

Dialogic Feedback on Graduate Students' Thesis Writing Supervision: Voices of Indonesian Graduate Students

Sarai Enita¹, Sumardi²

¹ Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia; saraienita@student.uns.ac.id

² Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia; sumardi74@staff.uns.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

dialogic feedback;
feedback dialogue;
graduate students;
thesis supervision

Article history:

Received 2022-06-05

Revised 2022-10-02

Accepted 2023-01-31

ABSTRACT

Researchers have become increasingly interested in the notion of dialogic feedback in higher education. Despite its growing awareness of dialogic feedback, relatively little is known about how dialogic feedback is perceived through the lens of graduate students in the thesis supervision context. Hence, the purpose of this study is to explore the perceptions of graduate students regarding dialogic feedback during thesis proposal writing in a group supervision setting. An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) was undertaken to investigate the feedback experiences. Five TESOL graduate students were recruited to participate in semi-structured interviews and observations regarding supervision meetings. Two themes emerged from the findings. The first is the role of dialogic feedback in preventing students' misunderstanding and cultivating students' reflective thinking. Findings indicated that dialogic feedback could help improve students' writing skills and thesis progress. The second is the positive and negative emotions encountered in the dialogic feedback experience. It contains feelings of low self-confidence, no fear of negative correction, and feelings of being motivated. The implication of the study brought to light the impact dialogic feedback has on thesis progress as well as providing a view of the dynamics between students' and supervisors' interactions in dialogic feedback experience.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Sarai Enita

Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia; saraienita@student.uns.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Thesis writing is an essential part of graduate students' journey in pursuing their Master's degree as it offers the opportunity for students to apply their existing knowledge and skills into practice. For TESOL students with little expertise in academic writing in English, this might be a challenging endeavor (Wang & Yang 2012). Despite the many factors influencing students' academic discourse development, supervisory feedback is pivotal (Basturkmen et al., 2014; Kumar & Stracke, 2007; Xu, 2017) in assisting

them to write their thesis proposals. It is designed for the specific needs of students in their learning process (Bitchener, 2017, p. 90). However, feedback was frequently mentioned as one of the unsatisfactory aspects (Mulliner & Tucker, 2017) and was frequently considered challenging for students (Blair & McGinty, 2013). Some shreds of evidence (Agricola, Prins, van der Schaaf, & van Tartwijk, 2021; de Kleijn, Mainhard, Meijer, Brekelmans, & Pilot, 2013; Weaver, 2006) showed that students find it hard to grasp the feedback given by the supervisor because of the academic term employed, and this affected how they could not make sense of the direction given.

It is common for students to have different expectations when it comes to feedback during thesis or proposal writing (Kumar & Stracke, 2007). The condition which situates the students to be unsatisfied and could not engage with feedback given poses significant issues for the design of feedback and its approach (Carless & Boud, 2018; Matusov, von Duyke, & Kayumova, 2016). It is, therefore, crucial to provide high-quality feedback to students as it potentially gives a significant impact on student's progress in the process of learning (Geitz, Brinke, & Kirschner, 2015; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Hence, the development of the dialogic approach is a response aimed at addressing issues and providing feedback during supervision. This approach emphasizes dialogue and open communication to ensure that students benefit from the feedback.

From a socio-constructivist standpoint, dialogic feedback resonates with how Vygotsky (1978) defined feedback. He viewed feedback as a dynamic interactional process that enables students to participate and engage in feedback dialogues with their supervisors or peers. Dialogic feedback has been identified as an essential facet of educational study and practice. In the past ten years, educators have emphasized its importance (Ajjawi, & Boud, 2017; Beaumont, O'Doherty, & Shannon, 2011; Nicol, 2010; Steen-Utheim & Wittek, 2017; Yang & Carless, 2013). Moreover, dialogic feedback describes learning interactions provided by educators or peers. Previous studies demonstrated the importance of dialogic feedback to students' learning growth and achievement (Adie, Kleij, & Cumming, 2018; Ajjawi & Boud, 2018; Nicol, 2010). Drawing from the work of Adie, Kleij, and Cumming (2018), it was revealed that educator and student involvement is a crucial predictor of success. The study examined the most important factors in fostering successful feedback dialogues. Dialogic quality of feedback can help both students and educators to learn. Additionally, Ajjawi and Boud (2018) utilized interactional analysis to investigate the characteristics of each component of feedback dialogue and their intermediate impacts on students. This was achieved through examining student feedback dialogue extracts.

The available literature suggests that dialogic feedback is pertinent as it can help students improve their writing. Although there is an increasing awareness of the importance of dialogic feedback, research attention to students' perceptions of this type of feedback is still relatively limited. Previous research has documented participants' experiences and provided understanding for unraveling dialogic feedback in the context of doctorate writing supervision (Sun & Trent, 2020). However, research on how dialogic feedback experience is captured within master's thesis supervision has been rarely elucidated. Even though there is a research study focusing on feedback involvement in the Master of Education program at a university in the Greater China region (Zheng, Yu, Wang & Zhang, 2019), this study does not discuss dialogic feedback; rather, it just addresses feedback approaches in general. Further, in Indonesia itself, several research concerning dialogic feedback have been found in the context of supervision in a professional training program (PLP) (Amirulloh, Lengkanawati, & Setyarini, 2019). Yet still, there is a lack of information in the area of graduate student supervision context, though it is an important topic to explore. As a thoughtful response to this dearth, this leads us to point out that our research focuses on the feedback practices in the supervision context with reference to the graduate students' point of view. Hence, this research's focus is to find out graduate students' experiences and perceptions of dialogic feedback in the supervisory thesis writing context. Drawing from this aim, this research tried to seek out the following two research questions: (1) What role does dialogical supervisory feedback experience play in facilitating graduate students' thesis writing? (2) How do graduate students describe their emotions and feeling towards their experience of dialogic feedback in thesis writing supervision?

2. METHODS

This qualitative case study involved five graduate students of TESOL, two male, and three female, who were at different stages of writing their theses. Out of 40 TESOL graduate students who participated in this study, five of them were recruited using purposive sampling. Five of them have experienced dialogic feedback in their supervision meetings. They were enrolled in a Master's degree program in English Teacher Education at a university in Indonesia. Only one participant had already completed the thesis defense. The participants were between 23 and 34 years and from the same supervision group. They were observed for varying lengths of time and then interviewed about their development in thesis writing activities.

In terms of research ethics, we considered various aspects provided by Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2018) which include seeking informed consent, ensuring confidentiality and anonymity, identification and non-traceability, and being sensitive to study. All measures were taken to protect the rights and interests of the participants. Data were accessed and archived solely for this study, and no judgments were made about the responses. Before beginning the study, all participants were given an informed consent form detailing the confidentiality measures that would be in place, including using pseudonyms. The participants signed a consent form agreeing that their names would not appear in the publication. Additional information about the non-traceability and lack of potentially sensitive issues was addressed. The respondents were reassured that their involvement would not negatively impact their grades and that data would not be shared with third parties. They assured that their participation would be kept confidential and that their responses would be used for study purposes only.

Qualitative data was collected through the administration of interviews and supervision meetings observations. These observations were used to create the interview guide and gain insight into students' opinions. The preferred method was consistent with the social constructivist ontology and epistemology proposed in this study. Two supervision meetings were conducted virtually through zoom to gain an insight into feedback practice in students' supervision meetings completed two weeks before the interviews. The observation was more preferred as it allowed for a direct connection to the actual feedback practices and interview questions (Maxwell, 2005). This study provides valuable insights into students' perception of feedback and the best way it can be used to improve learning. The study design used comments given by the supervisor to explore feedback practice and its influence on enhancing learning. WhatsApp and Google drive were used to share the reviewed comments after ethical approval and submission of informed consent papers. Previous data was analyzed and combined with the observation findings to develop semi-structured interview questions, which lasted approximately 32 to 55 minutes. An interview guide was used based on current theory, and observed feedback practice in the supervision meeting (Kvale, 2001).

The data was transcribed, and interviews were audio-recorded. IPA (Smith, Jarman, & Osborn, 1999) was used to evaluate qualitative data, given that it included a deep analysis of how people utilized their lives. The initial coding process involved transcribing each recorded audio interview and checking thoroughly for any critical areas highlighted (Smith et al., 2009; Smith et al., 1999). The following stage involved analyzing the emergent themes in order to generate tentative interpretations and subsequently analyze them. The next step involved examining patterns and relationships within conceptual groups to help understand the participants' experiences (Smith et al., 1999, p.232). This was accomplished by categorizing analyzed data into emergent themes and reviewed to complete the interpretation and connect it with the study objective.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Drawing from the coded interview data of five participants, two primary themes emerged from this section: the role of dialogic feedback in preventing students' misunderstanding and cultivating

students' reflective thinking and the positive and negative emotions encountered in the dialogic feedback experience.

The Role of Dialogic Feedback

The idea of dialogic feedback places an emphasis on the importance of interaction in the delivery of feedback and involves students in the process of constructing interpretive meaning about the feedback comments (Steen-Utheim & Wittek 2017). Dialogic feedback generally enhances student learning in a variety of ways. The students' experiences after participating in the dialogic feedback exercise during supervision meetings changed in certain ways. This section contains data on the role dialogic feedback plays in helping graduate students to write their theses. There are two roles of dialogic feedback that emerge in our study: preventing students' misunderstanding and cultivating students' reflective thinking.

Preventing Misunderstanding

Feedback on thesis writing has not occasionally been well received, leading to passive, irritated, or perhaps just compliant behavior on the part of the student. The misunderstandings could commonly arise with written comments. However, the results of this study showed that there was a significant benefit for the students when the supervisor provided dialogic feedback to students through converging zoom meetings. Usually, the supervisor shared the screen with students, showed their work, and made corrections directly while explaining them verbally. If students had difficulty understanding the feedback, they were given a chance to ask for clarification. For instance, they could ask, "How could I fix this area?", "Could you please explain further?". Then, the supervisor gave another question or asked about the other students' opinions. That was when the dialogue between the supervisor and the students occur. Instead of simply receiving feedback and becoming confused, students could directly ask for clarification, which in turn allowed them to make the necessary corrections.

(Excerpt 1)

I can understand the feedback clearly as I can talk about my weakest areas in writing. I could consult it by talking to my supervisor and I could fix the problems right away. (P1/Interview)

(Excerpt 2)

In providing the feedback, usually, my supervisor not only tells the feedback but also asks about my opinion on it. When I have another idea then I propose it to my supervisor right at that time. He is very open-minded and listens carefully to my idea. (P2/Interview)

(Excerpt 3)

My supervisor gave me room for discussion when I do not understand a specific part. (P3/Interview)

From the P1, P2, and P3 experiences above, they consider feedback as the key to improving weak areas in writing. Consulting a supervisor helps with prompt identification and resolution of issues. It was evident that they were comfortable asking questions and expressing opinions in the meeting, which also applied to other students. All of the students agreed that the supervisory dialogic feedback prompted them to ask questions and seek clarification to avoid misunderstanding.

(Excerpt 4)

Even if it's not our work that got the feedback, we can learn from each other's work as we could give suggestions to others' work and we can ask questions from other students' feedback (P2/Interview)

P2 also added another interesting experience in the dialogic feedback. P2 explained that the supervisors usually invited other students to provide feedback on one another's work, promoting the sharing of ideas and learning from one another.

(Excerpt 4)

sometimes it takes time to understand this and that, and you know, very often the question came up after the meeting has ended. Well, I directly send a Whatsapp message to my supervisor by asking if this part should be like this, does this method is suitable for my objective, and things like that (P4/Interview)

Furthermore, P4 came up with a different experience. The student explained that sometimes it took time to deeply understand the comment and question that was going to ask come up after the meeting had ended. To gain clarity regarding such a situation, the student contacted the supervisor through WhatsApp messenger to ensure that the proposed method was in line with the set objectives. Interestingly, P4 did not view the supervision session as a session that is only limited until the zoom meeting has ended. Instead, it is viewed as an ongoing learning process both inside and outside the supervision meeting. In conclusion, they all felt that dialogic feedback was crucial in preventing misunderstanding in class as their questions and ideas would not be ignored. As the students given the time to participate, they could check their understanding of the feedback they got and pose inquiries about it. Besides giving the students the chance to evaluate their grasp of the feedback received. Feedback dialogues here also gave room for the supervisor to find ways to scaffold the students.

Cultivating Students' Reflective Thinking

Reflective process requires the students to be actively involved in the discussion when they were receiving feedback. This position might be easier to enable in dialogic feedback sessions as opposed to written monologic feedback (Prins, Sluijsmans, & Kirschner, 2006). This subtheme shows how dialogic experience could cultivate students' sense and skills in reflection. At the end of the meeting, the supervisor usually allowed students to express their thoughts on what they gleaned from the supervision meeting. The supervisor would likely inquire about students' thoughts and feelings after receiving this feedback and the lessons learned.

(Excerpt 5)

My supervisor always spends some time just reflecting on what we have done on that particular day, I mean in the supervision meeting. I learn to activate my brain to the contrast between what I wrote and the supervisor's feedback. That way I could understand it better. (P1/Interview)

(Excerpt 6)

I reflect on my work with the supervisor, and many times I realize that I need to simplify my sentences and so on. It was beneficial to help me to remember things that need improvement. (P2/Interview)

(Excerpt 7)

I learn to evaluate and see what areas I really need to work on. I could also think again about the objectives of my study. it helps me to think about what kind of steps I should do after getting feedback like this. (P3/Interview)

(Excerpt 8)

Reflecting again on what we have learned, I think will sharpen my memory, as it reminds me again and again. It activated my brain to remember the feedback for me and my friends. (P4/Interview)

The excerpts above reflect students' responses to the reflection process which produced positive impacts on their learning process. Besides activating their brain to evaluate their work, the reflection process in dialogic feedback also helped them to decide the next step. This motivated students to consider realistic steps to enhance the outcome and promoted learning through experience. This reflection conducted by the supervisor contributes to strengthening students' cognition instead of just delivering commands to their work (Anderson, 2014).

Positive and Negative Emotions Encountered in Dialogic Feedback Experience

As what is asserted by Pekrun, Goetz, and Perry (2002), feedback experiences can evoke either positive or negative emotions. Thus, this section shows the students' emotions that they encounter during their experience in supervisory dialogic feedback. The emotions contain the feelings of low-self confidence in showing their writing, no fear of negative correction, and feelings of being motivated.

Feelings of Low-Self Confidence in Showing Their Writing

Most students encountered low self-confidence when it comes to showing their work to supervisors, fearing it would not meet expectations.

(Excerpt 9)

I am not confident to present my work to my supervisor because he is an expert in the field of research and publication. Compare to my experience, I am just a beginner. Lack of many things. (P3/Interview)

(Excerpt 10)

In showing my thesis proposal, I mean the draft, I am not confident. I feel that my writing would not be good enough. You know as a student I have a kind of feeling to make my supervisor proud of me or just simply that I do not want to disappoint my supervisor. (P4/Interview)

Various reasons are described in the excerpts above. P3 and P4 indicated that they thought they would be unable to live up to the set expectation, given the supervisor's professionalism and experience. In addition, another student, P1 also admitted to being inexperienced such as the supervisor, making to feel inferior when sharing the writing. P2 was also quite skeptical of the ability to compose a strong thesis proposal indicating the fear that the work would fall short of the supervisor's expectations.

No Fear of Correction

It was revealed in the previous section that students felt a mixture of low self-confidence and fear before the supervision meeting. However, interestingly, it was discovered that most of the students were not afraid of criticism or negative feedback.

(Excerpt 11)

instead of feeling afraid of the corrections, I actually find it fun and relief we can talk about the area that I need to pay attention to. My supervisor and my peers were so supportive and did not bully me. (P1/Interview)

(Excerpt 12)

It's not something that I need to be afraid of, even though I will talk to him directly and be observed by my other friends. Instead, I always wait for the correction, because that way, I can notice my errors and discuss them right away with my supervisor and friends. Even sometimes,

when I thought I did my best, my supervisor always found a way in providing me with new insights on how to make my sentences better. (P3/Interview)

One student, P1, implied that the correcting process was fun and relieving, as it allowed them to focus on areas in which they need attention. All students shared the same opinion, which explains that they were not afraid of getting lots of corrections directly from the supervisor in the presence of their peers. Further, from P1's excerpt, it can be interpreted that the group of supervision also promoted a safe and supportive ambiance. They maintained their positive attitude towards the feedback. Despite the correction and critique for the incorrect grammatical or lexical errors and ambiguity in the content of the students' work, all of them stated that they did not feel discouraged. They could learn from mistakes and discuss them with the supervisor. Even when students did their best, the supervisor found meaningful insights to improve their work. Having the room for interaction between the students and the supervisor helps the students to spot the area needed for improvement right away.

Feelings of Being Motivated

Motivation plays a vital role in the learning experience, and in this context, students said they felt a significantly increased level of motivation to revise their thesis after getting the chance to talk with the supervisor.

(Excerpt 13)

It gets me motivated to write even better after I had a discussion with my supervisor in the supervision meeting. (P2/Interview)

(Excerpt 14)

I was in a fog at the beginning. Writing a thesis is totally different from my undergraduate experiences. It was quite complicated, but then I got a lot of support from my supervisor. He motivated me to complete my thesis. (P4/Interview)

One respondent, P2, explained that having discussions with the supervisor motivated the student to write better. While another opinion came from P4 who expressed that, at the beginning of the program, there was anxiety because the writing experience was different from the previous undergraduate degree. From their utterances, it can be inferred that the interaction with such a supportive supervisor could motivate students to complete their work. Some students' statements also emphasize how they felt assured and their work was appreciated.

(Excerpt 15)

My supervisor said that my writing was nicely put in sequence, but I still need to pay attention to some grammatical issues, academic terminology, and things like that. (P1/Interview)

(Excerpt 16)

Even though there are a lot of corrections for my writing, he usually starts the feedback by giving compliments on our effort. From the way he talked to us, I could feel that he was quite sincere. (P4/Interview)

The supervisor's feedback, which included compliments and critiques, boosted students' confidence and made them feel that their work was valued and appreciated. In addition, motivating students by giving them compliments is an effective way to start before correcting their work. Furthermore, P4 also added that sincerity could be felt when the supervisor talked and gave compliments to the students orally.

(Excerpt 17)

My supervisor sometimes made a call through WhatsApp. Simply asking how we were doing and our barriers or struggle lately. He motivated us to finish our work as soon as possible and to always make a progress. I have never experienced this kind of approach before. Usually, the students who tried to contact the students, but my supervisor is different. Well, I think this is

something that I need, especially since I've already married and worked, so it's kind of hard you know to just balance this and that. I am thankful to experience this. (P3/Interview)

Another point of view came from P3. As a student who had to balance working full-time, taking care of family, and writing a thesis proposal, P3 often felt exhausted. However, he mentioned that he got continuous reinforcement from the supervisor. From the excerpts above, it was revealed that there was some occasion when the supervisor called the students one by one by phone and initiate discussion to check on their progress and motivate them. Derived from this finding, the supervisor's approach appeared to play a role in upholding students' motivation in their thesis writing process.

Drawing upon multiple data sources, the results of this study showed that students appreciate the roles of dialogical supervisory feedback in facilitating their thesis writing. For instance, firstly, it prevents any misunderstanding. It was proven that discussing with students about their work has helped the students to clarify any misconceptions. This resonates with the assertions made by Winstone and Carless (2019) that looking at the time nature of feedback, dialogic feedback is aimed at helping students immediately absorb the feedback and address any misunderstandings. Besides, it gave the student the confidence to proceed forward while also giving them a realistic understanding of what is expected in their thesis writing. However, in relation to the implementation of dialogic feedback, Steen-Utheim and Hopfenbeck (2019) also reminded educators that ineffective dialogues can lead to misconceptions or students' sentiments of discouragement or inadequacy. Therefore, educators need to pay attention that the quality of dialogic engagement is critical in this approach (Steen-Utheim, & Hopfenbeck, 2019). Secondly, the dialogic feedback experience could liven up students' reflective thinking, so it allows students to reflect on their learning. In the same vein, Quinton and Smallbone (2010) asserted that "[f]eedback offers students an experiential base for reflection" (p.125). It is pivotal to provide opportunities for feedback reflection, as this may enable students to engage cognitively and metacognitively (Mutch, 2003; Shute, 2007). In addition, students also had a very positive reaction to the reflective activity in the supervision meeting.

This study also sought to understand the graduate students' emotions and feelings towards their experience of dialogic feedback in thesis writing supervision. Based on the findings, three primary emotions were expressed. First, feelings of low self-confidence when displaying their writing. In this first point, the gap between students and the supervisor in terms of experience and professionalism appeared to affect students' emotions. They felt the urge not to disappoint the supervisor since had received sufficient feedback. Secondly, it is revealed that there was no fear of getting negative corrections. Although the students were unconfident in showing their work to the supervisor, surprisingly, they have remained positive and built trust with their supervisors. Instead of feeling powerless to revise their thesis, students found motivation in the negative feedback. Carless (2009) argued that students need to be willing to trust their supervisor to succeed. However, this evidence is contradicted by Carless (2006), which stated that negative feedback could damage a student's self-esteem. This brings us to the third finding which is interrelated with the previous finding. All students in this study said that they also got motivated through their experience of dialogic feedback. The results are in line with how Carless (2016, p. 2) delineated the educator's and students' relationship through several characteristics of care, trust, class atmosphere, and relationships. This was in correspondence with the constructivist standpoint. Additionally, Carter and Kumar (2017) also found that compliments can be helpful in feedback. It also suggested that to reduce stress and improve student engagement, supervisors should provide compliments in addition to criticism.

4. CONCLUSION

This study showed that graduate students who experienced dialogic feedback made positive progress in their writing skills and emotional support. It is revealed that all of the students valued their interaction with their supervisor to ask questions and discuss the area matters to prevent them from misunderstanding. Furthermore, the findings also demonstrated that students could build reflective thinking through the dialogic feedback approach. Several emotions are also vividly portrayed by the

students through the feeling of low self-confidence, no fear of negative corrections, and getting motivation. In sum, the supervisor provided moral support during interactions, which enabled students to maintain their positive attitude and respond to feedback effectively. The quality of feedback and the supervisor-student dynamics were also found to impact students' engagement. Thus, it is suggested that active engagement from both the supervisor and the students is required for the feedback experience to be effective. As a result, the data uncovered in this study lends thought to the notion that dialogic feedback is an appropriate feedback approach for graduate students in the supervision context. These findings are relevant to current academic discussions about appropriate feedback practices to promote students' feelings of positivity during the dialogic feedback process. It is recommended that future studies should look at technology-enhanced dialogic feedback practices. It is worth looking at how this implementation could serve as a facilitator or distraction for effective dialogic feedback. It is also recommended that future studies should investigate dialogic feedback practices and engagement in a more comprehensive and contextualized way.

Acknowledgments: The researchers would like to gratefully acknowledge the participants for their willingness to have voluntarily participated in this study.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Adie, L., van der Kleij, F., & Cumming, J. (2018). The development and application of coding frameworks to explore dialogic feedback interactions and self-regulated learning. *British Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 704-723.
- Agricola, B. T., Prins, F. J., van der Schaaf, M. F., & van Tartwijk, J. (2021). Supervisor and Student Perspectives on Undergraduate Thesis Supervision in Higher Education. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 65(5), 877-897.
- Ajjawi, R., & Boud, D. (2017). Researching feedback dialogue: An interactional analysis approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(2), 252-265.
- Ajjawi, R., & Boud, D. (2018). Examining the nature and effects of feedback dialogue. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(7), 1106-1119.
- Amirulloh, R. D. N. K. S., Lengkanawati, N. S., & Setyarini, S. (2019). Dialogic supervision: Investigating supervision practices of English pre-service teachers in a professional training program (PLP). *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 434-442.
- Basturkmen, H., East, M., & Bitchener, J. (2014). Supervisors' on-script feedback comments on drafts of dissertations: Socialising students into the academic discourse community. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(4), 432-445.
- Beaumont, C., O'Doherty, M., & Shannon, L. (2011). Reconceptualising assessment feedback: a key to improving student learning?. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(6), 671-687.
- Bitchener, J. (2017). Written feedback typically provided on L2 students' chapter drafts. In *Developing Research Writing* (pp. 89-95). Routledge.
- Blair, A., & McGinty, S. (2013). Feedback-dialogues: exploring the student perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(4), 466-476.
- Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in higher education*, 31(2), 219-233.
- Carless, D. (2009). Trust, distrust and their impact on assessment reform. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(1), 79-89.
- Carless, D. (2016). Feedback as dialogue. *Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory*, 1-6.
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315-1325.
- Carter, S., & Kumar, V. (2017). 'Ignoring me is part of learning': Supervisory feedback on doctoral writing. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 54(1), 68-75.

- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education (8th ed.)*. Routledge.
- de Kleijn, R. A., Mainhard, M. T., Meijer, P. C., Brekelmans, M., & Pilot, A. (2013). Master's thesis projects: student perceptions of supervisor feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(8), 1012-1026.
- Geitz, G., Brinke, D. J. T., & Kirschner, P. A. (2015). Goal orientation, deep learning, and sustainable feedback in higher business education. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 26(4), 273-292.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Kumar, V., & Stracke, E. (2007). An analysis of written feedback on a PhD thesis. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12(4), 461-470.
- Matusov, E., von Duyke, K., & Kayumova, S. (2016). Mapping concepts of agency in educational contexts. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 50(3), 420-446.
- Mulliner, E., & Tucker, M. (2017). Feedback on feedback practice: perceptions of students and academics. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(2), 266-288.
- Mutch, A. (2003). Exploring the practice of feedback to students. *Active learning in higher education*, 4(1), 24-38.
- Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 501-517.
- Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Titz, W., & Perry, R. P. (2002). Academic emotions in students' self-regulated learning and achievement: A program of qualitative and quantitative research. *Educational psychologist*, 37(2), 91-105.
- Prins, F., Sluijsmans, D.M.A., & Kirschner, P.A. (2006). Feedback for general practitioners in training: Quality, styles and preferences. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 11, 289 – 303.
- Quinton, S., & Smallbone, T. (2010). Feeding forward: using feedback to promote student reflection and learning – a teaching model. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 47(1), 125–135.
- Shute, V. J. (2007). Focus on formative feedback. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2007(1), i-47.
- Steen-Utheim, A., & Wittek, A. L. (2017). Dialogic feedback and potentialities for student learning. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 15, 18-30.
- Steen-Utheim, A., & Hopfenbeck, T. N. (2019). To do or not to do with feedback. A study of undergraduate students' engagement and use of feedback within a portfolio assessment design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(1), 80-96.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Wang, X., & Yang, L. (2012). Problems and strategies in learning to write a thesis proposal: A study of six MA students in a TEFL program. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 324-341.
- Weaver, M. R. (2006). Do students value feedback? Student perceptions of tutors' written responses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(3), 379-394.
- Winstone, N., & Carless, D. (2019). *Designing effective feedback processes in higher education: A learning-focused approach*. Routledge.
- Xu, L. (2017). Written feedback in intercultural doctoral supervision: A case study. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 22(2), 239–255.
- Yang, M., and D. Carless. 2013. "The Feedback Triangle and the Enhancement of Dialogic Feedback Processes." *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(3), 285–297.
- Zheng, Y., Yu, S., Wang, B., & Zhang, Y. (2019). Exploring student engagement with supervisor feedback on master's thesis: Insights from a case study. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 1–12.