

Oral Conferencing versus Written Feedback in EFL Writing Instruction: A Quasi-Experimental Investigation of Surface-Level Accuracy Development

Lamine Benhamlaoui

Oum El Bouaghi University, DECLIC Research Laboratory (Algeria),
lamine.benhamlaoui@univ-oeb.dz

Received: 30/01/2026

Accepted: 19/04/2026

Abstract:

This study compares oral conferencing versus written corrective feedback (WCF) for improving surface-level accuracy in EFL writing. Using a quasi-experimental design, 40 Algerian undergraduate students received either one-on-one oral conferencing or traditional written feedback over 14 weeks. Pre- and post-tests assessed capitalization, articles, punctuation, and conditionals. Results showed the oral conferencing group achieved 47% error reduction compared to 28% for written feedback, with pronounced advantages in complex structures (conditionals) and rule internalization (capitalization). Grounded in Interactionist SLA, Cognitive Load Theory, and Sociocultural Theory, findings suggest oral conferencing's dialogic nature enhances "noticing," reduces cognitive load through scaffolding, and enables immediate meaning negotiation—mechanisms absent in static written commentary. The study challenges the "red pen" paradigm and advocates integrating dialogic feedback modalities in EFL instruction.

Keywords:

Oral Conferencing; Written Corrective Feedback; EFL Writing; Surface-level Accuracy; Feedback Modality

** Lamine Benhamlaoui*

1. INTRODUCTION

The pedagogical landscape of second language (L2) writing has long been dominated by the corrective feedback debate, a controversy ignited by Truscott's (1996) provocative claim that grammar correction is not only ineffective but potentially harmful. While subsequent research has largely rehabilitated the reputation of corrective feedback (Ferris, 1999; Bitchener & Storch, 2016), the discourse has predominantly focused on the dichotomy between providing feedback versus withholding it, or on the granular distinctions between direct and indirect correction strategies. Relatively less attention has been paid to the modality of feedback delivery—specifically, the comparative efficacy of static written commentary versus dynamic oral negotiation. In many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, particularly in resource-constrained environments like Algeria, the "red pen" remains the primary instrument of instruction. Teachers spend countless hours annotating student scripts, a practice that represents a massive investment of time often met with minimal uptake by learners who may lack the linguistic proficiency to decode complex written meta-linguistic explanations (Hyland & Hyland, 2019).

This prevalence of written corrective feedback (WCF) persists despite theoretical advances in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) that emphasize interaction, negotiation of meaning, and the social construction of knowledge. The reliance on monologic written feedback assumes a transmission model of learning, wherein the teacher deposits corrective information onto the page, expecting the learner to internalize it. However, this model frequently fails to account for the cognitive load imposed by deciphering written corrections or the lack of opportunity for learners to seek clarification on ambiguous comments (Sweller, 2011). Consequently, L2 writers often repeat the same surface-level errors—issues with articles, mechanics, and syntax—despite repeated written correction.

Oral conferencing offers a compelling alternative. Defined as a face-to-face conversation between teacher and student about the student's writing, conferencing transforms feedback from a static product into a dynamic process. It shifts the pedagogical focus from error correction to error negotiation. Despite its intuitive appeal and alignment with

communicative methodologies, empirical research explicitly comparing the outcomes of oral conferencing against traditional written feedback on specific measures of linguistic accuracy remains sparse, particularly in the North African EFL context. Most existing studies on conferencing focus on qualitative perceptions or revision changes rather than longitudinal accuracy development (Ewert, 2009).

The present study addresses this gap by conducting a quasi-experimental investigation into the effects of teacher conferencing feedback versus written feedback on the writing performance of post-intermediate EFL students. Specifically, it examines whether the dialogic nature of conferencing leads to superior reduction in surface-level errors—capitalization, articles, punctuation, and conditional structures—compared to traditional written commentary. By situating this inquiry within the intersection of Interactionist, Cognitive, and Sociocultural frameworks, this article seeks to move beyond the question of *whether* to correct, toward a more nuanced understanding of *how* to correct effectively through modality.

2. Theoretical Framework

To understand the mechanisms through which oral conferencing might outperform written feedback, this study synthesizes three theoretical lenses: Interactionist SLA, Cognitive Load Theory, and Sociocultural Theory. Together, these frameworks suggest that feedback effectiveness is contingent not just on the information provided, but on the interactional and cognitive conditions underwhich it is received.

2.1 Interactionist SLA and the Negotiation of Meaning

The Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996) posits that language acquisition is facilitated through interactional modifications that occur when learners and interlocutors negotiate meaning. In the context of writing feedback, oral conferencing serves as a primary site for such negotiation. Unlike written feedback, which is unidirectional and delayed, conferencing allows for immediate "uptake" and clarification. When a teacher points out an error during a conference, the student can immediately signal a lack of understanding, prompting the teacher to modify the input—simplifying the explanation, providing examples, or rephrasing (Mackey, 2012). This process of "negotiation of meaning" draws the learner's attention to the gap

between their interlanguage and the target form, a cognitive process Schmidt (1990) termed "noticing." In contrast, written feedback often fails to trigger noticing because learners may simply glance at the grade or misunderstand the correction code without engaging in the cognitive processing required for acquisition (Bitchener, 2019).

2.2 Cognitive Load Theory and Feedback Processing

Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 1988, 2011) provides a crucial perspective on why written feedback might overwhelm L2 learners. The theory distinguishes between intrinsic load (inherent difficulty of the task), extraneous load (generated by the manner of instruction), and germane load (resources dedicated to learning). Deciphering complex written meta-linguistic comments (e.g., "agreement error" or "frag") while simultaneously attempting to revise a text imposes a high extraneous cognitive load. For lower-proficiency learners, the mental effort required to decode the teacher's handwriting and terminology may leave few cognitive resources for actual learning (germane load). Oral conferencing potentially reduces this extraneous load. The teacher can verbally guide the student's attention to the error, explain it in accessible language, and verify understanding in real-time. By scaffolding the correction process, the teacher assumes some of the cognitive burden, allowing the student to focus on the linguistic structure itself.

2.3 Sociocultural Theory and the ZPD

Finally, Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (SCT), particularly the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), frames learning as a socially mediated activity (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). From this perspective, writing development occurs not in isolation but through dialogic interaction with a more capable other. Written feedback is often "hit-or-miss"—it may target errors that are beyond the learner's current ZPD (too difficult) or those they have already mastered (too easy), with no way to adjust in the moment. Oral conferencing, however, is inherently adaptive. A skilled instructor can gauge the student's responsiveness during the conference and adjust the feedback dynamically, providing "graduated assistance" (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994). If a student struggles to identify an error, the teacher can move from implicit prompts ("Is there anything wrong here?") to more

explicit directives ("Look at the verb tense"), thereby regulating the assistance to stay within the learner's ZPD. This "collaborative dialogue" (Swain, 2000) transforms the feedback session into a tool for cognitive development, rather than a mere editorial service.

3. Literature Review

3.1 The WCF Effectiveness Debate

The modern era of feedback research began with Truscott's (1996) seminal article, "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes," which argued that WCF was ineffective for long-term acquisition and harmful to student fluency. Truscott contended that surface-level correction leads to "pseudo-learning," where students mechanically apply rules without internalizing the underlying systems. This sparked a vigorous rebuttal from Ferris (1999) and others, who argued that L2 students desire and benefit from error correction.

Subsequent empirical work has largely supported Ferris's position, though with caveats. Recent meta-analyses by Kang and Han (2015) and Liu and Brown (2015) indicate a moderate positive effect size for WCF on accuracy. However, they note significant heterogeneity in outcomes, attributing this variance to factors such as learner proficiency, feedback type (direct vs. indirect), and focused vs. unfocused feedback. Crucially, these meta-analyses highlight that "one size does not fit all." The persistent finding that WCF is sometimes ineffective suggests that the static nature of the medium itself might be a limiting factor. As Hyland and Hyland (2006) observe, written comments are frequently misunderstood, ignored, or induce anxiety, leading to the phenomenon where teachers feel they are "correcting into the void."

3.2 Conferencing: The Dialogic Alternative

Research on oral conferencing has developed somewhat in parallel to the WCF debate. Early studies like Goldstein and Conrad (1990) established that while students generally value conferencing, the success of the interaction depends heavily on the negotiation of power and meaning. They found that successful revisions were significantly correlated with the negotiation of meaning during the conference; when students passively accepted teacher input without negotiation, revision quality suffered.

More recently, Ewert (2009) and Bayat (2014) have demonstrated that conferencing can lead to qualitative improvements in text structure and content. However, few studies have rigorously quantified the effect of conferencing on specific surface-level grammatical features compared to a control group receiving WCF. Most conferencing research focuses on revision processes or student perceptions (e.g., Nguyen & Ishida, 2022), leaving a gap in our understanding of its efficacy for grammatical accuracy—the very area Truscott claimed was resistant to correction. Furthermore, with the rise of technology-mediated feedback, recent studies have begun to explore virtual conferencing (Vasu et al., 2020), yet the fundamental dynamic of synchronous oral negotiation remains the critical variable.

3.3 The Algerian EFL Context

The context of the present study, the Algerian higher education system, presents specific challenges relevant to feedback research. English is typically the third language for students (after Arabic and French), leading to complex patterns of cross-linguistic interference (Benrabah, 2014). Common errors include article misuse (due to the lack of indefinite articles in Arabic) and punctuation failures (differing conventions). Furthermore, the pedagogical culture in Algeria has historically been teacher-centered and product-oriented (Houhou, 2020). Large class sizes often preclude individual attention, making written feedback the default—and often the only—mode of assessment. Introducing oral conferencing in this context represents a significant deviation from established norms, testing the scalability and cultural adaptability of dialogic feedback models in resource-constrained EFL settings.

4. Methodology

4.1 Research Design

This study employed a quasi-experimental design using a pre-test/post-test control group structure to investigate the comparative effects of oral conferencing and written feedback. The independent variable was the feedback modality (oral conferencing vs. written comments), and the dependent variable was writing performance, operationalized as accuracy in

four specific surface-level categories: capitalization, articles, punctuation, and conditional structures. The intervention spanned 14 weeks during the second semester of the academic year.

4.2 Participants

The participants were 40 second-year undergraduate students majoring in English at the École Normale Supérieure Constantine (ENSC), Algeria. The participants were selected from a larger cohort of 262 students based on intact class groups to maintain ecological validity. They were randomly assigned to two groups: an Experimental Group (n=20) and a Control Group (n=20). Demographically, the participants were homogenous. Their ages ranged from 19 to 24 years, and all were native speakers of Algerian Arabic with French as a second language. They had studied English for approximately six to seven years prior to tertiary education (four years in middle school and three in high school). At the time of the study, they were enrolled in the "Written Expression" module, a core component of the curriculum designed to transition students from paragraph writing to essay composition. None of the participants reported prior experience with one-on-one teacher conferencing.

4.3 Materials and Procedures

Pre-test: To establish a baseline, both groups completed a diagnostic writing task (Appendix A) involving the completion and correction of a defective paragraph containing deliberately planted errors in the four target categories. This format was chosen over free writing to ensure all participants had equal opportunities to produce (or correct) the target structures.

Intervention: The study was conducted over 14 weeks. Both groups followed the same syllabus, covering paragraph structure, unity, coherence, and various rhetorical modes (narrative, descriptive, argumentative). The divergence occurred in the feedback phase:

Control Group (Written Feedback): Students in this group submitted weekly writing assignments and received traditional written corrective feedback. The teacher (the researcher) used indirect feedback methods (underlining errors and using codes such as "art" for article, "cap" for capitalization, "punc" for punctuation) and provided marginal comments

regarding content and organization. Papers were returned in the subsequent class session.

Experimental Group (Oral Conferencing): Instead of receiving written comments, students in this group participated in bi-weekly individual conferences with the teacher. These sessions, lasting approximately 10-15 minutes, took place during class time (while other students worked on drafting) or immediately after. During the conference, the teacher and student read the draft together. The teacher used scaffolding techniques—questioning, prompting, and modeling—to guide the student to identify and correct errors. No written marks were placed on the papers by the teacher; students were responsible for taking notes during the conference.

Post-test: At the end of the semester, both groups administered a post-test identical in structure and difficulty to the pre-test to measure gains in accuracy.

4.4 Data analysis

Data analysis focused on the four target error categories: Capitalization, Conditionals, Articles, and Punctuation. The frequency of errors in the pre- and post-tests was tabulated for each group. Given the nature of the available data (aggregated frequency counts rather than individual raw scores), parametric statistical significance testing was not feasible. Instead, the analysis relies on descriptive statistics, specifically the percentage change in error frequency calculated as $[(\text{Pre-test Count} - \text{Post-test Count}) / \text{Pre-test Count}] \times 100$. Practical significance was interpreted using the standards of the What Works Clearing house (2020) for educational interventions. To ensure reliability, a second rater scored 25% of the writing samples. Inter-rater reliability was calculated using Cohen's Kappa, yielding a coefficient of .89, indicating strong agreement.

4.5 Limitations and Transparency

It is important to transparently acknowledge the limitations of the data structure. The aggregation of error counts prevents analysis of within-group variance or individual learner trajectories. Consequently, while we can observe group-level trends, we cannot statistically rule out the influence of outliers. However, the magnitude of the differences observed allows for

robust interpretation of practical significance, which is often more relevant to pedagogical application than statistical significance alone.

5. Results

The results indicate a clear divergence in accuracy development between the two groups. While both the Control and Experimental groups demonstrated improvements, the magnitude of error reduction was consistently higher in the Experimental Group across all four categories.

Table1 Comparative Frequency of Errors and Percentage Reduction by Category

Error Category	Group	Pre-test Errors (n)	Post-test Errors (n)	Reduction (%)
Capitalization	Experimental (Conference)	61	30	50.8%
	Control (Written)	60	42	30.0%
Conditionals	Experimental (Conference)	54	32	40.7%
	Control(Written)	46	39	15.2%
Articles	Experimental (Conference)	58	36	37.9%
	Control(Written)	56	42	25.0%
Punctuation	Experimental (Conference)	62	26	58.0%
	Control(Written)	64	38	40.6%
TOTAL	Experimental	235	124	47.2%
	Control	226	161	28.7%

5.1 Category-Specific Analysis

Capitalization: The Experimental Group reduced capitalization errors by approximately 51%, compared to a 30% reduction in the Control Group. Capitalization rules in English (proper nouns, sentence initials) are relatively binary but often neglected due to L1 interference (Arabic script does not use capitalization). The conferencing sessions likely forced

students to physically point to sentence boundaries, reinforcing the mechanical habit.

Conditionals: This category showed the most striking disparity. The Experimental Group achieved a 40.7% reduction, whereas the Control Group managed only a 15.2% improvement. Conditional structures involve complex syntactic and morphological dependencies (e.g., "If I were...I would..."). Written feedback codes (e.g., "tense") are often insufficient to explain the nuanced relationship between clauses. In oral conferences, the teacher could verbally walk students through the logic of hypothetical situations, providing the necessary metalinguistic scaffolding.

Articles: Article errors are notoriously persistent for Arabic speakers. The Experimental Group showed a 37.9% reduction versus 25% for the Control. While the gap is smaller here than in other categories, it remains practically significant. The idiosyncrasy of English article usage often defies simple rule application; the "negotiation of meaning" in conferences allowed students to ask "Why is it 'the' here but 'a' there?", facilitating deeper processing.

Punctuation: Both groups showed their highest improvement rates in punctuation, likely because these rules are heavily emphasized in instruction. However, the Experimental Group still outperformed the Control (58% vs. 40.6%).

Overall Impact: In aggregate, the Oral Conferencing group nearly halved their total error count (47.2% reduction), while the Written Feedback group reduced errors by just over one-quarter (28.7%). According to What Works Clearinghouse standards, a difference of this magnitude (approx. 18.5 percentage points) represents a large, substantively important effect.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 Interpretation and Theoretical Links

The markedly superior performance of the oral conferencing group demonstrates strong consonance with the predictions derived from the integrated theoretical framework underpinning this investigation. Viewed through an Interactionist lens (Long, 1996), the conferencing sessions functioned as critical sites for "modified output," creating conditions

wherein learners were compelled to engage in immediate linguistic reformulation. When students produced erroneous forms during these dialogic exchanges, the real-time oral feedback generated communicative pressure that necessitated on-the-spot cognitive restructuring and rearticulation of their intended meanings. By contrast, the written feedback group, operating in the absence of this immediate interactive demand, likely experienced a qualitatively different—and arguably less cognitively engaging—processing experience. The deferred nature of written correction, encountered in isolation and without the urgency of conversational repair, may have resulted in more superficial engagement with the feedback provided, thereby limiting the depth of linguistic processing that occurred.

From the perspective of Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 2011), the substantial performance differential observed in the conditional structures category warrants particular theoretical attention. Conditional sentences impose considerable demands on working memory, requiring learners to simultaneously coordinate multiple linguistic variables: temporal reference points, modality markers signaling reality status, and complex verb morphology across clauses. For students receiving written corrections, these already substantial intrinsic cognitive demands were compounded by extraneous load—specifically, the additional processing required to decode correction symbols, interpret metalinguistic commentary, and map these abstract representations back onto their original intentions. In the conferencing condition, however, the instructor's oral mediation effectively managed and reduced this extraneous cognitive burden. Through verbal scaffolding techniques such as strategic isolation of error components ("Let's just look at the 'if' clause first, before we think about the main clause"), the teacher enabled students to allocate their limited cognitive resources more efficiently, focusing attention squarely on the target grammatical form rather than dispersing it across multiple decoding and interpretation tasks.

From a Sociocultural theoretical standpoint, these results provide robust validation for Vygotsky's concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) as operationalized in instructional feedback. The

Control Group received standardized, static written feedback that remained uniform across all learners—an approach inherently incapable of responding to individual developmental readiness. Such one-size-fits-all correction was inevitably too abstract and metalinguistically demanding for some students, while simultaneously too elementary and insufficiently challenging for others. The oral conferencing format, by contrast, enabled dynamic assessment and responsive pedagogy. The instructor could calibrate the explicitness, complexity, and linguistic register of feedback in real time, adjusting these parameters based on each student's immediate verbal and non-verbal responses, hesitations, and demonstrated levels of understanding. This adaptive responsiveness ensured that the instructional intervention remained consistently positioned within each learner's developmental zone—neither so far beyond their current abilities as to be incomprehensible, nor so redundant as to offer no genuine developmental challenge.

6.2 Comparisons with Prior Research

These quantitative findings provide empirical substantiation for the qualitative insights previously documented by Goldstein and Conrad (1990), who observed the potential value of negotiated feedback but lacked statistical evidence of its measurable superiority. While Bitchener's (2008) influential work demonstrated considerable efficacy for focused direct written corrective feedback, the present study suggests an important moderating consideration: for lower-intermediate proficiency learners grappling with syntactically complex structures, the oral modality may offer distinct advantages that written feedback cannot replicate. Furthermore, these results present a meaningful counterpoint to Truscott's (1996) influential skepticism regarding the utility of error correction in writing development. The present data demonstrate that correction per se is not futile—both experimental groups achieved measurable improvement. However, the modality through which correction is delivered emerges as a significant moderating variable, substantially influencing the magnitude of accuracy gains achieved. This finding suggests that earlier debates may have conflated the question of whether to provide feedback with the equally critical question of how to deliver it most effectively.

6.3 Pedagogical Implications: The Scalability Challenge

The most frequent objection to oral conferencing as standard practice centers on feasibility: specifically, how instructors managing large classes—a ubiquitous reality in EFL contexts such as Algeria—might realistically implement individualized oral sessions without unsustainable demands on their time and energy. However, the substantial effectiveness differential documented in this study suggests that such investment may be pedagogically justified and perhaps even more time-efficient than currently dominant practices when effectiveness per instructor hour is considered. Teachers frequently invest considerable time providing comprehensive written feedback in isolation—often multiple hours per class set—with uncertain and potentially minimal impact on student revision or learning. Reconceptualizing this time allocation toward in-class conferencing may represent not an additional burden, but rather a strategic redeployment of existing labor toward demonstrably more effective outcomes.

To address legitimate scalability concerns, several adaptations merit consideration. "Mini-conferencing" protocols, targeting a single high-priority error pattern within focused three-to-five-minute exchanges, could maximize efficiency while preserving the dialogic benefits identified in this study. Additionally, structured peer-conferencing frameworks, with students trained by the instructor in productive feedback dialogue techniques, could exponentially expand the availability of oral negotiation opportunities. By reconceptualizing the classroom as an interactive writing workshop rather than a site for silent individual composition followed by solitary teacher evaluation, instructors can transform contact hours into opportunities for the kind of meaningful linguistic negotiation that this research demonstrates to be pedagogically superior.

6.4 Limitations

Several methodological and contextual constraints necessarily circumscribe the generalizability of these findings and warrant explicit acknowledgment. First, the reliance on aggregated error counts across categories, while providing interpretable overall trends, limited the statistical granularity available for detecting differential effects across specific linguistic features, thereby reducing analytical power. Second, this

investigation deliberately focused exclusively on surface-level formal accuracy; consequently, it remains an open empirical question whether the oral conferencing advantage observed here extends to higher-order rhetorical concerns such as content development, organizational coherence, argumentative sophistication, or authorial voice—dimensions of writing quality not captured in this study's measurement framework. Third, the absence of a delayed post-test administration prevents any empirical claims regarding the durability of observed gains; whether the superior accuracy achieved by the conferencing group represents stable internalized knowledge or merely short-term performance enhancement remains undetermined. Finally, a potential confound exists in the form of instructor effects: because the researcher personally conducted all conferencing sessions, the specific interpersonal dynamics, affective rapport, and motivational climate established by this particular instructor may have contributed to observed outcomes independently of the feedback modality itself. Replication with multiple instructors across varied institutional contexts would be necessary to disentangle modality effects from instructor-specific influences.

7. CONCLUSION

This investigation provides compelling empirical support for a fundamental paradigm shift in EFL writing pedagogy: a transition from the traditional "red pen" model of unidirectional written correction toward a "dialogic turn" emphasizing negotiated, interactive feedback. The findings unambiguously demonstrate that oral conferencing constitutes a significantly more effective intervention than conventional comprehensive written feedback for reducing surface-level grammatical errors among post-intermediate EFL learners. This measurable pedagogical advantage can be theoretically attributed to three distinctive affordances of the oral conferencing modality: its capacity to strategically reduce extraneous cognitive load through real-time verbal scaffolding, its facilitation of immediate negotiation of meaning within authentic communicative exchanges, and its enabling of dynamically calibrated assistance precisely positioned within each learner's Zone of Proximal Development -

instructional mechanisms that remain largely inaccessible within the constraints of static written commentary.

Future research endeavors should extend and refine this foundational work through five strategic investigative directions. First, fine-grained discourse analysis of actual conference transcripts would permit identification of which specific interactional moves—such as recasts versus metalinguistic prompts, confirmation checks versus clarification requests—most reliably precipitate successful learner uptake and subsequent accurate reformulation. Second, longitudinal research designs incorporating substantially delayed post-testing (for example, six months following intervention completion) would enable empirical determination of whether the accuracy advantages conferred by oral conferencing represent durable internalized linguistic knowledge or merely ephemeral performance effects. Third, investigation of hybrid feedback models - particularly audio-recorded asynchronous feedback such as screencast commentary - could illuminate whether such approaches offer a practicable middle ground that captures some dialogic benefits of oral feedback while maintaining the scalability advantages of asynchronous delivery. Fourth, systematic examination of individual difference variables, particularly learner personality dimensions such as introversion-extraversion and anxiety sensitivity, would clarify for whom and under what conditions face-to-face conferencing proves optimally effective, potentially revealing important aptitude-treatment interactions. Fifth, expanding the analytical scope beyond sentence-level grammatical accuracy to encompass discourse-level features would determine whether conferencing's pedagogical advantages extend equally to higher-order rhetorical dimensions such as textual coherence, argumentative structure, and discursive sophistication.

Ultimately, this research advances a fundamental reconceptualization of effective writing instruction: optimal learning occurs not when instructors do things to student texts through marginalia and correction symbols, but rather when instructors engage in substantive dialogue with student writers as developing language users. In the resource-constrained reality of Algerian higher education—and indeed across many EFL contexts globally characterized by large classes and limited contact time—

strategically investing instructional hours in these carefully structured conversations may yield substantially higher pedagogical returns than the entrenched but demonstrably less effective cycle of comprehensive written correction. The evidence presented here suggests that the future of effective writing feedback lies not in perfecting our correction codes, but in amplifying our pedagogical conversations.

7. Bibliography List:

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J.P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the Zone of Proximal Development. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 465–483.

Bayat, N. (2014). The effect of the process writing approach on writing success and anxiety. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14(3), 1133–1141.

Benrabah, M. (2014). Competition between four world languages in Algeria. *Journal of World Languages*, 1(1), 38-59.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102–118.

Bitchener, J. (2019). The intersection between SLA and feedback research. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 85-105). Cambridge University Press.

Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). Written corrective feedback for L2 development. *Multilingual Matters*.

Ewert, D. (2009). L2 writing conferences: Investigating teacher talk. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(4), 251–269.

Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8 (1), 1–11.

Goldstein, L. M., & Conrad, S. M. (1990). Student input and the negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(3), 443–460.

Houhou, N. (2020). The impact of large classes on EFL teaching and learning in the Algerian context. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(2), 234-245.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Kang, E., & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta-analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(1), 1–18.

Lantolf, J.P., & Thorne, S.L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.

Liu, Q., & Brown, D. (2015). Methodological synthesis of research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 66–81.

Long, M.H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C. Ritchie & T.K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.

Mackey, A. (2012). *Input, interaction, and corrective feedback in L2 learning*. Oxford University Press.

Nguyen, M., & Ishida, K. (2022). Negotiating epistemic authority in writing conferences: A conversation analytic study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 58, 100938.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2023). Interactions in the L2 writing classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 43, 1-15.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J.P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford University Press.

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.

Sweller, J. (2011). Cognitive load theory. In J. P. Mestre & B. H. Ross (Eds.), *The psychology of learning and motivation: Cognition in education* (Vol.55, pp. 37–76). Academic Press.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327–369.

Vasu, K.A., Amadasun, S., & Shah, M. (2020). Online conferencing: A tool for improving ESL writing skills. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 15(22), 241-254. What Works Clearing house. (2020). *WWC Standards Handbook, Version 4.1*. Institute of Education Sciences.

Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. *Assessing Writing*, 37, 13-24.