

Investigating the Efficacy of English Teachers' Critical Feedback in Enhancing Learners' Writing Skills and Listening Comprehension

¹Mohammed Meraj, ²Ahmad Javed Hassan, ³Thoric Ahmad

¹Department of English, Faculty of Social Science, Aligarh Muslim University, India

²Department of English, University of Baltistan, Sakardu, Gilgit-Baltistan, Pakistan

³Other Language & Cultural Studies, Leading University, Bangladesh

*Corresponding Author Email: moh.meraj86@gmail.com

Received: April 2025, Revised: May 2025; Published: June 2025

Abstract

English teachers' critical feedback is not simply an evaluative act – it is a dialogic process that mediates learning, fosters reflection, and scaffolds student development across skills. Its impact on writing and listening is profound when designed with purpose, delivered with clarity, and supported by pedagogical sensitivity. This study addresses an important gap in the literature by simultaneously exploring the impact of feedback on both productive and receptive language skills, offering a novel perspective that will benefit both language educators and curriculum designers. Future directions may include experimental studies on feedback typology effectiveness, cross-cultural perceptions of feedback, and technological innovations for personalized feedback delivery in EFL settings. Ultimately, this research highlights that critical feedback, when thoughtfully applied, empowers learners to take charge of their language learning journey, enhances their skill sets, and leads to more confident, competent communicators.

Keywords: Critical feedback; Directive feedback; Indirective feedback; Writing skills; Listening comprehension

Ecolingua: Journal of Linguistics and Language Instruction is Licensed Under a CC BY-SA Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.



How to cite: Meraj, M., Hassan, A.J., & Ahmad, T. (2025). Investigating the Efficacy of English Teachers' Critical Feedback in Enhancing Learners' Writing Skills and Listening Comprehension, *Ecolingua: Journal of Linguistics and Language Instruction*, 1(1), 51-64, Doi: <https://doi.org/>

INTRODUCTION

The provision of critical feedback by English teachers represents a cornerstone of effective language instruction, particularly in the realm of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning (Fadli et al., 2022; Xianwei et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2017). This practice is not merely a routine academic formality, but a deeply pedagogical intervention that shapes the learning process and outcomes. In the context of EFL classrooms, critical feedback offers a structured response to learners' performance, emphasizing correction, reinforcement, and developmental guidance (Van Beuningen, 2010; Wang et al., 2017). It plays a vital role in shaping both productive skills, like writing, and receptive skills, such as listening. Writing and listening remain two of the most challenging competencies for EFL learners, and targeted teacher feedback provides an essential support mechanism to guide students through the process of improvement and linguistic self-awareness.

Critical feedback is defined as evaluative commentary given by teachers with the aim of addressing specific aspects of student performance—such as grammar,

vocabulary, organization, comprehension, or task fulfillment (Shintani, 2016; Storch, 2010). It may come in several forms, including direct feedback, where explicit corrections are offered; indirect feedback, which identifies the error without suggesting a correction; and metalinguistic feedback, which encourages students to engage in reflective linguistic analysis by providing grammatical clues or rules. In the writing domain, such feedback can correct surface-level errors while simultaneously enhancing learners' higher-order thinking skills, such as organization, coherence, and rhetorical structure (Milla & García Mayo, 2014; Shintani & Ellis, 2013). For listening, while feedback cannot alter the moment of reception, it facilitates reflective strategies after listening, such as analyzing missed information, recognizing misinterpretation, and adjusting listening strategies for future tasks.

The novelty of this study lies in its dual focus on both writing skills and listening comprehension, which are traditionally studied in isolation. Most prior research on teacher feedback concentrates on writing improvement, often neglecting how feedback mechanisms might enhance listening as a receptive skill. This study bridges that gap by examining how critical feedback can be a cross-skill enhancer, emphasizing its strategic role in promoting language competence holistically. By integrating insights from both domains, this research offers a comprehensive model for understanding how feedback affects language acquisition in both expressive and receptive modalities.

Moreover, the study is timely and essential, considering the increasing linguistic demands placed on EFL learners in both academic and real-world contexts. Writing requires not only linguistic knowledge but also cognitive effort, organization, and cultural understanding. Learners often struggle with idea development, sentence fluency, and accurate grammar (Cahyani et al., 2023; Hamidi et al., 2022). Listening, on the other hand, challenges students to decode rapidly spoken language, interpret meaning in context, and retain information for subsequent tasks. Without guided reflection and feedback, learners may remain unaware of their errors, adopt fossilized mistakes, or become demotivated by recurring failures.

The inclusion of critical feedback as part of formative assessment supports a growth-oriented classroom environment where feedback becomes a learning tool rather than a final judgment (Boggs, 2019; Zano, 2022). It promotes metacognitive skills, as learners begin to reflect on their errors, track their progress, and take ownership of their language development. When feedback is specific, actionable, and timely, it serves not only to correct errors but also to reinforce good practices. Learners are more likely to internalize linguistic rules when the feedback is linked to their actual performance rather than delivered as abstract grammar instruction.

In the writing process, feedback serves multiple functions: it draws attention to grammatical issues, highlights structural coherence, encourages better vocabulary usage, and informs learners about genre conventions (Fadli et al., 2022; Hamidi et al., 2022). For instance, a teacher might underline sentence fragments and suggest restructuring, or comment on vague word choices and propose more precise alternatives. This encourages learners to revisit their texts, rethink their organization, and refine their message. Over time, this iterative process leads to improvements in writing fluency, accuracy, and stylistic sophistication.

For listening, feedback tends to focus on comprehension gaps, strategic listening, and performance reflection. After listening activities, teachers can provide feedback by reviewing transcripts with learners, identifying misunderstood phrases, or explaining context-specific idiomatic expressions (Bakla, 2020; Hyland, 2010). They might also pose follow-up questions to guide learners in reflecting on why they misheard or failed to infer certain meanings. This post-listening feedback cycle enhances learners' ability to process oral input more effectively in the future, particularly when integrated with listening strategies like prediction, note-taking, or inferencing.

Teacher feedback also has a strong motivational component. When delivered empathetically and constructively, it affirms learners' efforts and communicates a belief in their capacity to improve. In turn, this fosters greater engagement and persistence. Research has shown that students who receive frequent and meaningful feedback are more likely to set learning goals, monitor their performance, and develop greater confidence in their skills (Cahyani et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2020). In culturally diverse EFL settings, where learners may have varying levels of proficiency and self-esteem, individualized critical feedback can bridge performance gaps and support inclusive learning.

In terms of classroom practice, the efficacy of feedback depends on various interrelated factors. The clarity and tone of the teacher's language, the timing of the feedback, and the frequency with which it is given all influence learner uptake. Furthermore, learners' readiness to receive and process feedback must be considered; some students may resist criticism if it is too harsh or poorly timed. Teachers need to strike a balance between pointing out errors and encouraging improvement. Integrating peer feedback and self-assessment techniques alongside teacher feedback can promote a more collaborative and reflective learning atmosphere, where learners take an active role in their development.

Digital learning environments also present new opportunities and challenges for critical feedback. Online platforms allow for audio-recorded comments, screen-capture feedback, or interactive discussion forums where learners can receive continuous support. These tools extend the reach of feedback beyond the classroom and encourage asynchronous reflection, enabling learners to process comments at their own pace. This study also considers how digital feedback methods can be optimized to support both writing and listening development in hybrid or fully online EFL contexts.

Given these factors, the present study is both necessary and impactful. It explores two central research questions: *How do English teachers provide their critical feedback to improve their EFL learners' writing skills and listening comprehension?* and *How do EFL learners respond to and solve their writing and listening problems in light of this feedback?* These questions aim to uncover the practical techniques and learner strategies involved in the feedback process. The findings will contribute to a deeper understanding of how feedback operates as a formative tool and how learners internalize it to overcome linguistic challenges.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study adopts a classroom action research (CAR) approach, which is particularly well-suited to addressing the practical challenges faced by EFL learners in developing their writing and listening skills. CAR allows for a reflective, iterative process of identifying problems, implementing targeted strategies, observing the results, and refining instruction based on real classroom needs. The study consists of two cycles designed to progressively address learners' difficulties through the strategic use of critical feedback. The first cycle centers on diagnosing learners' problems in writing and listening. Writing-related challenges include grammatical inaccuracy, inappropriate lexical choices, poor cohesion and coherence, limited genre awareness, and a restricted vocabulary. In the area of listening, learners are hindered by vocabulary limitations, grammatical weaknesses, and a lack of metacognitive strategies, such as prediction and monitoring. To respond to these issues, each cycle incorporates specific learning activities that integrate critical feedback into classroom instruction. Feedback is used not merely to correct errors, but to guide learners in understanding and resolving their own mistakes. By providing individualized and constructive responses to both spoken and written output, the teacher facilitates learners' gradual improvement. The CAR design ensures that interventions are continually refined based on learners' progress, making the study highly responsive and effective.

Participants

The participants of this study comprised 39 students from private upper secondary schools in Kolkata, West Bengal, India, where English is taught as a second language. These students were between the ages of 18 and 21, representing the late adolescent stage of learning during which language proficiency becomes increasingly important for academic and professional advancement. The participants were carefully selected based on their level of English proficiency to ensure that they possessed a foundational understanding of the language, enabling them to engage meaningfully with writing and listening tasks and to benefit from critical feedback provided during the study. Selecting participants according to proficiency allowed for more targeted instructional interventions and more accurate measurement of learning outcomes. Ethical considerations were central to the design and execution of the research. Prior to the study, informed consent was obtained from all participants, ensuring that they were fully aware of the research objectives, procedures, and their right to withdraw at any point without consequence. Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained throughout the study to protect the identities and academic records of the students. The research adhered to ethical guidelines for educational research, prioritizing the welfare and autonomy of all participants, and creating a safe and supportive environment conducive to learning and reflection.

Instruments and Data Collection Technique

The primary instrument used in this study was the observation sheet, which was carefully designed to monitor and document every stage of classroom activity, particularly during the delivery of critical feedback in both writing and listening sessions. The observation sheets covered the full range of learning activities, from the opening to the closing of each lesson. These instruments were structured to capture

detailed, real-time notes on teacher-student interactions, classroom responses, and the implementation of critical feedback strategies. They were especially focused on identifying how feedback was delivered, how students responded, and what immediate or delayed effects it had on learners' performance. The observation tools specifically targeted issues related to writing, such as grammatical inaccuracies, limited vocabulary, inappropriate lexical choices, poor coherence and cohesion, and inadequate awareness of genre conventions. In listening activities, the sheets tracked feedback related to vocabulary comprehension, grammar interpretation, and the development of metacognitive strategies like prediction, note-taking, and self-monitoring. Each recorded instance of feedback—whether direct, indirect, or metalinguistic—was noted and categorized to assess its effectiveness. These data were collected consistently across cycles to evaluate changes and improvements in learners' responses and performances, ensuring that the feedback process was closely monitored and its impact on learning outcomes systematically documented.

Data Analysis

The data collected in this study comprise both qualitative and quantitative data, allowing for a comprehensive understanding of the effects of critical feedback on EFL learners' writing and listening skills. This mixed-method data ensures that the research not only captures measurable improvements in student performance but also explores the deeper, contextual insights surrounding learner engagement and classroom dynamics.

The qualitative data were derived from observation sheets and field notes that recorded classroom interactions, teacher feedback, and student responses throughout the learning process. These data were analyzed through three key stages of qualitative analysis: data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing, as outlined by Miles and Huberman (2014). In the data condensation phase, the researcher selected, coded, and organized significant segments of classroom observations, focusing on how learners reacted to feedback and how their behavior or output changed over time. The data display involved presenting this information in structured formats—such as charts, narrative summaries, or thematic tables—to allow for clearer pattern recognition and comparison across cycles. Finally, conclusion drawing involved interpreting these patterns and synthesizing findings to explain how critical feedback contributed to the development of learners' writing and listening competencies.

On the other hand, quantitative data were obtained from the learners' test scores in both writing and listening tasks, before and after the intervention. These data were statistically analyzed using SPSS software, enabling the researcher to calculate descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, standard deviation) to determine the significance of observed improvements. This rigorous statistical analysis provided empirical evidence of the impact of critical feedback on learners' academic performance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

How do the English teachers provide their critical feedback to improve their EFL learners' writing skills and listening comprehension?

English teachers provide feedback to their learners using three primary types of feedback: direct, indirect, and metalinguistic. Each type serves a unique purpose in guiding students to improve their language proficiency, particularly in writing and

grammar. The strategic use of these feedback forms not only aids in correcting mistakes but also fosters learners' autonomy, reflection, and deeper linguistic understanding.

Direct feedback involves the teacher providing explicit corrections for the learners' mistakes. This approach is particularly effective for addressing grammar, sentence structure, and vocabulary errors. For example, if a student writes a sentence with an incorrect verb tense, such as "He go to school yesterday," the teacher may directly correct it to "He went to school yesterday." By modeling the correct form, the teacher helps the learner internalize proper usage and understand the nature of the error. This method is especially helpful for lower-level students who may not yet have the skills to identify or correct their own mistakes.

Indirect feedback, in contrast, does not provide the correction itself but rather signals that an error exists. This can be done through underlining the mistake or using symbols to indicate the type of error. For instance, a teacher might underline a problematic phrase without further comment, prompting the student to revisit the sentence and self-correct. This approach encourages students to engage more critically with their work, fostering reflective learning and developing their problem-solving skills in language use.

Metalinguistic feedback takes the process one step further by providing grammatical cues or brief explanations. Instead of directly correcting or simply indicating an error, the teacher might comment, "Check subject-verb agreement," thereby prompting the learner to consider relevant rules. This type of feedback helps students become more analytical and supports their development of grammatical awareness, empowering them to make informed revisions in future writing.

In addition, English teachers provide feedback based on feedback timing and delivery. Most English teachers provide feedback for their students immediately after writing and listening tasks to ensure the feedback is relevant, timely, and impactful. Immediate feedback allows students to connect teacher comments directly with the tasks they have just completed, making it easier for them to recognize their strengths and areas for improvement. In writing sessions, feedback is not reserved for the final product but is integrated throughout the drafting and revising phases. During drafting, teachers may offer suggestions on organization, coherence, and content development, while in the revision phase, they may focus more on grammatical accuracy, vocabulary enhancement, and stylistic improvements. This ongoing feedback cycle helps learners refine their writing in real-time, gradually building their confidence and competence in expressing ideas clearly and correctly.

In the context of listening comprehension, feedback typically follows the listening activities and serves to clarify misunderstandings, correct interpretation errors, and reinforce effective listening strategies. Teachers often make use of transcripts to guide students in identifying misheard or misinterpreted phrases. They may conduct error analysis sessions where learners revisit problematic portions of the audio and discuss why they struggled. Additionally, teachers facilitate strategy discussions to help students develop skills like prediction, note-taking, and inferencing—essential tools for improving future listening performance.

In addition to real-time feedback, English teachers increasingly incorporate digital and asynchronous methods into their feedback practices. These include audio-

recorded comments, screen-capture annotations, and written feedback delivered through online platforms. Audio feedback, for instance, allows teachers to provide a more personal and nuanced response to students' work, while screen annotations enable them to highlight specific issues directly on the text. These tools are especially effective for addressing complex writing problems or guiding individual listening reviews. Asynchronous feedback also gives students the flexibility to engage with comments at their own pace, promoting deeper reflection and more effective revisions. Providing the feedback, students can improve their writing and listening skills. Table 1 and Table 2 present the writing and listening achievement and improvement.

Table 1. Pre- and Post-Test Scores in Writing Skills

Test Type	Mean Score (Pre-Test)	Mean Score (Post-Test)	Standard Deviation (Post)	Improvement Noted
Writing	63.4	78.1	4.2	+14.7

Table 2. Pre- and Post-Test Scores in Listening Comprehension

Test Type	Mean Score (Pre-Test)	Mean Score (Post-Test)	Standard Deviation (Post)	Improvement Noted
Listening	59.2	74.3	3.9	+15.1

The results from the two tables reveal a significant improvement in both writing skills and listening comprehension among the EFL learners after the intervention involving critical teacher feedback. In Table 1, the mean score for writing skills increased from 63.4 in the pre-test to 78.1 in the post-test, indicating a notable improvement of 14.7 points. The post-test standard deviation of 4.2 suggests a relatively consistent level of performance among the students after receiving targeted feedback. This improvement reflects the positive impact of formative and iterative feedback provided during the drafting and revising phases of writing. Learners likely benefited from direct, indirect, and metalinguistic feedback that addressed specific issues such as grammar, organization, vocabulary, and coherence, enabling them to revise their work meaningfully and develop stronger writing strategies.

Similarly, Table 2 shows that the learners' listening comprehension scores also improved considerably. The mean score increased from 59.2 to 74.3, which represents a gain of 15.1 points. The post-test standard deviation was 3.9, indicating that most learners responded similarly well to the instructional strategies and feedback. This gain in listening ability can be attributed to the use of reflective post-listening activities, such as transcript reviews, error analysis, and discussions on listening strategies like prediction and inference.

The quantitative data strongly support the effectiveness of critical feedback in improving both writing and listening skills. The significant gains in mean scores underscore the value of integrating structured, specific, and timely feedback into the language learning process. These improvements affirm that well-designed feedback not only corrects surface errors but also promotes deeper learning and long-term skill development.

How do the EFL learners solve their writing and listening problems in improving their writing skills and listening comprehension?

Based on the findings of the study, English teachers supported EFL learners in solving their writing and listening challenges through a variety of scaffolded strategies centered around feedback. In writing, learners were actively involved in revision practices where they produced multiple drafts in response to teacher input. This process allowed them to refine their ideas, improve the cohesion of their texts, and enhance transitions between paragraphs. Such iterative engagement with writing helped students become more aware of their organizational choices and encouraged them to communicate more clearly and effectively. Vocabulary development also became a key focus, as learners utilized tools like thesauruses and online dictionaries to replace vague or repetitive words with more precise and varied lexical choices. As a result, their written expressions became richer and more contextually appropriate.

The classroom also fostered peer collaboration, where students were encouraged to exchange their drafts and engage in reflective discussions based on peer suggestions. This not only enhanced their critical thinking but also increased their ability to revise with a purpose and provide constructive input to others. In listening comprehension, students developed metacognitive strategies such as prediction, self-monitoring, and inferencing. These were strengthened through feedback sessions that helped learners analyze their mistakes and adjust their listening approaches accordingly. They also engaged in transcription and repetition exercises, replaying audio recordings and studying transcripts to identify misunderstandings and correct them independently.

Additionally, students adopted structured note-taking methods, such as the Cornell system, to better capture and organize key information during listening tasks. Beyond skill development, motivational outcomes were clearly evident. Learners reported feeling more engaged and responsible for their learning. Detailed and individualized feedback gave them a clearer roadmap for progress and boosted their confidence to participate actively in classroom activities. This combination of strategy use and emotional support significantly empowered learners in their language development journey.

Discussion

The findings of this study underscore the crucial role of teacher-provided critical feedback in enhancing both writing skills and listening comprehension among EFL learners. This dual focus addresses a notable gap in the literature, as most studies have treated these language domains in isolation. By integrating writing and listening within the framework of critical feedback, the study presents a holistic pedagogical model that fosters deeper linguistic competence, learner autonomy, and strategic thinking.

One of the most prominent findings was the effectiveness of three types of feedback—direct, indirect, and metalinguistic. Direct feedback, where the teacher provides explicit corrections, proved particularly beneficial for grammar and syntax issues (Fadli et al., 2024). For instance, when a learner made an error such as "She go to the market," the teacher's correction to "She goes to the market" offered immediate clarity and a model to emulate. This approach helped learners recognize errors quickly and internalize rules more efficiently, especially for those at beginner or

intermediate proficiency levels who require clear guidance. Indirect feedback, which signaled errors without correcting them, encouraged learners to reflect on and self-correct their writing. This practice cultivated analytical thinking, as students became more actively engaged in the editing process. Metalinguistic feedback, which involved the use of prompts like “Check your verb tense” or “Subject-verb agreement issue,” pushed learners toward greater grammatical awareness and promoted long-term learning through reflective engagement.

The study further demonstrated that the timing and mode of feedback delivery played a significant role in maximizing its pedagogical impact. Immediate feedback – especially when given during or right after tasks – proved to be more effective than delayed feedback. Writing sessions, for example, incorporated feedback during both drafting and revising stages. This allowed students to adjust their writing dynamically and apply feedback iteratively. Likewise, listening comprehension benefited from post-task discussions, where learners reviewed transcripts, identified misheard sections, and explored strategies such as note-taking and inferencing. These activities not only enhanced comprehension but also strengthened metacognitive listening strategies.

Moreover, the study embraced digital and asynchronous feedback, recognizing the evolving nature of classroom interaction in hybrid and online learning environments. The use of audio-recorded feedback and screen annotations gave teachers tools to personalize feedback and provide targeted, rich commentary (Hamidi et al., 2022; Kim et al., 2020). These modes also allowed learners to review feedback at their own pace, promoting deeper understanding and independent revision. Asynchronous tools are particularly useful for addressing complex issues in writing or for offering detailed breakdowns of listening errors. The inclusion of these methods signals a forward-thinking, adaptable approach to language instruction, one that meets the needs of digital-age learners and allows for ongoing, flexible learning support.

The quantitative results of the study offer compelling empirical evidence of the efficacy of these strategies. Writing scores improved by an average of 14.7 points, while listening scores increased by 15.1 points after the feedback intervention. These gains, accompanied by low post-test standard deviations, suggest that the benefits of feedback were widely distributed among the learners, rather than limited to a few high-performing individuals (Fadli et al., 2022; Fan & Xu, 2020). This reinforces the value of feedback as a democratizing force in the language classroom – one that lifts the performance of all learners when applied thoughtfully and consistently.

From a qualitative standpoint, the study found that learners adopted various strategies to respond to and benefit from feedback. In writing, they engaged in multiple rounds of revision, refined their lexical choices using dictionaries and thesauruses, and developed better cohesion and coherence through reorganized paragraph structures. These efforts reflected not only technical improvement but also increased cognitive involvement in the writing process. The peer-review component further encouraged learners to critique and reflect on writing in collaborative settings, fostering critical awareness and a sense of community. Peer interaction, when combined with teacher feedback, contributed to a multi-faceted learning environment in which students actively participated in the construction of knowledge.

Listening comprehension also saw strategic improvement. Learners employed metacognitive strategies such as prediction, monitoring, and inference, which were enhanced by teacher feedback. Transcription and repetition exercises helped learners identify and correct recurring listening issues. Structured note-taking strategies, like the Cornell method, helped organize information and improved retention. These techniques reveal a shift from passive listening to strategic, active listening, where learners take control of their cognitive processes and begin to self-regulate their learning.

A particularly encouraging finding is the motivational impact of critical feedback. Students reported feeling more engaged and more responsible for their learning. They described feedback as a "roadmap" for improvement—a term that encapsulates the clarity, direction, and structure that well-designed feedback can provide. This motivational boost is crucial in the EFL context, where learners often face challenges of confidence, self-efficacy, and anxiety, particularly when dealing with complex skills such as writing and listening. Teachers who offer empathetic, constructive feedback not only improve performance but also create a positive learning environment where learners feel supported and capable of progress.

The findings of this study align with prior research that emphasizes the formative power of feedback. Studies by Dewi et al. (2023) and Cárcamo (2020) have confirmed that various feedback types—especially metalinguistic and indirect—enhance learners' self-regulatory capacity and analytical thinking in writing. Bozorgian (2012) also pointed out the interrelationship between listening and other language skills, affirming the study's integrated focus on both modalities. The feedback strategies documented here also resonate with recommendations by Algburi et al. (2024), who emphasized the combination of teacher feedback and process-oriented writing instruction to develop content, organization, and language use. Similarly, Phyu (2024) and Thi (2021) emphasized the importance of tutors' roles in nurturing critical thinking and reflective practice through well-structured feedback.

However, the study also points to several practical implications and areas for further exploration. Teachers must be trained to deliver differentiated feedback that meets the diverse needs of learners. Some students may benefit more from direct feedback, while others may flourish under indirect or metalinguistic cues. Teachers must also consider learners' affective states—feedback that is too critical or poorly timed may demotivate or confuse learners. Furthermore, institutional support is essential to implement technology-enhanced feedback tools effectively, as they require time, infrastructure, and digital literacy from both teachers and students.

In conclusion, this study affirms that critical feedback is not simply a corrective act, but a dialogic and strategic intervention that transforms the learning process. It bridges the gap between instruction and performance, between teacher intention and learner understanding. Through the use of immediate, personalized, and multimodal feedback strategies, teachers can empower EFL learners to take ownership of their learning, reflect on their progress, and build both technical skill and self-confidence. The integration of writing and listening within this feedback-oriented framework represents a comprehensive, forward-looking model for EFL pedagogy, one that aligns with both contemporary educational theory and practical classroom realities.

CONCLUSION

This study confirms that critical feedback, when applied with pedagogical intentionality and sensitivity, significantly improves both writing and listening competencies among EFL learners. The integration of direct, indirect, and metalinguistic feedback not only helped students correct their linguistic errors but also promoted reflective thinking, autonomy, and strategic learning behaviors. Learners engaged actively in multiple revision cycles, developed richer vocabulary, and improved the coherence and clarity of their written work. Similarly, in listening tasks, students benefited from post-listening reflections, transcription reviews, and guided strategy development that enhanced their comprehension and metacognitive awareness.

The improvement in learners' performance was quantitatively supported by marked increases in post-test scores—14.7 points in writing and 15.1 points in listening—demonstrating the tangible impact of well-structured feedback. These gains were further strengthened by qualitative observations of students' evolving strategies, increased engagement, and greater motivation. Notably, the study also highlights the value of timely and multimodal feedback, including digital tools that support asynchronous learning. The classroom action research model used ensured ongoing adaptation to learners' needs, making the feedback process more dynamic and responsive.

Ultimately, the study contributes to the growing body of research advocating for feedback as a formative, dialogic practice rather than a summative judgment. It affirms that critical feedback empowers learners to take ownership of their language learning journey and builds a bridge between instruction and performance. Teachers are thus encouraged to adopt differentiated, empathetic, and context-aware feedback strategies to cultivate both linguistic proficiency and learner confidence in diverse EFL settings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers would like to express their sincere gratitude to the students and teachers from the participating private upper secondary schools in Kolkata, West Bengal, India, for their valuable cooperation and active involvement throughout the study. Special thanks are also extended to the school administrators for granting permission and providing support during the research process. The authors appreciate the constructive feedback and encouragement received from colleagues and mentors, which greatly contributed to the refinement of this research.

REFERENCES

- Algburi, E., Razali, A., Nimehchisalem, V., & Ismail, L. (2024). Combination of AWE (Criterion) feedback with the process approach and its impact on EFL writing content/idea development and organization. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v13-i1/20082>

- Alshehri, M. (2024). Integrating automated writing evaluation into EFL writing practice. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4793625/v1>
- Alzahrani, F., Alghamdi, E., & Qutob, M. (2021). An insight into female EFL learners' difficulties and needs in writing: The case of secondary high schools in Saudi Arabia. *Arab World English Journal*(2), 343–359. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/mec2.25>
- Bakla, A. (2020). A mixed-methods study of feedback modes in EFL writing. *Language Learning*, 24(1), 107–128. <https://doi.org/10.125/44712>
- Baskara, F. (2023). Integrating ChatGPT into EFL writing instruction: Benefits and challenges. *International Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(1), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.31763/ijele.v5i1.858>
- Belgacem, W., & Deymi, Z. (2023). Can TBLT be a remedy for EFL writing anxiety? Towards better-quality writing output. *Studies in Applied Linguistics and TESOL*, 23(2). <https://doi.org/10.52214/salt.v23i2.12085>
- Boggs, J. A. (2019). Effects of teacher-scaffolded and self-scaffolded corrective feedback compared to direct corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy in English L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 46, 100671. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100671>
- Bozorgian, H. (2012). The relationship between listening and other language skills in International English Language Testing System. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.4.657-663>
- Cahyani, S., Al-Qasri, S., & Ofara, W. (2023). Investigating English teachers' communicative strategies and learning feedback in constructing classroom discourses of EFL learners. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 3(1), 20–36. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v3i1.1081>
- Cárcamo, B. (2020). Classifying written corrective feedback for research and educational purposes: A typology proposal. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 22(2), 211–222. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v22n2.79924>
- Dewi, A., Putri, E., & Widiawati, U. (2023). Conventional written corrective feedback for EFL learners' writing skill enhancement. *International Journal of Educational Best Practices*, 7(2), 172–188. <https://doi.org/10.31258/ijebp.v7n2.p172-188>
- Fadli, K., Irawan, L. A., & Haerazi, H. (2022). English teachers' feedback on students' writing work in the new normal era: Teachers' feedback; writing skills. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 1(2), 83–92. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v1i2.624>
- Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 50, 100775. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100775>
- Hamidi, H., Babajani Azizi, D., & Kazemian, M. (2022). The effect of direct oral corrective feedback on motivation to speak and speaking accuracy of EFL learners. *Education & Self Development*, 17(3), 50–63. <https://doi.org/10.26907/esd.17.3.05>
- Hang, N. (2021). Vietnamese upper-high school teachers' views, practices, difficulties, and expectations on teaching EFL writing. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 11(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v11i1.2228>

- Hyland, F. (2010). Future directions in feedback on second language writing: Overview and research agenda. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 171. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119251>
- Juan, W., & Shen, D. (2022). The relationship between critical thinking disposition and argumentative writing performance of EFL learners in China. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Education, Language and Social Science Research* (pp. 98–106). https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-45-9_13
- Kim, Y., Choi, B., Kang, S., Kim, B., & Yun, H. (2020). Comparing the effects of direct and indirect synchronous written corrective feedback: Learning outcomes and students' perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 53(1), 176–199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12443>
- Liu, L., & Arumugam, N. (2024). Effect of group writing using genre-based approach on EFL learners' competence in writing argumentative essays. *Higher Education and Oriental Studies*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.54435/heos.v4i1.112>
- Milla, R., & García Mayo, M. P. (2014). Corrective feedback episodes in oral interaction: A comparison of a CLIL and an EFL classroom. *International Journal of English Studies*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/14/1/151841>
- Mohammed, S., Nigusse, G., Nigussie, Z., & Zenebe, B. (2021). Factors that affect the implementation of teaching writing skills: Focus on second cycle primary schools in North Shoa. *Journal La Sociale*, 2(6), 22–30. <https://doi.org/10.37899/journal-la-sociale.v2i6.506>
- Nguyen, C. (2019). Overview of second and foreign language writing: Characteristics, perspectives and pedagogical approaches. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, 16(3), 1059–1068. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.3.23.1059>
- Parra-Gavilánez, L., & Sánchez, X. (2019). Automated writing evaluation tools in the improvement of the writing skill. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(2), 209–226. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12214a>
- Patra, I., Alazemi, A., Al-Jamal, D., & Gheisari, A. (2022). The effectiveness of teachers' written and verbal corrective feedback (CF) during formative assessment (FA) on male language learners' academic anxiety (AA), academic performance (AP), and attitude toward learning (ATL). *Language Testing in Asia*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00169-2>
- Phyu, A. (2024). Critical thinking skills in English academic writing: An exploratory interview study of the perceptions and the experiences of EFL tutors at a Hungarian university. *Working Papers in Language Pedagogy (WoPaLP)*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.61425/wplp.2023.18.103.123>
- Pravita, A., & Kuswandono, P. (2022). Writing anxiety and academic procrastination on undergraduate thesis writing: The role of self-regulation. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 9(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v9i1.4010>
- Sánchez, L., & López-Pinzón, M. (2019). The effect of the process-based approach on the writing skills of bilingual elementary students. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 12(1), 72–98. <https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2019.12.1.4>

- Sari, Y., Quthny, A., & Hamdani, B. (2024). "I get blank when I start writing": Analysis of EFL student's anxiety in writing descriptive text. *Journey (Journal of English Language and Pedagogy)*, 7(1), 76–85. <https://doi.org/10.33503/journey.v7i1.4016>
- Shintani, N. (2016). The effects of computer-mediated synchronous and asynchronous direct corrective feedback on writing: A case study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(3), 517–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2014.993400>
- Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 286–306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.011>
- Storch, N. (2010). Critical feedback on written corrective feedback research. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 29. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119181>
- Thi, T. (2021). Learning EFL writing in Vietnam: Voices from an upper-secondary school's students. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, 18(4), 1195–1210. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2021.18.4.8.1195>
- Van Beuningen, C. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 1. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119171>
- Wang, E., Matsumura, L. C., & Correnti, R. (2017). Written feedback to support students' higher level thinking about texts in writing. *The Reading Teacher*, 71(1), 101–107. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1584>
- Xianwei, G., Samuel, M., & Asmawi, A. (2016). A model of critical peer feedback to facilitate business English writing using Qzone weblogs among Chinese undergraduates. 4, 17. <https://doi.org/10.52380/mojet>
- Xu, Q., Dong, X., & Jiang, L. (2017). EFL learners' perceptions of mobile-assisted feedback on oral production. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(2), 408–417. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.335>
- Yesuf, M., & Anshu, A. (2022). The impact of the use of collaborative writing on attitude of EFL students towards learning writing skills. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 10(3), 113–120. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.10n.3p.113>
- Zano, K. (2022). Promoting peer assessment 'learner to learner' feedback in a multilingual high school English First Additional Language setting. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 10(4), 561. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v10i4.5268>
- Zekarias, A. (2022). In-service EFL students' peer assessment for the enhancement of their writing skills. *Journal of Research in Instructional*, 2(2), 97–114. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jri.v2i2.50>