

Ola Majchrzak  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2161-3909>

University of Humanities and Economics in Lodz

e-mail: omajchrzak@ahe.lodz.pl

Feedback practices in EFL writing instruction – the case of Polish secondary schools

Abstract

The present paper addresses the problem of feedback in L2 writing instruction. Its main objective is to present the outcomes of a study identifying trends concerning the provision of feedback in Polish comprehensive high schools during English lessons. The data was gathered with the use of a questionnaire, mostly based on a Likert scale. It was distributed among first-year students of English Studies at a private university in Poland, who graduated from various high schools in Poland. The results show that students often obtain feedback from their teachers on their L2 texts; however, the feedback focuses mostly on accuracy; also, only half of the students surveyed found the feedback to be motivating; the students never prepare more than one draft of their L2 text; the students perceive the role of their L2 teachers as the one of a proofreader; peer feedback is used very seldom in L2 writing instruction. The data gathered in the study show that there is a great discrepancy between what is expected from valuable feedback on L2 writing and how feedback is provided in Polish secondary schools. Hence, there exists a need for educators to change their feedback practices to make them more effective, motivating and engaging for students.

Keywords: EFL writing instruction, EFL writing practices, secondary school, feedback, teacher feedback

The role of feedback in developing students' L2 writing skills

Feedback, understood as *input from a reader to a writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision* (Keh, 1990: 294), plays a crucial role in the development of second language writing skills. It does not only help learners notice and correct language errors, but also supports the development of more complex writing strategies, such

as organizing ideas, maintaining coherence, and adjusting tone or register (Ferris, 2003; Hyland, 2003). Depending on the type, clarity, and tone, feedback influences students' confidence and motivation (Hyland, Hyland, 2006). Supportive, constructive comments can build a sense of competence and progress, while vague or overly critical feedback may discourage further effort (*Ibid.*). Apart from being motivating, feedback should be timely, specific, and interactive (Lee, 2017). By interactive it is meant that students are invited to reflect and respond to the feedback they have received. Also, the very focus of feedback should depend on what the students are expected to practise and which draft they are working on, starting from more general, content-related issues, and finishing with polishing their texts' linguistic accuracy (Ferris, 2010). The teacher's role, therefore, should not be limited to correction: the L2 writing teacher should assist students in their development as L2 writers by providing them with constant and regular help during the writing process, together with emotional encouragement (Hyland, 2003). In this way, feedback does not only shape students' performance, but also influences their long-term attitudes toward writing in a second language.

In the context of L2 writing instruction, feedback has both formative and summative purposes. Formative feedback helps students improve their drafts by offering suggestions, highlighting strengths, and drawing attention to problematic issues. In this way, students become more conscious of the learning process, more autonomous in their learning and more motivated (Nicol, Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). At the same time, they tend to experience less anxiety as they know that the goal of feedback is to help them perform better (Choroszczyńska, Kossakowska, 2007). What is more, formative feedback helps build better relationship between teachers and students as the teacher does not only assess their performance but guides them in their development (*Ibid.*). This approach helps students understand writing as a process of constant revision and self-expression, and not just as a one-time product (Hyland, 2003).

The main goal of summative feedback is to assess students' performance, in this case written text, with the use of a grade, scores, percentages or a written comment. Hence, the goal here is to grade the ready product performed by the student rather than help them develop it (Brown, 2004). It may be understandable in case of final exams, for which the students have been preparing themselves for a longer period of time. However, on a regular basis summative assessment discourages students from engaging with the feedback they receive as they are aware that the grade is final and that the teacher does not expect them to introduce any corrections in their texts (Lee, 2017). What is more, knowing that they have only one opportunity to write their texts contributes to experiencing higher anxiety levels by the students (Hyland, 2003).

It should be mentioned, though, that a teacher is not the only source of feedback on students' L2 texts. Classmates may provide valuable information on other students' texts too if guided appropriately. Peer feedback is believed to be beneficial not only for the writer of the text but also, if not mostly, for the reader (Lundstrom, Baker, 2009). By analyzing and commenting on somebody else's text, one has the opportunity to compare their own texts with the texts of others and to reflect on the necessary changes to be introduced.

Apart from the class peers, artificial intelligence has a great potential of helping students improve their L2 texts (Barrot, 2023; Escalante, Pack, Barrett, 2023). When prompted adequately, it may provide students with very detailed feedback on their texts, concerning both the global as well as local issues. The undisputable benefit of AI in providing feedback is its positive tone, 24/7 availability, and infinite patience for the students' questions and corrections.

Feedback in the Polish context: a review of selected studies

The present section will focus on five studies conducted in Poland. Their goal was to investigate L2 writing practices present at the level of Polish secondary schools. The focus, though, will be on the area of feedback provision, as this is the focus of the present study.

Reichelt's research (2005) provides an in-depth analysis of English-language writing instruction in Polish primary, secondary, and university settings. Through interviews with teachers and classroom observations, Reichelt concluded that Polish EFL writing instruction is heavily influenced by high-stakes exams, such as the *Matura exam*, which impact teaching approaches and limit opportunities for creative and process-oriented writing. L2 writing instruction focuses largely on vocabulary, grammar, and exam formats rather than on critical thinking, creativity, or broader language functions. As a result, writing is often seen as a task where students are evaluated primarily on adherence to prescribed formats rather than on actual communicative skills.

Concerning feedback practices, Reichelt observed that, as assessing writing is a very time-consuming process for L2 teachers, Polish teachers of English try to minimize the amount of it. As she describes,

Because of their heavy workloads, the teachers [...] utilize techniques for teaching writing that make responding to student writing more manageable. Students often work in groups to write short pieces during class, drawing on vocabulary and/or grammar the teacher has introduced. Students often read their writing aloud or copy it onto the chalkboard, receiving feedback during class. When students write individual pieces at home, teachers sometimes give feedback orally to the entire class, focusing on common problem areas, rather than responding to papers individually (Reichelt, 2005: 221).

How students respond to teacher feedback and how motivating it is for them to further work on their L2 texts was verified in the study by Lipińska (2021). Specifically, the goal of her study was to determine how Polish high school learners perceive teacher written corrective feedback and how it influences their motivation to write in French as L2. The study used a questionnaire that included both closed and open-ended questions, allowing students to share their preferences, experiences, and emotional responses to various types of feedback. The types of feedback that the respondents were expected to assess were the following: error correction by the teacher, error indication without correction, descriptive assessment, class discussion of written work, and individual discussion with the teacher on written work. The most preferred type of feedback indicated

by the respondents was individual discussion with the teacher on written work (mean score 3.9), error correction by the teacher (mean score 3.7), and descriptive assessment (mean score 3.4). The least preferred type of feedback was error indication without correction (mean score 1.8). The students appreciated having their mistakes indicated in their L2 works by the teacher. They, however, criticized pointing out the errors without correcting them as it did not help them understand and improve what they did wrong. As one respondent observed, “The mere fact of highlighting students’ errors won’t guide them on how to improve. Furthermore, the grade itself and the red lines on the work can only stress the student out, rather than motivate them to improve” (Lipińska, 2021: 47). Also, many respondents indicated that descriptive comment was too general and it did not provide precise explanations of the mistakes. Discussing the written texts in front of the classroom raised both positive as well as negative comments. Some of the respondents saw it as an opportunity to see how they perform in relation to the whole class and how the text should have been written. On the other hand, some students perceived such form of feedback as too general as it did not concern the problem areas of every student; finally, pointing out errors in front of others was perceived as embarrassing. Individual consultations with the teacher were ranked highly, with students appreciating individual feedback provided one-to-one, which minimized the level of anxiety. 79% of the students reported that receiving detailed feedback from their teachers motivate them to further work. What is most motivating for them is the opportunity to fully understand the mistakes they have made in their texts. They also mentioned that negative comments have a discouraging effect. On the other hand, seeing the teacher being engaged in their L2 writing development is very motivating for them.

The study shows that teacher written corrective feedback is appreciated by the students. However, what matters is its form and the way it is delivered to the students. Students would like to be supported in their L2 writing development and not just assessed for their performance. What seemed very important for them was the individual approach: being able to consult their work with the teacher individually and receive feedback that focuses on their work. This shows that there is a need not only for formative assessment among secondary school students but also for more individual attention being paid to students in class.

The topic of formative assessment was also researched in the study by Baran-Łucarz (2019). The goal of the study was to estimate to what extent formative assessment is used in Polish secondary schools in English as a foreign language classes. The author checked how students, former secondary schools graduates, assess the application and frequency of formative comments on both L2 skills (speaking, writing, reading, listening) and subskills (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation). Concerning L2 writing, it was found that the respondents received summative assessment on their L2 texts mostly once or twice a month and two or three times a semester. The general tendency shows that this type of assessment was provided rather often than seldom. There in no clear tendency, however, in case of formative assessment. The respondents were divided in their opinions concerning the frequency of receiving this type of assessment on their L2 texts, with the final results being split in half between often and seldom (a considerable group of respondents was provided formative comments once or twice a month and a similar

number of respondents claimed they did not remember receiving such comments on their L2 texts). The respondents later reported that “writing was only assessed by a credit, which didn’t tell me anything about my weaknesses and how to deal with them” (p. 324). It was also found that feedback that was not constructive, clear and fair influenced the way in which the teacher was perceived by the student. The study generally showed that formative assessment is not often used at the level of secondary schools in Poland, both when developing L2 writing and other language skills.

The last two studies described in this section focus on determining whether feedback on L2 texts represents process or product approach. The first study by Hryniuk (2018) focused on Polish EFL learners’ perceptions of writing instruction tailored to high-stakes exams, particularly the Matura exam. Concerning feedback, the respondents, Polish secondary school graduates and first-year students of English studies, reported that in secondary schools teachers focused primarily on vocabulary and grammar (41%), with occasional attention paid to content and organization. Peer reviewing was largely absent from these classrooms, with 49% of students never participating in it. Similarly, multiple drafts of their L2 texts were rarely encouraged, with 51% of students never submitting more than one version of their texts. This shows that L2 writing in secondary schools is mostly taught within the product approach.

The second study that examined whether L2 writing is taught within the process or product approach was conducted by Potocka and Adams-Tukiendorf (2023). Specifically, it examined the nature of feedback provided by secondary schools teachers in Poland on students’ English writing. Data were gathered through questionnaires and interviews. In order to investigate the approach towards writing, the two areas were mainly looked at: what feedback concentrates on and how interactive it is. The findings indicate that teachers rarely adopt a process-oriented approach to writing instruction. Concerning the focus of feedback, the teachers provide comments that usually concentrate on the problematic areas concerning the content, language and organization, while error-free texts usually receive very limited feedback. When giving feedback, 50% of the teachers concentrated on content, 40% on the language and 10% on the organization. However, 75% of the teachers found the content to be the most important aspect of their learners’ texts. During individual interviews, the teachers reported that when giving feedback on students’ texts, their comments mostly regarded “problem areas, errors/mistakes and lapses in writing” (p. 77), which were first marked in the text by the teacher, corrected and discussed later with a student. All the teachers reported that “the most common method of assessing learner texts involved carefully marking errors and providing extra comments on language, content, and / or organization” (p. 75).

In case of interactivity of feedback, feedback transpired to be in no way interactive, as students were not given an opportunity to rewrite their text on the basis of the teacher’s comments. This very often leads to the situation when teachers feel that their students ignore their suggestions for improving their writing as they expect their learners to “use them [their comments] in future writing tasks or make-up assignments” (p. 78). However, most often students are not expected to rewrite their texts. Students are usually required to produce a single draft of their work, which is reviewed by the teacher only once. They

are allowed to rewrite their texts only when the grade is negative. The teachers explained that they did not use multiple draft approach to writing due to a large number of learners and a limited time devoted to teaching writing. In their opinion, it was simply “unrealistic to work on multiple drafts and multiple extensive comments” (p. 77). This study, just like the previous one, shows that L2 writing in Polish secondary schools is taught within the product approach.

Summary of findings

On the basis of the aforementioned studies, it can be concluded that in Poland in secondary schools:

- L2 writing is taught mainly within the product approach;
- summative feedback dominates; however, formative feedback is expected by the students.
- feedback is not interactive, as students are not asked to prepare more than one draft of their work;
- feedback mostly focuses on linguistic issues, namely vocabulary and grammar;
- feedback focuses on problem areas rather than strengths of the work;
- students find feedback motivating when it is individualized, personal, offers guidelines concerning future improvements, and is kind;
- students do not want to be corrected in front of the whole class;
- teacher feedback dominates; peer feedback is almost never used.

The study

The following section describes the study conducted by the present Author within the area of feedback practices in Polish secondary schools. Inspired by the five studies described in the previous section, the present study aims at answering the following research questions:

RQ1: *How often do students receive teacher feedback on their L2 texts?*

RQ2: *What does teacher feedback focus on?*

RQ3: *Do students use the teacher feedback they receive? (Do they work on multiple drafts?)*

RQ4: *Does teacher feedback motivate them to further work? Why?*

RQ5: *How do students perceive the role of the teacher in developing their L2 writing skills?*

RQ6: *Is peer feedback used?*

On the basis of the results of the studies reviewed in the previous section, the following hypotheses have been formulated:

H1: *Students often receive feedback on their L2 texts from teachers. Whenever they write something, it is commented on.*

H2: *Teacher feedback focuses mostly on linguistic issues; however, it may also focus on content.*

H3: *The students do not have many opportunities to use teacher feedback as product approach towards writing dominates in L2 writing instruction. Students are not asked to write more than one draft of their texts.*

H4: *Teacher feedback does not motivate students to work more on their texts. The reasons behind this may be: too general comments, feedback in the form of a grade, no guidelines concerning how to improve one's work.*

H5: *Students see teachers as those who correct their texts, pointing out mistakes mostly. They do not perceive teachers as the ones who guide them throughout the writing process or inspire them in terms of what or how to write.*

H6: *Peer feedback is inexistent in Polish secondary schools in L2 writing instruction.*

Participants

80 students participated in the study. They were doing their first year of B.A. studies at the faculty of English studies at one of the private universities in central Poland, both full-time (31%) and part-time (69%). The students were mostly aged between 18 and 20 (65%); 26% were slightly older, namely between 21 and 23 years old. However, there were also few students (9%) who were more than 23 years old. The study group consisted of both women (60%) and men (40%). Most of the students (57.5%) assessed their level of English proficiency as B2. 17.5% saw their English competence as B1 and the same number of students as C1. There were 4 students who believed their English proficiency was lower than most of the students (namely on A2 level) and there were 2 students who indicated C2 level. The majority of the respondents (69%) graduated from high school, while the remaining 31% from technical secondary school.

Instrumentation and procedure

The present study is a part of a larger project that focused on developing L2 writing skills in Polish secondary schools. It was carried out in the winter semester 2022/2023 during the creative writing course, which is conducted by the author of the present article. The students were asked to fill in an anonymous, online questionnaire. It was prepared and distributed in the Polish language.

This study focuses on the seven questions from the questionnaire that centred upon feedback in L2 writing instruction in secondary schools. Five of them included Likert scale, one required the respondents to choose from two options (*yes* or *no*) and one questions was an open-ended one, asking the respondents to justify their answer from the previous question. The remaining five questions focused on personal information concerning the respondents, such as gender, age, level of L2 proficiency, the type of secondary school a student graduated from and course of studies.

The students were asked to fill in the online questionnaire during the class. The questionnaire was prepared in Google documents. The moment the students filled it in, the results were automatically saved and could be viewed and analyzed by the researcher.

Results

The results in this section will be presented with respect to the earlier formulated research questions.

The frequency of teacher feedback on students' L2 writing

The following table presents the respondents' answers concerning the frequency of receiving teacher feedback on their L2 texts.

Tab. 1. How often did you receive feedback from your teacher concerning your L2 text?

Frequency	Percent of students
always	12.5
very often	22.5
often	21.5
rarely	22.5
very rarely	16.0
never	5.0
Mean score:	3.78 (often)

Source: own elaboration.

The results indicate a moderately positive trend, with 12.5% of students stating they received comments "always", 22.5% reporting "very often", and 21.5% "often". This implies that more than a half of the respondents often received feedback from their teachers, which is essential for developing their writing skills. However, the data also reveal a significant concern: 38.5% of students reported receiving feedback "rarely" or "very rarely", and 5% claimed they never received comments on their work. This, in turn, shows that almost half of the students did not receive regular feedback on their texts from their teachers.

The focus of teacher feedback

The following table presents the respondents' answers concerning the areas that teacher feedback in L2 writing instruction focused on in secondary schools.

Tab. 2. How often did teacher feedback focus on the following aspects?

Focus of teacher feedback	Mean score	Response
accuracy	4.79	very often
content	4.00	often
vocabulary	3.98	often
text organization	3.96	often
grammar structures	3.79	often
originality	2.75	seldom

Source: own elaboration.

The results regarding the focus of teacher comments on various aspects of student writing show that there is a strong emphasis on accuracy (mean score 4.79), which indicates that teachers prioritize correct language use in their students' L2 texts. Content, vocabulary, text organization, and grammar structures also receive considerable attention and are often addressed in teachers' comments. However, originality appears to be significantly less emphasized (mean score 2.75). This suggests that while teachers may be scrupulous in addressing aspects such as accuracy and content, they may be missing an opportunity in encouraging students to develop their unique voices and creative ideas in writing.

Interactivity of feedback

The following table presents the responses of the students concerning their experience in writing multiple drafts of the same L2 paper. In this way, the Author wanted to check whether a student has a chance to include teacher feedback in later drafts of the same work.

Tab. 3. How often did you work on multiple drafts of the same paper?

Frequency	Percent of students
always	1
very often	0
often	1
rarely	5
very rarely	9
never	84
Mean score:	1.29 (never)

Source: own elaboration.

The students reported that they never (mean score: 1.29) had to prepare more than one draft of their text. This implies that in Polish secondary schools L2 writing is seen as a one-time activity.

Teacher feedback as motivator for further work

The table below presents the respondents' opinions concerning whether teacher feedback motivated them to work further on their L2 texts.

Tab. 4. Did teacher feedback motivate you to work further on your L2 text?

Students' answers	Percent of students
yes	44
no	56

Source: own elaboration.

56% of the students indicated that they did not feel motivated by the comments they received from their teachers. The reasons they provided were similar to the ones mentioned by the respondents in Lipińska's (2021) study. Namely, they found the comments being vague or overly general (*You can do better*), focusing mostly on grammar and mistakes (*The teacher only pointed out errors without showing how to improve*), and lacking any positive reinforcement. Also, many students reported that there was no teacher feedback whatsoever (*I never got any real comments – just grades*).

On the other hand, 44% of students reported feeling motivated by comments they received from their teachers. The respondents emphasized that teacher feedback was constructive and specific, offering suggestions for improvement (*I knew exactly what I could improve.*), included praise and recognition (*Positive feedback always motivated me – especially when the teacher noticed my effort and ideas*), and was expressed in a kind and motivating tone. These answers are in line with Lipińska's (2021) findings.

The role of the teacher in developing students' L2 writing skills

The six roles of the L2 writing teacher were named in the questionnaire:

- **coordinator**: organizes activities, manages time, creates work space;
- **model**: presents the examples of well written texts and writing techniques;
- **motivator**: encourages to write;
- **guide**: offers feedback and support;
- **language consultant**: advises in terms of language;
- **proofreader**: corrects the mistakes.

The table below presents the results concerning the perceived role of the teacher in developing students' L2 writing skills.

Tab. 5. How do you perceive the role of your English teacher in developing your L2 writing skills?

The role of the teacher in developing L2 writing skills	Mean score	Response
Proofreader	4.68	yes
Language consultant	4.11	rather yes
Guide	4.00	rather yes
Coordinator	3.80	rather yes
Model	3.73	rather yes
Motivator	3.33	rather no

Source: own elaboration.

The students indicated that the role that their L2 teachers most frequently adopted when teaching L2 writing was the one of a proofreader (mean score 4.68). Then there was language consultant (mean score 4.11), guide (4.0), coordinator (3.8), and model (3.73). The students did not feel that their teachers took the role of the motivator (mean score 3.33). It is visible that students mostly see their secondary school teachers as the ones who corrected their works and not as those who motivate and encourage the student to write in L2.

Peer reviewing

The table below presents the respondents' experiences concerning the frequency of having their L2 papers peer reviewed.

Tab. 6. How often was peer reviewing used by the teacher?

Students' answers	Percent of students
always	0.0
very often	1.0
often	7.5
rarely	12.5
very rarely	20.0
never	59.0
Mean score:	1.73 (very seldom)

Source: own elaboration.

The results regarding the frequency of peer reviewing in L2 writing instruction in Polish secondary schools show that it was very rarely used (mean score 1.73). Peer reviewing is a valuable educational tool, both for the student commenting as well as the one receiving comments. It does not only help students in developing their writing skills through providing and receiving constructive feedback but also fosters a sense of community and collaboration among students. This lack of peer feedback opportunities suggests a significant gap in collaborative learning experiences within the classroom. Bearing in mind

that providing feedback is extremely time-consuming for teachers, peer reviewing seems to be a practical option, which would not only relieve the teachers but, most importantly, make students more autonomous in their search for valuable feedback on their L2 texts. At the same time, collaboration would be promoted when students realize that there are other sources they can turn to in order to receive valuable feedback on their L2 texts.

Summary of findings and implications for providing feedback in L2 writing

With reference to the research questions, the findings clearly show that:

RQ1: How often do students receive teacher feedback on their L2 texts?

The respondents often receive feedback on their L2 texts from their teachers. This means that not every text they work on is commented on. Providing students with regular and detailed feedback is time-consuming. However, the teacher is not the only source of feedback the students may turn to. Self-assessment, peer review or using tools based on AI may all prove useful when introduced reasonably, step-by-step into L2 writing instruction.

RQ2: What does the teacher feedback focus on?

Teacher feedback focuses most often on accuracy and least often on creativity of students' L2 texts. Constant focus on mistakes may result in students experiencing anxiety towards L2 writing. Students know that what matters for their teachers is how correct they will be in their essays and not what they have to say in their texts. In order to reverse this trend and let students see writing as a process in which they have space to communicate their thoughts, it is advisable to introduce free writing exercises in regular L2 writing practice. In this way, students will be given space to express themselves without worrying about mistakes they might make in the process. Apart from exercises that prioritize content over form, it would be beneficial to provide students with feedback on their consecutive drafts that focuses on one particular area at a time instead of all of them at once. Such a solution will allow them to work on a particular element of their text, such as organization, punctuation etc. The overall feedback should be given on the final draft of a student's work.

RQ3: Do students use the teacher feedback they receive? (Do they work on multiple drafts?)

The students never prepare more than one draft of their text. This practice has important consequences concerning feedback: students do not see a point in analyzing teacher feedback, and teachers get frustrated because students do not read their comments. Indeed, teachers often have a feeling that students ignore their comments, as observed by Potocka and Adams-Tukiendorf (2023). This can be changed when product approach towards writing is replaced with process approach. When students work on multiple versions of the same text, there is time and real need to search for feedback, which will help improve next versions of their work. Also teachers will have a chance to see their role in a more positive light: students will seek for their feedback on the drafts of their L2 texts.

RQ4: Does teacher feedback motivate students to further work?

56% of the respondents did not find the feedback they received from their secondary school teachers motivating, while 44% was motivated by the comments they got.

As mentioned by the respondents in the present study (but also in other studies described in this article), feedback that students receive from their teachers is often demotivating as it is too vague, general, rather negative (concentrating on the problem areas in their writing), and without tips concerning how the mistakes could be improved. According to the students' expectations, feedback should be formative and process-oriented. Hence, teachers should rethink the feedback they usually provide to their students and adhere it to the students' expectations. They should try to make their comments constructive and include specific guidelines concerning possible improvements in text. Their feedback should not only focus on the problem areas but also on the strengths of their students' papers. The tone of feedback should be kind and supportive as students value when their teachers appreciate their efforts and notice progress they have made. Last but not least, in order for the students to have a real need to use the feedback they get, teachers should create an opportunity to use the feedback they have provided their students with. Lastly, seeing teachers engaged in the process of their students' L2 writing development was the greatest motivation for the students to work on their L2 writing skills. Hence, it is worth including individual consultations as a regular feedback practice in L2 writing instruction.

RQ5: How do students perceive the role of the teacher in developing students' L2 writing skills?

The students perceive the role of their L2 teachers as the one of a proofreader. However, as known from other studies, the students' expectations are different concerning the teacher's role in developing their L2 writing skills. Students would like their teachers to support them in their L2 writing development, appreciate their efforts and creativity (Lipińska, 2021). They do expect corrections on their works (*Ibid.*), however, what matters most to them is that the teacher guides them in the learning process. Focusing too much on errors does not allow teachers to focus on the bigger picture. Instead of observing the learners in the process, helping them build on their strengths and work on the areas that need improvement, teachers correct mistakes, which is not what students expect and which has a detrimental effect on their well-being. Teachers should be guides, who show the way to development, design the steps on the way, and show various opportunities, also concerning receiving feedback. In this way the students will feel that their teachers are close to them, ready to help whenever needed or show resources they may use on the way. This will not only make the students more autonomous but will also unburden the teachers allowing them to focus on what is truly important. Following these changes will enable Polish secondary school teachers to turn from summative to formative feedback.

RQ6: Is peer feedback used?

Peer feedback is used very seldom. This shows that feedback comes almost always from the teacher in L2 writing instruction. On the one hand, teachers report that feedback is time-consuming. On the other hand, they do not recommend other sources of feedback to their students. It concerns not only peer feedback but also self-assessment or tools based on AI. Peer feedback does not only allow to unburden the teacher. It allows students

to have access to a variety of texts, which helps them see their own texts in a wider context and get inspired by texts of other students. At the same time, students provide comments on these texts, which help their authors revise them. Hence, it is worth introducing peer review as a regular L2 writing practice.

Conclusions

The results of the present study clearly show that there is a great discrepancy between what is expected from valuable feedback and how it is provided in Polish secondary schools. Feedback provided in English classes can be described as summative. In order to make it closer to formative, the introduction of other forms of feedback may be needed. These may include:

- **peer review** activities, which enhance student engagement, promote critical thinking, and ultimately improve writing proficiency. Encouraging peer feedback could also increase students' confidence in sharing their work, which is still a challenge for them;
- **self-assessment** based on pre-prepared rubrics;
- **AI-based tools**, such as chatGPT, Grammarly and others.

All of the above mentioned solutions present many benefits both for the students as well as the teachers. **The students** will undoubtedly become more autonomous in developing their L2 writing skills, as they will become aware that they can obtain feedback from elsewhere than only from the teacher. As tools based on AI are available 24/7, students have an opportunity to be given feedback whenever in need. In this way, every piece of writing a student produces may be commented on. Depending on the instruction provided to the tool, the feedback may be more general or more specific. Still, it will undoubtedly be delivered in a kind and appreciative voice, which will motivate the student to work on their drafts. On the basis of the received comment, a student may introduce necessary corrections, further discussing them with an AI tool if needed. In this way, L2 writing becomes process-oriented as student not only writes but also rewrites their texts with the use of feedback received.

The teacher, on the other hand, will have the first drafts of their students commented on by other sources, which will not only result in receiving better versions of the final papers but, most importantly, on having more time to focus on the global issues, such as content, organization, and possible ways of improving students' works in longer perspective. Hence, the teacher will be given more time to perform the role of a motivator, rather than a proofreader, a role that both a peer and an AI tool may now successfully adopt. In this way, assessment will be seen as "the process of seeking and interpreting evidence for learners and their teachers to decide where the learners are in their learning, where they need to go, and how to best get there" (Radford, 2015: 9).

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to prof. Katarzyna Hryniuk, dr Małgorzata Adams-Tukiendorf and dr Agnieszka Borowiak for sharing their time and expertise in reviewing the questionnaire used in this study.

References

- Baran-Łucarz M. (2019), *Formative assessment in the English as a foreign language classroom in secondary schools in Poland. Report on a mixed-method study*, "Journal of Education Culture and Society", vol. 10(2), pp. 309–327, <https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs20192.309.327>
- Barrot J.S. (2023), *Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials*, "Assessing Writing", vol. 57, pp. 1–6.
- Brown H.D. (2004), *Language assessment: principles and classroom practices*, New York.
- Choroszczyńska M., Kossakowska B. (2007), *Czy doświadczenia polskie w zakresie wdrażania oceniania kształtującego są OK?*, [in:] B. Niemierko, M.K. Szmigiel (eds.), *Uczenie się i egzamin w oczach uczniów. XIII Konferencja Diagnostyki Edukacyjnej*. Łomża, 5-7.10.2007, Kraków.
- Escalante J., Pack A., Barrett A. (2023), *AI-generated feedback on writing: insights into efficacy and ENL student preference*, "International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education", vol. 20, article 57, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00425-2>
- Ferris D. (2003), *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*, Mahwah.
- Ferris D. (2010), *Second Language Writing Research and Written Corrective Feedback in SLA*, "Studies in Second Language Acquisition", vol. 32, pp. 181–201.
- Hryniuk K. (2018), *Polish EFL Learners' Perceptions of Learning Writing for High-Stakes Secondary School Graduation Examinations*, "Acta Philologica", vol. 53, pp. 5–16.
- Hyland K. (2003), *Second Language Writing*, Cambridge.
- Hyland K., Hyland F. (2006), *Feedback on second language students' writing*, "Language Teaching", vol. 39, pp. 83–101, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Keh C.L. (1990), *Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation*, "ELT Journal", vol. 44(4), pp. 294–304.
- Lee I. (2017), *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*, London.
- Lipińska J. (2021), *Le feedback est-il toujours motivant ? Les attitudes des bacheliers polono-phones de classes bilingues envers la rétroaction corrective écrite*, "Neofilolog", vol. 56(1), pp. 39–54, <https://doi.org/10.14746/n.2021.56.1.4>.
- Lundstrom K., Baker W. (2009), *To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing*, "Journal of Second Language Writing", vol. 18(1), pp. 30–43.
- Nicol D., Macfarlane-Dick D. (2006), *Formative Assessment and Self-Regulated Learning: A Model and Seven Principles of Good Feedback Practice*, "Studies in Higher Education", vol. 31, pp. 199–218, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>

Potocka K., Adams-Tukiendorf M. (2023), *Teacher Feedback to Writing of Secondary School Learners of English in the Polish Classroom Context*, [in:] M. Baran-Lucarz, A. Czura, M. Jedynak, A. Klimas, A. Słowik-Krogulec (eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Foreign Language Education*, London, pp. 67–86.

Radford B.W. (2015), *The effect of formative assessment on language performance*, Provo.

Reichelt M. (2005), *English-language writing instruction in Poland*, "Journal of Second Language Writing", vol. 14, pp. 215–232.

Streszczenie

Informacja zwrotna w pisaniu w języku angielskim jako obcym w polskich szkołach średnich

Niniejszy artykuł podejmuje problem informacji zwrotnej (feedbacku) w nauczaniu pisania w języku obcym. Jego głównym celem jest przedstawienie wyników badania identyfikującego tendencje dotyczące udzielania informacji zwrotnej w polskich szkołach ponadpodstawowych podczas lekcji języka angielskiego. Dane zebrano za pomocą kwestionariusza opartego głównie na skali Likerta. Kwestionariusz został udostępniony studentom pierwszego roku filologii angielskiej na prywatnej uczelni w Polsce, którzy ukończyli różne szkoły ponadpodstawowe na terenie kraju.

Wyniki pokazują, że uczniowie często otrzymują od nauczycieli informację zwrotną na temat swoich tekstów w języku obcym, jednak feedback koncentruje się głównie na poprawności językowej. Ponadto tylko połowa badanych uznała informację zwrotną za motywującą. Uczniowie nigdy nie przygotowują więcej niż jednej wersji swojego tekstu w języku obcym; nauczyciela postrzegają głównie jako korektora swoich prac. Ocena rówieśnicza jest stosowana bardzo rzadko.

Zebrane dane wskazują na znaczną rozbieżność między tym, czego oczekuje się od wartościowej informacji zwrotnej w procesie pisania w języku obcym, a tym, jak feedback jest faktycznie udzielany w polskich szkołach średnich. Potrzebna jest zatem zmiana dotychczasowych praktyk nauczycieli w tym zakresie, aby uczynić je bardziej skutecznymi, motywującymi i angażującymi dla uczniów.

Słowa kluczowe: nauczanie pisania w języku angielskim jako obcym, praktyki w zakresie pisania w języku angielskim, szkoła średnia, informacja zwrotna, feedback nauczycielski