65	2.65
Mechanics	Experimental	33	10.52	2.46
	Control	30	6.98	1.58
	Total	63	8.83	2.73

Table 2
Writing skills analysis using MANOVA (df = 1, 61).

Variables		Tests between-Subjects Effects				
writing skills	Groups	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Content/idea	Experimental	1.388	1.39	2.90	0.094	0.046
	Control					
Organization	Experimental	2.800	2.800	2.88	0.095	0.046
	Control					
Language use or Grammar	Experimental	4.257	4.257	4.27	0.043	0.066
	Control					
Vocabulary	Experimental	0.176	0.176	0.10	0.756	0.002
	Control					
Mechanics	Experimental	0.279	0.279	0.21	0.650	0.003
	Control					

Table 4
Writing skills analysis using MANOVA (df = 6, 61).

writing skills		Tests between-Subjects Effects				
	Groups	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Content/idea	Experimental	21.13	21.13	3.637	0.062	0.061
	Control					
Organization	Experimental	45.77	45.77	7.297	0.009	0.115
	Control					
Language use or Grammar	Experimental	1.24	1.24	1.285	0.262	0.022
	Control					
Vocabulary	Experimental	153.66	153.66	32.768	0.000	0.369
	Control					
Mechanics	Experimental	194.00	194.00	42.881	0.000	0.434
	Control					

mechanics (F(1,61) = 42.881, p = 0.000; η2 = 0.434), language (F (1,61) = 32.768, p = 0.000), and organization (F(1,61) = 7.297, p = 0.009, η2 = 0.115). In contrast, there were no statistically significant differences in the two L2 writing skills: language usage or grammar (F (1,61) = 1.285, p = 0.262; η2 = 0.022) and content (F(1,61) = 3.637, p = 0.062; η2 = 0.061). Therefore, the post-test results in Table 4 presented two types of results. The first type showed statistically significant differences in three L2 writing skills (organization, vocabulary, and mechanics) between the experimental and control groups, indicated by p > 0.05 at the 0.05 significance level or 95% confidence level. Following the teacher-student writing conferences, there were statistically significant disparities in the writing skills of high school students, suggesting differences in their writing abilities. The results imply that modifications occurred following the teacher-student writing conferences. Based on the three writing skills results (memory, organization, and mechanics) and the statistically significant differences in writing skills after the teacher-student writing conference intervention, teacher-student writing conferences are an effective pedagogical strategy for teaching L2 writing in Ethiopia. The findings also suggest that the treatments administered to the experimental group throughout the study's intervention led to these modifications.

According to the benchmark of Hair et al. (2013), with values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 for small, medium, and large effect sizes in vocabulary and mechanics, the aforementioned eta effect size (η2) may be considered a medium effect size (η2 = 0.115) in organization and large effect sizes (η2 > 0.15) in those areas, respectively. This indicates meaningful correlations between the independent and dependent variables in the research. The three writing skills (organization, vocabulary, and mechanics) were the dependent variables, and the independent variable, the teacher-student writing conference, significantly influenced them. The effects of teacher-student writing conferences on L2 writing skills were as follows: mechanics (43.4%), vocabulary (369.9%), and organization (11.5%). Therefore, feedback from teachers to students can aid in improving the structure, vocabulary, and mechanics of their L2 writing.

5. Discussion

It is not yet known if certain writing conferences are more open to criticism than others, despite ongoing research on the subtleties and complexity of teacher-student writing conferences (Ferris, 2003, 2010; Wondim et al., 2023). Previous studies had limited theoretical implications (e.g., Alfalagg, 2020; Bayraktar, 2013; Solhi and Eğinli, 2020; Suthipiyapathra, 2021), so the main aim of this study was to improve the impact of teacher-student writing conferences on Ethiopian students' L2 writing skills. This research aims to contribute to the understanding of the connection between L2 writing skills and writing conferences, as discussed by Alfalagg (2020). Before implementing the intervention, the study first evaluated the comparability of the participant groups due to the quasi-experimental approach used. No statistically significant changes were found in the writing skills of the experimental and control

groups, although there was a significant difference in language use and grammar before the intervention. The data also revealed variations in vocabulary, organization, content, and mechanics, indicating that one of the dependent variables crucial to the study's goal for subsequent intervention stages differed among the participant groups.

The second research question explored whether teacher-student writing conferences have comparable impacts on the writing abilities of L2 students in Ethiopian high schools, as shown by the immediate post-test results. The organizational, vocabulary, and writing mechanics scores of the L2 learners in the experimental group significantly improved from the pre-test to the immediate post-test. Therefore, it can be concluded that writing conferences between teachers and students greatly influence these three writing abilities in Ethiopian high school students. However, in terms of content and language usage or grammar, teacher-student writing conferences had no effect. Given that writing requires students to organize their thoughts in a written format, Gebremariam and Hiluf (2023) argue that writing abilities are essential to education. The results related to organization, vocabulary, and mechanics align with the findings of Wondim et al. (2023), who found that receiving corrective feedback significantly improved L2 writing achievement. Further research on the impact of corrective feedback on writing accuracy was conducted by Solhi and Eğinli (2020), who concluded that any form of feedback is better than none at all.

There were no statistically significant differences between the experimental and control groups in terms of the two writing abilities (content and language or grammar). Additionally, the two L2 writing skills did not show much improvement as a result of teacher-student writing conferences. This finding aligns with Ghoorchaei et al., (2022) research, which found that receiving instructors' feedback did not enhance students' short-term recall of subject-verb agreement or improve academic exam results. Similarly, Alharrasi (2019) found that students' writing accuracy regarding spatial prepositions improved with instructors' written correction feedback. Chandler (2004) also found that students' recall of grammatical accuracy in writing was not affected by corrective comments. These results are consistent with Gebremariam and Hiluf's (2023) findings that students with poor performance levels may struggle to recognize and correct their mistakes.

Therefore, the results of this study partially support other research suggesting that engaging writing exercises can enhance teacher-student writing conferences (Adawiyah, 2019; Nazerian et al., 2021; Yeh, 2017). These exercises are not only beneficial in improving the quality of students' writing assignments (Suthipiyapathra, 2021; Yang, 2022) but also play a crucial role in enhancing L2 writing performance (Galloway-Speight, 2021; Widiati et al., 2023). However, research indicates that writing conferences between teachers and students can yield both accurate and inaccurate results (Shvidko, 2016). If there is a noticeable difference before the implementation of teacher-student writing conferences and no clear correlation between the two, the effectiveness of the intervention method is called into question, impacting students' L2 writing skills (Yang, 2022). The results of teacher-student interactions also vary (Bayraktar, 2013). One

interpretation of this study's results on L2 writing abilities is that writing conferences between teachers and students remain a debated topic. Nevertheless, as this study suggests, writing conferences can help second language learners develop their organization, vocabulary, and mechanics. Thus, writing conferences may or may not aid in the development of L2 writers' skills as they begin writing.

On the contrary, the results contradict earlier research in the literature (Adawiyah, 2019; Bayraktar, 2013; Liu et al., 2024; Sahle et al., 2023; Suthipiyapathra, 2021; Woreta and Gebremariam, 2023), which found no significant impact of teachers' feedback on L2 students' writing accuracy. This study's results indicate that there was no beneficial impact of teacher-student writing conferences on the language usage, grammar, and content of L2 students in a writing setting, as measured by posttest scores. This suggests that improving Ethiopian high school students' L2 writing skills through teacher-student writing conferences alone is insufficient. Teachers should focus more on providing opportunities for writing accuracy rather than solely focusing on grammatical correction in their writing classes, despite the literature emphasizing its importance for language acquisition. They should also allow for a longer writing period to enable language learners to engage in teacher-student writing conferences.

6. Conclusions

To obtain more significant research findings, similar studies could be replicated in the future under different ecological conditions. Writing conferences between teachers and students may be more beneficial and motivating for students to enhance their writing skills than instructor criticism. While teacher-student writing conferences may not directly impact L2 writing skills, they could be beneficial for new academic writing projects, research at varying competency levels, and feedback techniques. The teacher-student writing conferences method was integrated into the existing writing course, encouraging students to take ownership of their learning. Despite this requirement, students in the experimental group outperformed those in the control group. This could be attributed to the experimental group's students learning how to enhance their writing skills and conduct teacher-student writing conferences.

Previous studies have explored the effects of teacher-student writing conferences on second language learners' writing, but challenges remain in effectively observing and guiding various forms of student-teacher feedback. These modalities are crucial to the writing feedback process and collaborative learning in general. Further research on teacher-student writing conferences could provide deeper insights into L2 writing theories through real classroom studies, shedding more light on this complex field of study. Therefore, additional research may be necessary to fully understand how teacher-student writing conferences influence L2 writing. Writing conferences between teachers and students are part of a broader curriculum that includes ecologically sound writing assignments and relevant revision exercises for second language learners. These conferences are conducted with the aim of benefiting students. Future research could explore how other learner characteristics, such as L1 context, skill levels, and gender, interact with each other. These variables were not examined in the current study.

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate

Human participants involved in the studies were informed that they could voluntarily take part in the study, and that the results would be used for educational research purposes. The patients/participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study. The study's ethical progress was also reviewed by two senior professors and approved by the standing committee, Department Graduate Committee (DGC) of Ethiopian Languages and Literature, College of Social Science and Humanities, Arba Minch University.

Conflict of Competing Interests

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any potential conflicts of interest with regards to the research, authorship, financial, and/or publication of this article.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Kumneger Chenekew Goshu: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Project administration, Investigation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Hailay Tesfay Gebremariam:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Supervision, Resources, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Conceptualization.

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.

Appendix A. Essay Writing Skills Rubrics

Content

The overall content of the essay should convey a clear message and be of a reasonable length. The ideas presented should be clear, profound, and well-developed, with a specific purpose and focus.

5 The essay has a clear message with minimal gaps; most ideas are deep, clear, and relevant to the topic, but some details may be lacking.
4 The essay communicates the subject's message, but may contain occasional repetition and unnecessary ideas.
3 The essay lacks a clear message and may include repetition and irrelevant ideas.
2 The essay lacks clarity, coherence, and important ideas, making it confusing and unclear.
1 The essay lacks clear ideas and a coherent message.

Organization of Ideas

The essay should include clear introduction, body, and conclusion paragraphs, with appropriate transitions and supporting details.

5 The essay has well-organized paragraphs with a clear introduction, body, and conclusion.
4 The essay may contain abstract ideas that are difficult to understand, with some issues in connecting supporting sentences.
3 The essay lacks a coherent flow of ideas, with repetitive content and weak transitions.
2 The essay lacks a clear structure and may lack an introduction or conclusion.

1 The essay lacks a coherent structure and confuses the reader.

Choice and Use of Words

The essay should use appropriate and effective language, with no vague or inappropriate statements.

5 The essay uses precise and appropriate language with no vague or inappropriate statements.
4 The essay includes a variety of word choices, but may have some usability issues.
3 The essay contains unclear and difficult-to-understand words.
2 The essay includes many meaningless and confusing words.
1 The essay is filled with incomprehensible words that hinder understanding.

Grammatical Accuracy

The essay should demonstrate correct word and sentence structure.

5 The essay has correct word and sentence structure throughout.
4 The essay may have some possessive clause agreement and word structure issues.
3 The essay contains simple grammatical errors that may affect communication.
2 The essay has numerous grammatical errors that hinder understanding.
1 The essay is riddled with grammatical errors that make it incomprehensible.

Writing Mechanics

The essay should be free of spelling and punctuation errors.

5 The essay has very few spelling and punctuation errors.
4 The essay may have occasional formatting, spelling, or punctuation issues.
3 The essay contains consistent spelling and punctuation problems.
2 The essay is plagued by formatting, spelling, and punctuation errors.
1 The essay is so poorly written that it is not communicative.

Note: By following these guidelines, educators can effectively assess and provide feedback on students' essay writing skills.

References

Adawiyah, R., 2019. The implementation of writing conference in teaching essay writing to the English department students in the university. Retain 7 (3), 30–39.

AL Harrasi, K.T.S., 2023. Reexamining feedback in the context of different rhetorical patterns of writing. Lang. Test. Asia 13 (4), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00216-6.

Al Zahrani, S., Chaudhary, A., 2020. Error analysis in the written compositions of EFL students: a classroom study. Int. J. Engl. Ling. 10 (3), 357–366. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n2p357.

Alfalagg, A., 2015. ESL/EFL students' use of conjunctions to maintain cohesion in academic writing. Global English-Oriented Research Journal 1 (1), 29–42.

Alfalagg, A.R., 2020. Impact of teacher-student writing conferences on frequency and accuracy of using cohesive devices in EFL students' writing. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education 5 (1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00104-z.

Algrim, L., 2013. Writing conferences: the power of a teacher's feedback. Mich. Read J. 45 (2). Article 9. Available at: https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mrj/vol45/iss2/9.

Alharrasi, S.N.M., 2019. The Effectiveness of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Improving the Grammatical Accuracy of Omani EFL Learners. University of Sterling *[Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]*. http://hdl.handle.net/1893/29846.

Bayraktar, A., 2013. Nature of interactions during teacher-student writing conferences, revisiting the potential effects of self-efficacy beliefs. Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research 50, 63–86.

Carless, D., Boud, D., 2018. The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. Assess Eval. High Educ. 43 (8), 1315–1325. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354.

Chandler, J., 2004. A response to Truscott. J. Sec Lang. Writ. 13 (4), 345–348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.05.001.

Dinsa, M.T., 2023. EFL students' writing strategies use in Ethiopia: gender and year level. Cogent Education 10 (2), 2256207. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2256207.

Ferris, D., 2003. Response to Students Writing: Implications for Second-Language Students. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, USA. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410607201.

Ferris, D., 2006. Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In: Hyland, K., Hyland, F. (Eds.), Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues. Cambridge University Press, pp. 81–104.

Ferris, D.R., 2004. The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime?). J. Sec Lang. Writ. 13 (1), 49–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.005.

Ferris, D.R., 2010. Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: intersections and practical applications. Stud. Sec. Lang. Acquis. 32 (2), 181–201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490.

Flower, L., Hayes, J.R., 1981. A cognitive process theory of writing. Coll. Compos. Commun. 32, 365–387. https://doi.org/10.2307/356600.

Fonkamo, D., Zeru, A., 2022. Exploring the impediments on the application of reflective teaching in EFL paragraph writing classes. Cogent Education 9 (1), 2109648. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2109648.

Galloway-Speight, A.N., 2021. Using blended learning and writing conferences to develop high schoolers' writing skills and self-regulated learning (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from. https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/6507.

Gebremariam, H.T., 2024. In-service teacher trainees experience and preference for online learning environments during Covid-19 pandemic. Heliyon 10 (8), e29505. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29505.

Gebremariam, H.T., 2023. Language teacher's experience and preference towards online learning platforms during covid-19 pandemic. Education Research International 2023 (2), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/9932873.

Gebremariam, H.T., Asgede, D.M., 2023. Effects of students' self-reflection on improving essay writing achievement among Ethiopian undergraduate students: a counterbalanced design. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education 8 (1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-023-00203-7.

Gebremariam, H.T., Hiluf, B., 2023. Using need-based writing instruction through self-reflection to improve students' writing difficulties: a counterbalanced design. International Journal of Educational Research Open 5, 100293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2023.100293.

Gebremariam, H.T., Sisay, A.B., 2024. Reflective practice in higher education institutions: exploring teachers' reflective experiences and challenges in Ethiopian public universities. Interchange 55 (1), 10780. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-024-09526-x.

Ghoorchaei, B., Mamashloo, F., Ayatollahi, M.A., Mohammadzadeh, A., 2022. Effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on Iranian EFL writers' short and long term retention of subject-verb agreement. Cogent Education 9 (1), 2014022. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.2014022.

Golpour, F., Ahour, T., Ahangari, S., 2019. Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs and practices regarding writing activities and class organization. Cogent Education 6 (1), 1651812. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1651812.

Hair, J.F., Ringle, C.M., Sarstedt, M., 2013. Partial least squares structural equation modeling: rigorous applications, better results and higher acceptance. Long. Range Plan. 46 (1–2), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2013.01.001.

Hiluf, B., Alemu, M., Gebremariam, H.T., 2024. Exploring the links between emotional intelligence and writing performance among Ethiopian high school learners. Cogent Education 11 (1), 2369970. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2369970.

Huisman, B., Saab, N., van Driel, J., van den Broek, P., 2018. Peer feedback on academic writing: undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. Assess Eval. High Educ. 43 (6), 955–968. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1424318.

Hyland, K., Hyland, F., 2006. Feedback on second language students' writing. Lang. Teach. 39 (2), 83–101. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399.

Jang, J.J., 2022. An exploratory study on learner agency and second language writing practices of Korean high school students. Asian. J. Second. Foreign. Lang. Educ. 7, 31. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00158-1.

Kang, E., Han, Z., 2015. The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: a meta-analysis. Mod. Lang. J. 99 (1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12189.

Khanlarzadeh, M., Nemati, M., 2016. The effect of written corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy of EFL students: an improvement over previous unfocused designs. Iran. J. Lang. Teach. Res. 4 (2), 55–68. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306216646.

Kim, S., 2012. Measuring linguistic accuracy in an EFL writing class: anelectronic communication channel. Linguistic Research 29 (3), 665–688. https://doi.org/10.17250/khisli.29.3.201212.0106.

Kocaman, O., Maral, B., 2022. Effects of explicit corrective feedback on writing skill: a private middle school example. The Literacy Trek 8 (1), 108–120. https://doi.org/10.47216/literacytrek.1121256.

Liu, S., Reynolds, B.L., Thomas, N., Soyoof, A., 2024. The use of digital technologies to develop young children's language and literacy skills: a systematic review. Sage Open. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241230850.

Murray, T.J., Pipino, L.L., Gigch, J.P., 1985. A pilot study of fuzzy set modification of delphi. Human System Management 5, 76–80.

Nazerian, S., Abbasian, G., Mohseni, A., 2021. Measurement and incorporation of ZPD scenarios in developing writing accuracy in EFL classes. Cogent Education 8 (1), 1968735. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1968735.

Polio, C., 2012. The relevance of second language acquisition theory to the written error correction debate. J. Sec Lang. Writ. 21, 375–389. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.004.

Rahmat, N.H., Thasrabiab, T., Taib, S.A., Jenal, N., Sukimin, I.S., Zamani, N.F.M., Amir, N., 2022. Perception of difficulties and learners' reasons in academic writing: a self-imposed prophecy. Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci. 12 (10), 531–543. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v12-i10/14870.

Rahimi, M., 2019. A comparative study of the impact of focused vs. comprehensive corrective feedback and revision on ESL learners' writing accuracy and quality. Lang. Teach. Res. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819879182.

Sahle, S., Siawk, Y.A., Gebremariam, H.T., 2023. Effects of peer-editing on L2 writing achievement among secondary school students in Ethiopia. Cogent Education 10 (1), 2211467. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2211467.

Sarvestani, M.S., Pishkar, K., 2015. The effect of written corrective feedback on writing accuracy of intermediate learners. Theor. Pract. Lang. Stud. 5 (10), 2046–2052. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0510.10.

Shrestha, P.N., 2022. Examining evaluative language used in assessment feedback on business students' academic writing. Assess. Writ. 54, 100664 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2022.100664.

Shvidko, E., 2016. Relationship-building through embodied feedback: teacher-student alignment in writing conferences. Open Access Dissertations 1001. https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/open_access_dissertations/1001.

Solhi, M., Eğinli, I., 2020. The effect of recorded oral feedback on EFL learners' writing. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies 16 (1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.712628.

Suthipiyapathra, S., 2021. Effects of teacher-student conference on paragraph writing of EFL students in Thailand. Universal Journal of Educational Research 9 (7), 1385–1394. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2021.090705.

Teo, S.C., Lilian, A., Koo, A.C., 2023. Examining the effects of academic motivation and online learning on Malaysian tertiary students' psychological well-being and perceived learning performance. Cogent Education 10 (1), 2186025. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2186025.

Troia, G.A., Olinghouse, N.G., Mo, Y., Hawkins, L., Kopke, R.A., Wilson, J., Stewart, A., 2015. Academic standards for writing: to what degree do standards signpost evidence-based instructional practices and interventions? Elem. Sch. J. 116 (2), 291–321.

Vygotsky, L., 1978. Mind in Society: the Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Werani, A., 2018. Inner speech and its impact on teaching and learning. In: Lantolf, J.P., Poehner, M.E., Swain, M. (Eds.), The Routledge Handbook of Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Development. Routledge, pp. 136–152.

Widiati, M.U., Darwin, D.R., Indrawati, I., 2023. The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students' writing: EFL teachers' perspective. Cogent Education 10 (2), 2236469. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2236469.

Wondim, B.M., Bishaw, K.S., Zeleke, Y.T., 2023. Effects of teachers' written feedback on the writing acheivement of first-year Ethiopian university students. Education Research International, 7129978. https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/7129978.

Wendimu, S.G., Gebremariam, H.T., 2024. Teacher-students collaboration: using guided-writing instruction to assist learners with writing difficulties and low motivation to write. Sage Open. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241258020.

Woreta, F., Gebremariam, H.T., 2023. Peer feedback skill training to improve students' writing skills. Scope 13 (4), 671–679.

Yang, L., 2022. Focus and interaction in writing conferences for EFL writers. Sage Open 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211058200.

Y̆epni, S.B., 2016. A replication study: oral corrective feedback on L2 writing; two approaches compared. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 232, 520–528. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.072.

Yeh, C.C., 2017. Shared time, shared problems? Exploring the dynamics of paired writing conferences. Pedagogies: Int. J. 12 (3), 256–274. https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480x.2017.1356232.

Yoshida, R., 2008. Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. Lang. Aware. 17 (1), 78–93. https://doi.org/10.2167/la429.0.

Yoshida, R., 2010. How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom? Mod. Lang. J. 94 (2), 293–314. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01022.x.

Yu, L., 2020. Investigating L2 writing through tutor-tutee interactions and revisions: a case study of a multilingual writer in EAP tutorials. J. Sec Lang. Writ. 48 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100709.

Yüce, E., Aksu, A.B., 2019. Peer editing as a way of developing ELT students' writing skills: an action research. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies 15 (4), 1226–1235. https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.668377.

Yusuf, Q., Jusoh, Z., Yusuf, Y.Q., 2019. Cooperative learning strategies to enhance writing skills among second language learners. Int. J. InStruct. 12 (1), 1399–1412.

Kumneger Chenekew Goshu is now at College of Social Science and Humanities, Arba Minch University, Arba Minch, Ethiopia.

Hailay Tesfay Gebremariam is now at the college of Social Science and Humanities, Arba Minch University, Arba Minch, Ethiopia.