

# EFFECTS OF SUPERVISORY WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK: A REVIEW TO HIGHLIGHT PAST AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Bakhtawer Mughal, Jiancheng Qian

Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, China

## **ABSTRACT**

*Writing a dissertation is essential and widely recognized as a specifically challenging part of doctoral study[1]. A lot of postgraduates find this process complicated, exhausting, stressful, isolating and frustrating. It is necessary to recognize the effects of supervisory WCF since the whole journey of doctoral students learning depends on righteous supervisory feedback. Supervisors review student's dissertations and give feedback on a several of issues, they may highlight content, the idea of presentation/organization, the appropriate use of language, vocabulary and many other issues. The feedback on these areas have attracted great attention of researchers. Supervisor's feedback to doctoral students on their dissertations have been referred to supervisory feedback[2]. The value of supervisory feedback has been investigated by several studies. This review will highlight the past investigations and future directions in supervisory written corrective feedback. Since feedback at advanced level has different dynamics and perspectives, it is crucial to understand the best way of giving written feedback to advanced learners[3]. It is worth addressing diverse ways to treat advanced learners' writings with professional and satisfying supervisory feedback. Although numerous studies have been conducted on the subject, but recent research lacks a complete review on past research and future directions in the field of supervisory written corrective feedback. Hence, this review will attempt to fill the gap.*

## **KEYWORDS**

*Supervisory written corrective feedback, effects of Supervisory feedback, past studies, future directions*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

In SLA "written corrective feedback" has been recognized as an important element in treating learners' errors. Feedback is defined as teacher response to learners' output recognizing their strengths and weaknesses for correcting and indicating their errors, checking those errors and giving them correct responses to support them and provide new knowledge about target language and acquired concepts. Different researchers have given different definitions of feedback and these definitions are worth addressing and including. According to Kepner (1991) Corrective feedback is to utilize or to notify learner's instructional responses, whether they are correct or incorrect. Lambert (1980) says feedback is information on performance which affects subsequent performance by influencing their concentration on particular matter and after that the performance undergo a change. Keh (1990: 2294) explained feedback as "input from reader to a writer with the effect of giving information to the writer for revision" Lalande (1982: 141) defined "feedback as an instructional procedure which is use to inform a learner where the response is correct and incorrect". Moreover, error correction or feedback has been added as a proof in focus-on-form approach for language learning input [4]. Corrective feedback is also explained as the spontaneous response on learners' problematic performance within the meaning-focused interaction to drive learners' attention on linguistic forms.

According to Ellis (2005) providing feedback to learners can enhance their language learning along with language acquisition when providing correct form and strategies to correct and identify errors. Driscoll (2000) identified that feedback enables learners to be aware with their strengths and to recognize their areas of concentration or development. On the other hand, Sommer (1982) argued that feedback provide an opportunity to the learners to review their output with eagerness to learn, and that revision can help their language learning and acquisition. Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick (2006: 206) explained feedback as “anything which can strengthen the learners; capacity to self-regulate their own performance”.

Variety of terms have been used to replace the term feedback like: "responses", "correction" and "comments"[5]. Hattie and Timperley (2007), described that feedback can be provided through different mediums (sources) such as a teacher, a parent, a book, and a classmate. In short it is a guide which is more knowledgeable and can rectify errors. They support the importance of corrective feedback and say it increases learners' awareness of their strengths and weakness of learning output as it gives them knowledge that fills the gap between what students have learned and what they need to learn from more knowledgeable other. This can be done through "restructuring understanding, to confirm their responses and inform them whether they are right or wrong, giving them more information if it's needed and highlighting directions. Students can seek and to provide alternative strategies to rectify or understand specific information"[6].

It is confirmed that feedback has most important and significant role at advance learning process because its overall aim is to developed learners' language competence which includes to improve their linguistic competence, content competence and genre competence. It can give learners with new rules, vocabulary, and structure of target language, new ideas, better suggestions and validation of their ideas which can enhance their language learning along with thinking process. Corrective feedback can not only provides awareness of learners' weakness but at the same time it gives ways and strategies to overcome those weakness and deal with them properly. On the other hand feedback is important and very necessary for teachers as it helps them to rectify problematic areas in their expertise. Lastly, it has been commonly viewed as an important factor because of its significance in both encouraging and consolidating learning [7].

## **2. WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK**

There are two main forms in which written corrective feedback can be given: direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback. Direct corrective feedback is provided by teachers and they show the error location and suggest the correct form of that error. On the other hand indirect written corrective feedback is a kind of correction in which teachers use tools such as codes, underlines and circles to highlight the error position without giving the correct form of the error [8].

### **2.1. Direct Corrective feedback**

According to Bitchener and Ferris (2012) direct corrective feedback is correction which calls attention to the error and also gives specific solution of that error. It can be explained as the type of feedback which not only identifies the error but it provides learners the clear and explicit correction near or above the inaccurate, linguistic structure and form like linguistic errors. It aims to guide learners to revise their writing and develop their performance in future texts [3]. Ferris (2002) claimed that it is useful at the final stage of writing process because it guides them to pay an attention to the errors that remain in their texts and avoid committing them again in their future writing. It is also mentioned that advances learners are likely to take more advantages from direct corrective feedback because they are interested to avoid misunderstanding which is created

by the indirect corrective feedback. In short direct feedback lowers the rate of misunderstanding that learners can have if they are unable to comprehend indirect feedback.

## **2.2. Indirect Corrective Feedback**

Indirect corrective feedback is a type of correction which signposts the error location without mentioning any correction or solution. It can be given in different forms like circling, highlighting and underlining an error [4]. It is also defined as "indicating an error through circling, underlining, highlighting or mentioning its location in the given text, with or without a verbal rule reminder or an error code, and leave the correction for students to make it right themselves" [9]. Teachers provide learners an opportunity to carefully read and correct their errors. In this perspective, indirect corrective feedback emphasizes on the learners not the teachers who should understand their errors and its nature then attempt to correct the errors instead of relying on teacher correction.

This approach has been valued and suggested the most helpful approach because it gives learners chance to engage in guided learning and problem-solving [10]. It has been also explained as an implicit correction which provides learners with codes of what has caused the errors. Hyland (1990) says that the use of codes as error correction might be helpful because it assists teachers give effective implicit feedback while saving the positive effects of error correction. In contrast, Harmer (2005) argued using codes can reduce the negative psychological consequence of red ink on learners' texts.

## **2.3. Reformulation**

Reformulation is used to assist learners to write a more native like composition, to focus on rhetorical but not on grammatical factors [11]. This is a technique in which a native writer attempts to rewrite a non-native writer's composition by giving important changes in lexis, syntax, discourse and cohesion, while the original writer's idea is not changed. Cohen (1989) also defined that it involves writers to rewrite a text in their own words, to make it more native like piece of writing and preserving the original idea of the writer. It can be seen as a usual writing task. Basic content is given in a jumbled form and learners are instructed to discuss the best ways to reformulate the ideas.

Hedge (2000) argued that reformulation can be helpful for those learners who need to write a draft and are looking for developmental possibilities. Here learners will be able to make comparisons to compare the native like text and find out the differences, in other words they can keep the draft as a model and improve their piece of writing.

## **2.4. Written Commentary**

Written commentary is one of the types of written corrective feedback that gives learners input which enables them to identify whether their objectives have been achieved or not. It may help through some of the teacher's suggestions given for the revision of learner's written piece of text [12]. This kind of corrective feedback is a technique which provides opportunity of interaction between learners and teachers [13]. This kind of feedback or interaction with knowledgeable guide (teacher) can help learners to improve their writing skills [14]. It is defined by Goldstein (2005: 5) as "a social act involving the author and readers". Written commentary enables communication between teacher and learner focusing learners writing and it can motivate learners to improve and develop their written skills [15]. It can be given in different forms like syntactic form which include one -word, question, exclamation, declarative sentence and imperative sentence [9].

It can be particular comments that are given only on a specific written sentence or structure (E.g., What do you mean in this sentence?), or general comments which are provided on the whole piece of writing or essay (E.g., good conclusion) [15]. Later type is more general than specific written commentary [12]. However, few researchers like: (Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Chiang, 2004; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005) argued that these comments can be stronger because they specify learners' strengths and weaknesses in writing. Moreover, it can be positive (i.e. praise), which is important to acknowledge and give credit to another for some characteristic, attribute, skill, etc. Which is the main source of giving positive value by the person receiving the feedback. Furthermore, it needs a more intense or detailed comments than simply agreement [7]. On the other part, constructive criticism gives a negative evaluation of the text or a portion of that text without improvement suggestions [16]. According to Ferris & Hedgcock (2005) positive and negative written commentaries are very important for learners' writing development. Moreover, teachers should give written commentary with carefulness because it can confuse learners and it can also demotivate them.

## **2.5. Computer-Mediated Corrective Feedback**

Computer-mediated corrective feedback can be provided by using special software which lead learner's written text [17]. These software give feedback on grammar as well as the use of language. Students can receive corrective feedback on their text electronically while interacting with their teachers via computer (e.g., mail), and this kind of feedback is called asynchronous feedback [7]. This kind of computer based feedback programme are "web based and gives a core set of support features, including a writing manual, model essays, and translators" [12]. Through this learners can receive a lot of different kinds of feedback, after submitting their written texts, and these types include holistic and analytical scores, graphic display of feedback like bar charts tabulating problematic areas, generic feedback on revising strategies and individually tailored suggestions for improving particular aspects of their texts" [18].

Hyland and Hyland (2006) suggested that collaboration of technology in giving feedback can motivate learners and leads their active participation. On the other hand, it leads to the learner's autonomy because learners can ask questions and discuss difficult areas with their teachers while using technology. Furthermore, technological automated feedback is "legible, it is clear and less cryptic, and it can be saved for future reference or analysis" [9]. Though, researchers like (Yao & Warden, 1996; Chen, 1997) explained that it can save teachers' time and can help them to consider more areas of their writing. On the other hand, Belcher (1999) argued that technological automated feedback can lead ambiguity and can have negative influence on learners who are not familiar with technology or cannot access the computer facilities.

## **3. SUPERVISORY WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK**

As earlier it has been discussed that feedback can be defined as the type of information or input, which provides students about their performance in a learning task, mostly for improving their performance [19]. However, Carcamo, (2020) said in the field of education, feedback is explained as information which is provided by an agent to the guide students' learning from what is understood to what should be in the field of language acquisition. A number of research has focused on the phenomena of corrective feedback and numerous research has been conducted on this area. That is the reason with the passage of time different researchers have given diverse definitions of corrective feedback, which have already explained earlier. Now, it is important to consider supervisory written corrective feedback. That is feedback given by supervisors on students writing pieces.

Writing a dissertation is a challenging task for both native and non native writers. when students start writing thesis, instructions are given in oral and written feedback. oral feedback is provided before or after student writes a written draft. on the other hand written feedback is given after student writes a draft text. Supervising doctoral students is the most important and challenging aspect of teaching profession in higher education [20]. It plays vital role in the writing process of doctoral dissertations. According to apprenticeship model supervisor is an expert who gives input to the supervisees, although novice are not tend to rely totally on their supervisors but they should consider them as their partners [21]. Carter& Kumar, (2017) explain doctoral supervisor's aim is to accomplish two objectives, one is a strong dissertation with timely submission of dissertation without wasting time and energy and secondly Supervisors also focus to make their supervisees independent researchers, who can conduct an independent research. In contrast, they should not compromise on the quality and quantity of feedback, which has the significant effect on successful dissertation [22]. According to Bitchener, Bastrukmen and East (2011) supervisors' constructive feedback is the key to strong doctoral dissertations and it is a characteristic of good supervision practice. It is also emphasized that knowledge is gained and created through and within the feedback process especially when it is facilitating in nature [23]. Doctoral students are highly selected candidates, they are competent and fully motivated to finish their research work, that is the reason successful relationship of supervisor and supervisee can foster well-being and active engagement feedback practices [24].

Research indicated a number of issues related to doctoral students' thesis writing. The discrepancy between doctoral student's desired feedback and their supervisors' given feedback on doctoral dissertations has created difficulty on the side of both supervisors and confusion on the side of doctoral students [25]. What supervisors believe and practice as feedback for doctoral students may not be the one doctoral student's desire as useful or effective feedback for them. This issue is very important and it can complicate doctoral journey. That is the reason investigating the type of feedback preferred by doctoral students and the type of feedback provided by supervisors is worth investigating. Nurie (2019) investigated doctoral students perceived needs and preferences for supervisory written feedback and found out that doctoral students prefer feedback on content most, he further discussed that student's prefer feedback on content to feedback on genre and linguistic accuracy [20]. Feedback is main source to stimulate critical thinking among students to witness the development of complicated and constructive ideas for writing. Feedback is most important for PhD students, on the other hand through feedback supervisors train their scholars to cope up with academic community. The growing research has revealed different practices of supervisors on thesis writing. Bitchener et al (2010) discovered, most frequent given feedback was on content. Casanave and Hubbard (1992) revealed that supervisors identify or their main focus is on sentence and paragraph level, on the other hand Hyatt (2005) pointed out most comments on content, style and development of writing were frequent however comments on other categories, like organization and grammar were infrequent. Supervisors review student's texts and provide feedback on a number of diverse issues, they may target the content, the idea presentation/ organization, the correct use of vocabulary/ grammar and other issues [26].

He further described the categories in detail:

- (a) Content knowledge – its accuracy, completeness and relevance
- (b) Genre knowledge – the functions of different parts of a thesis
- (c) Rhetorical structure and organization
- (d) Argument development - coherence and cohesion
- (e) Linguistic accuracy and appropriateness

Interaction between supervisor and PhD student is significant for successful completion of Ph.D dissertation [27]. But most of the time this journey is full of misunderstandings, disappointments, emotional ups and downs, uncertainty, frustration, rewards and triumphs [2]. According to Lee and Williams it is "Strewn with suffering" (1999, p. 13). Many problems in PhD supervision have been addressed by a number of researchers. Such as poor communication with supervisors is one of the most important obstacles and because of this students can not complete their Ph.Ds.[28]. As plan d and O'Donoghue (1994) found out that language barrier and mutual cultural knowledge about the intellectual demands of a PhD can hinder effective communication between supervisors and international doctoral students. Salmon (1992) explained few examples of disrespect of students work by their supervisors. Negative criticism from supervisors can hurt the feelings of students and it can lead to loss of confidence and non-completion of Ph.D.[29]. On the other hand, constructive criticism is encouraged for quality of work to be produced by PhD scholars.

Moreover, doctoral student and supervisor's relationship is an important factor, which can determine the difference between success and failure of doctoral dissertation (e.g. Li & Seale, 2007; Wright, 2003). The quality of student and supervisor relationship can determine student's social behavior and being socialized into the academic community, quality and quantity of his work (product) [17]. Many factors such as psychological, cognitive and social factors can contribute to this relationship, this relationship can be better sited from supervisor's feedback.

Writing a dissertation is very essential and widely recognized as a specifically challenging part of doctoral study[30]. A lot of postgraduates find this process complicated, exhausting, stressful, isolating and frustrating. They face many challenges such as selecting a suitable topic, learning new analytical and writing techniques, maintaining supervisory relationships, mismanagement between family and work, dealing with financial problems, stress, anxiety and depression [9]. In the case of international students these challenges are even more than these mentioned issues such as living far from their family, working in their second or third language [30]. Leaving ones country is not just to being alone in the host country but at the same time they have to face challenges associated with working under a novel academic environment where expectations and conventions are more difficult and different from their precious educational institutions [31]. These doctoral students tend to handle these challenges for the four years of their study. Dealing these challenges and helping doctoral students is a part of effective supervision [31].

However, Green (2005) argues that the practice of research supervision needs to be reconsidered, and that the traditional "isolated dyadic relationship" (p.153) among the supervisor and doctoral student is not importantly the best way which guarantee students' success. Lee and Green (2009) argues despite the fact believe of supervision should be "a shared responsibility among many participants, there is a persistent administrative and conceptual defaulting to the one-to-one relationship (p. 6616)". For example there is dire need eagerly develop a strong support platform for students having doctoral research. These networks or teams can include supervisors but on the same time should include other academic and professional staff such as learning advisors and subject librarians and other students should also be included [31].

It is shared responsibility of students and supervisor to engage students with feedback. Many challenges faced by students and supervisors can have negative effects on students engagement. Basturkmen's (2006) suggested that the level of English language proficiency and academic writing creates huge obstacles while writing their dissertation and students report this hurdle as stumbling block to their writing. Prior research [3] found that international doctoral students find it difficult to maintain accuracy, maintain appropriateness in writing, develop their ideas and express those ideas coherently.

Students encourage feedback and they take it seriously and work on it properly if the feedback is timely and detailed. Although, giving deep and detailed feedback is time taking task and very demanding (Ali et al., 2015). Time demand is one of the major challenges that PhD supervisors face and they should be aware of this constraint [5]. However, Carter & Kumar (2017) revealed that students' lack of action on the feedback make supervisors frustrated because they do not want to give feedback on same issue or they avoid repetition. Some researchers suggest lack of interest to learn from feedback provided by supervisors [32]. Supervision is highly demanding and active process but supervisors rarely receive any training for this demanding role [33]. These mentioned challenges make doctoral journey complicated and time consuming.

#### **4. RECENT EMPIRICAL STUDIES ON DOCTORAL SUPERVISION (OVERVIEW OF PAST)**

Supervisory feedback has been concern of researchers since the rise of doctoral studies. It is crucial to know how the written corrective feedback is carried out by supervisors. Recently, many researchers have investigated the hot concern and diverted the attention of new scholars. Neupane Bastola, (2020) investigated engagement and challenges in supervisory feedback with students and supervisors' perspective, The study revealed marked difference in supervisors and the student's perceptions, differences were in the terms of the nature of student engagement, student's research experiences and different factors contributing to the challenges in supervisory feedback, which show a big difference in factors contributing in SWCF. However, Zheng et al., (2020) explored students engagement with supervisory feedback on master's thesis through a detailed case study which shown six themes, a. gaining reassurance from the supervisor's compliments, b. trusting supervisor's feedback due to position and authority, c. following supervisor's advice selectively, d. engaging in more academia by incorporating more citation, e. not fully getting feedback and f. letting it go and moving on it. This study gives clear picture of student's active engagement with the feedback.

Townsend et al., (2020) used a sentence which says "They think I am stupid" which shows a negative impact of supervisory feedback. The study suggests different ways to deal with supervisory feedback and mention some don'ts and do's. Don't: A. take feedback personally, b. Ignore or dismiss supervisor's feedback, c. use feedback as an excuse not to write. Do's: Write down, b. consult someone unconnected with your thesis, c. give yourself time to digest the feedback, d. arrange meetings with your supervisor, e. systematically work on each comment given and f. write everyday if you can. The study mainly gave some guideline for PhD scholars to handle the feedback accordingly and explained experience of dealing with supervisory feedback. The study showed a path to deal with supervisory feedback.

It is vital to know the preferences of students about feedback. However, according to Nurie, (2019) PhD students tend to prefer feedback on Content Knowledge to feedback on Genre knowledge –and Linguistic accuracy and appropriateness. He investigated doctoral students' perceived needs and preferences for supervisors' written feedback. Another study conducted by Helfer & Drew, (2019) suggested main reasons for dissatisfaction between supervisors and students were lack of involvement of supervisors in writing process and lack of supervisor's knowledge in their area of interest. Which caused demotivation and lack of interest in feedback. It totally depends on the criteria of every supervisor and also depends on the culture both the parties have been. Though, the feedback has very huge impact on doctoral journey.

After describing feedback preferences of students and supervisors it is important to know the role supervisors play in students' academic life. Friedrich-Nel & Mac Kinnon, (2019) investigated the quality culture in doctoral education by establishing the critical role of the doctoral

supervisors. The study revealed few themes such as nurturing personal and professional attributes of the students to prepare them for employment, effectively managing supervisory process and dealing with supervisory challenges which have impact on the quality of doctoral education. Another study conducted by Xu & Hu, (2019) on the experiences of Chinese international doctoral students' language feedback responses, voice and identity reconstruction. Findings of the study revealed that there is more need to develop culturally-responsive and empowering intercultural pedagogy to facilitate international doctoral students' (re)construction of scholarly identity in feedback practice and academic writing, as well as in the wider context of intercultural doctoral supervision. Fan et al. (2019), also conducted a study in Chinese context. They gave a social exchange theory perspective which shows a connection of supportive Chinese supervisor and innovative international students. The study suggests that supervisor support affects students' innovation, fosters citizenship behavior, creativity and innovation pursuit among international doctoral students. But what motivates doctoral students to have continuous concentration and constant motivation to finish their dissertations? The question is considered by few of the scholars and they tried to get the deep understanding in SWCF.

Most of the researchers focused on deep understanding of SWCF and the role of motivation. It is crucial to motivate advanced learners to focus and continue their work with the passing time. Kumae & Kaur, (2019) conducted a study focusing on supervisory practices for intrinsic motivation of doctoral students in the light of self-determination theory perspective. They conducted a thematic analysis, which reveals few of the themes like: students experience autonomy support, supervisors must respect their research interest, encourage self-initiative and accept the change suggested by the student. It also suggests that supervisors carefully need to consider quality, quantity, mood and time of feedback. It shows supervisors need to be careful about the needs of students. Friedrich-Nel & Mac Kinnon, (2019) also conducted a study which focuses on the quality culture in doctoral education while establishing the critical role of the doctoral supervisor. This study also revealed few themes such as nurturing personal and professional attributes of the students to prepare them for employment, effectively managing supervisory process and dealing with supervisory challenges which have impact on the quality of doctoral education. The study has great contribution as it explained few of the most important aspects of doctoral dissertations. Sometimes it is challenging to understand feedback, which shows a great gap between supervisor and student's approach. Stracke & Kumar, (2016) coined a term "feedback is hard to have", and explored doctoral students' perceptions of language use in supervisory written feedback practices. Findings suggest that students found three types of feedback: expressive feedback, directive feedback and referential feedback. Study also revealed that supervisors should acquire a higher level of language awareness so they can provide better feedback on students' dissertations. Which shows sometimes supervisors do not possess expertise of giving feedback. Devos et al (2016), confirms the findings of Stracke & Kumar (2016) by talking about the misfits between doctoral students and their supervisors. They investigated how these misfits are regulated? The results suggested some themes about misfits between students and supervisors: learn to live with it or find alternate resource, suffer with it without informing supervisor, address the issue and solve it with the help of supervisor, unable to address the issue because it reached a point of no return. Yet, it is essential to build a solid connection between both the parties.

It can be done by promoting student and supervisor partnership through thesis research and writing workshops [31]. There are many factors which lead towards unsuccessful thesis completion. Hytten et al, (2018) conducted a study which revealed that some students struggle to complete their coursework and start dissertation because of less guidance from supervisors. This leads towards ambiguity of the process. Similarly, it suggested there must be mutually beneficial partnership between student and their supervisors to have a successful dissertation completion. Furthermore, Jafarigohar.M, Hoomanfard. M, (2018) talked about a typology of supervisors' written corrective feedback on students' dissertations. The findings suggested that supervisors

have given seven main categories of comments on dissertations: grammar and sentence structure, content, method, organization, references, formatting, and academic procedures. Along with it supervisors focus on these areas and want students to focus on these categories. But who is going to focus on these areas?

Sakurai et al., (2017) separated doctoral students into two categories, domestic and international students and investigated the satisfaction and motivation of doctoral students. Findings of the study suggested that the international students embarked upon their doctoral programs with a greater wish to develop their career prospects and were more satisfied with their doctoral studies. On the other hand, domestic students, become more aware of the significance of their studies for more professional chances, which showed a positive engagement in their study.

It is always vital to know the needs of students but at the same time it is necessary to understand the voice of supervisors. Woolderink et al., (2015) conducted a study which shows that a good match between PhDs and supervisors is essential for a successful PhD dissertation, it suggests that both discuss and formally agree upon mutual expectations and responsibilities within the project. Which can make PhD journey a fruitful ride.

## **5. EXPECTATION FOR FUTURE**

Despite the increased amount of scholarly research in supervisory feedback for international doctoral students, there is need for further research on the type of feedback provided by supervisors and the type of desired feedback from doctoral students [8]. This review is an attempt to have over view of past and future research directions in supervisory written corrective feedback. Bitchener (2012) calls for more research on the expectations supervisors have from doctoral students regarding feedback implementation. Supervisory Feedback is crucial and necessary at PhD level, there are numerous issues related to this area [7]. Every doctoral scholar receive supervisory feedback throughout their PhD journey. Many doctoral students experience different supervision practices in their home countries but when it comes to foreign countries most of the international students are unaware about supervisory practices. Gap in literature suggests a dire need to investigate supervisors' given feedback and students' desired feedback. Not a single study has investigated this issue simultaneously. Additionally, post feedback practices are the most important part of feedback practices, which are not considered by researchers.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

This review of literature over the past studies in the field of supervisory written corrective feedback has identified few of the concerns involved different issues related to postgraduate research supervision. The amount and nature of feedback, challenges faced by both the parties, their expectations regarding feedback activates and much more was discussed. Further research is warranted, especially in the area of type of feedback provided to the post graduate students and post feedback activities and implementations by the supervisors and Ph.D. scholars. This review has tried to fill the gap and explore the past and future with the dire need of more research in this area.

## **REFERENCES**

- [1] V. Sweitzer, "Towards a theory of doctoral student professional identity development: A developmental networks approach," *J. Higher Educ.*, vol. 80, no. 1, pp. 1–33, 2009, doi: 10.1353/jhe.0.0034.
- [2] J. A. Jafarigohar.M, Hoomanfar. M, "A Typology of Supervisors' Written Feedback on Students'

- Theses/ Dissertations,” vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 43–87, 2018.
- [3] M. East, J. Bitchener, and H. Basturkmen, “What Constitutes Effective Feedback to Postgraduate Research Students? The Students’ Perspective,” *J. Univ. Teach. Learn. Pract.*, vol. 9, no. 2, p. 18, 2012, [Online]. Available: <http://zb5lh7ed7a.search.serialssolutions.com/directLink?&atitle=What+Constitutes+Effective+Feed+back+to+Postgraduate+Research+Students?+The+Students'+Perspective&author=East,+Martin;Bitchener,+John;Basturkmen,+Helen&issn=14499789&title=Journal+of+Universi>.
- [4] J. Bitchener, “Written Corrective Feedback for L2 Development: Current Knowledge and Future Research,” *TESOL Q.*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 855–860, 2012, doi: 10.1002/tesq.62.
- [5] S. Carter and V. Kumar, “‘Ignoring me is part of learning’: Supervisory feedback on doctoral writing,” *Innov. Educ. Teach. Int.*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 68–75, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1080/14703297.2015.1123104.
- [6] P. C. Burnett, “The supervision of doctoral dissertations using a collaborative cohort model,” *Couns. Educ. Superv.*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 46–52, 1999, doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.1999.tb01789.x.
- [7] J. Northcott, P. Gillies, and D. Caulton, “What Postgraduates Appreciate in Online Tutor Feedback on Academic Writing,” *J. Acad. Writ.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 145–161, 2016, doi: 10.18552/joaw.v6i1.268.
- [8] J. Bitchener and U. Knoch, “The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students,” *Lang. Teach. Res.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 409–431, 2008, doi: 10.1177/1362168808089924.
- [9] N. W. Evans, K. J. Hartshorn, and E. Allen Tuioti, “Written Corrective Feedback: The Practitioners’ Perspective,” *Int. J. English Stud.*, vol. 10, no. 2, p. 47, 2010, doi: 10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119191.
- [10] “A Typology of Supervisor Written Feedback on L2 Students’ Theses ...,” vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 43–87, 2018.
- [11] S. Shaukat, A. Siddiquah, M. Abiodullah, and R. A. Akbar, “Postgraduate Students’ Attitudes towards Research.,” *Bull. Educ. Res.*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 111–122, 2014.
- [12] C. M. Zhao, C. M. Golde, A. C. McCormick, C. Zhao, C. M. Golde, and C. Alexander, “More than a signature : how advisor choice and advisor behaviour affect doctoral student satisfaction More than a signature : how advisor choice and advisor behaviour affect,” no. November 2014, pp. 37–41, 2007, doi: 10.1080/03098770701424983.
- [13] A. A. Wadee, M. Keane, A. J. Dietz, and D. Hay, “Effective PhD Supervision: Mentorship and Coaching,” p. 155, 2010, [Online]. Available: <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/38561/ASC-075287668-2854-01.pdf?sequence=1>.
- [14] J. Bitchener, S. Young, and D. Cameron, “The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing,” *J. Second Lang. Writ.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 191–205, 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001.
- [15] W. Wei and Y. Cao, “Written Corrective Feedback Strategies Employed by University English Lecturers: A Teacher Cognition Perspective,” *SAGE Open*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2020, doi: 10.1177/2158244020934886.
- [16] M. Andrew, “Supervising doctorates at a distance : three trans-Tasman stories,” doi: 10.1108/09684881211198239.
- [17] L. C. Sobell, H. L. Manor, M. B. Sobell, and M. Dum, “Self-Critiques of Audiotaped Therapy Sessions: A Motivational Procedure for Facilitating Feedback During Supervision,” *Train. Educ. Prof. Psychol.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 151–155, 2008, doi: 10.1037/1931-3918.2.3.151.
- [18] H. Rajab, K. Khan, and T. Elyas, “A case study of EFL teachers’ perceptions and practices in written corrective feedback,” *Int. J. Appl. Linguist. English Lit.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 119–131, 2016, doi: 10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.1p.119.
- [19] Y. Nurie, “Doctoral Students’ Perceived Needs and Preferences for Supervisors’ Written Feedback,” *PASAA J. Lang. Teach. Learn. Thail.*, vol. 56, no. December, pp. 112–144, 2019, [Online]. Available: <http://survey.hshsl.umaryland.edu/?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1224436&site=ehost-live>.
- [20] J. Morton, N. Storch, and C. Thompson, “Feedback on writing in the supervision of postgraduate students: Insights from the work of Vygotsky and Bakhtin,” *J. Acad. Lang. Learn.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 24–36, 2014.
- [21] K. Pyhältö, J. Vekkailla, and J. Keskinen, “Fit matters in the supervisory relationship: doctoral students and supervisors perceptions about the supervisory activities,” *Innov. Educ. Teach. Int.*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 4–16, 2015, doi: 10.1080/14703297.2014.981836.

- [22] H. Azman, N. F. M. Nor, N. F. M. Nor, and H. O. M. Aghwela, "Investigating Supervisory Feedback Practices and their Impact on International Research Student's Thesis Development: A Case Study," *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 141, pp. 152–159, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.028.
- [23] K. Pyhältö, A. Toom, J. Stubb, and K. Lonka, "Challenges of Becoming a Scholar: A Study of Doctoral Students' Problems and Well-Being," *ISRN Educ.*, vol. 2012, pp. 1–12, 2012, doi: 10.5402/2012/934941.
- [24] A. Aridah, H. Atmowardoyo, and K. Salija, "Teacher Practices and Students' Preferences for Written Corrective Feedback and Their Implications on Writing Instruction," *Int. J. English Linguist.*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 112, 2017, doi: 10.5539/ijel.v7n1p112.
- [25] A. E. Dabboub, "The effectiveness of comprehensive corrective feedback-direct and indirect-on EFL learners' language accuracy, structural complexity and lexical diversity," no. April, 2019.
- [26] D. Maliotaki, "Let feedback make the connection: Battling isolation in Distance Learning - The case of the MEd in TESOL students of the Hellenic Open University TT - Η απομόνωση στην εξ αποστάσεως εκπαίδευση: η ανατροφοδότηση ως συνδεδετικός ιστός ανάμεσα στον διδάσκοντα," *Res. Pap. Lang. Teach. Learn.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 188–209, 2019, [Online]. Available: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2222886660?accountid=35052>.
- [27] K. J. Herrmann and G. Wichmann-hansen, "Validation of the quality in PhD processes questionnaire," 2017, doi: 10.1108/SGPE-D-17-00017.
- [28] N. Vyatkina, "Writing Instruction and Policies for Written Corrective Feedback in the Basic Language Sequence," *L2 J.*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2011, doi: 10.5070/12319070.
- [29] C. Guerin, R. Walker, C. Aitchison, and M. Laming, "Doctoral supervisor development in Australian universities Preparing research supervisors to teach writing," *J. Acad. Lang. Learn.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 88–103, 2017.
- [30] K. Hytten, E. Schröer-merker, and S. Denfeld, "Promoting Student Partnership in a Postgraduate Environmental Management Programme Through Thesis Research and Writing Workshops," vol. 1, no. 25, 2018.
- [31] J. Vekkailla, K. Pyhältö, and K. Lonka, "Experiences of disengagement - A study of doctoral students in the behavioral sciences," *Int. J. Dr. Stud.*, vol. 8, pp. 61–81, 2013, doi: 10.28945/1870.
- [32] J. Lefroy, C. Watling, P. W. Teunissen, and P. Brand, "Guidelines: the do's, don'ts and don't knows of feedback for clinical education," *Perspect. Med. Educ.*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 284–299, 2015, doi: 10.1007/s40037-015-0231-7.

## AUTHORS

**Bakhtawer Mughal** is a Ph.D. scholar at the School of Foreign Languages, Zhengzhou University, China. She, has been teaching ESL students in her native country at Mehran University of Engineering and Technology. Her interests is ELT and Second language acquisition



**Dr. Jiancheng Qian** is a Ph.D professor and Dean at the School of Foreign Languages, Zhengzhou University, China. In this role he leads the Awards, Grants and Fellowships program and engages learning and teaching activities at the Zhengzhou University. He has experience in a range of research approaches and particularly his research area is Second language Acquisition. He is an active researcher and research supervisor in the field of English linguistics.