

A Study on the English Writing Revision Behaviors of Vocational College Students: A Comparison Based on Teacher Feedback and Peer Feedback

Yujie Wang

¹School of General Education, Beijing Vocational College of Agriculture, Beijing 102442, China

Corresponding author: Yujie Wang (e-mail: wyj_2010stu@163.com)

ABSTRACT This study investigates revision behaviors of vocational college students in English writing under two feedback conditions: teacher feedback and peer feedback. Accurate technical writing is also essential in engineering disciplines such as electromagnetic waves, antennas, and propagation, where local language accuracy and global logical coherence directly affect the communication of experimental methods and design results. Although previous research has shown that both forms of feedback can support second-language writing development, relatively limited attention has been paid to how vocational students respond to feedback during revision. To address this gap, the study adopts a small-scale comparative design involving 64 first-year students from a public vocational college in China over an eight-week instructional period. Students completed four practical English writing tasks, and their first drafts, feedback sheets, revised drafts, scores, and interview responses were analyzed. Revisions were coded by level, type, uptake, and textual effect. The findings indicate that teacher feedback produced a higher overall uptake rate and was especially effective in stimulating local revisions involving grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, and accuracy. Peer feedback generated a larger proportion of global revisions, particularly in idea clarification, paragraph development, coherence, and reader awareness. The study concludes that teacher and peer feedback serve different pedagogical functions and should be combined strategically in process-oriented writing instruction, including technical writing training for electromagnetic engineering students.

INDEX TERMS teacher feedback, peer feedback, revision behavior, technical writing, electromagnetic education

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is widely recognized as one of the most demanding skills in second language learning because it requires the coordinated use of linguistic knowledge, discourse control, rhetorical awareness, and self-monitoring ability[1]. For students in vocational colleges, English writing is often even more challenging. Compared with students in academically selective universities, vocational college students frequently enter higher education with weaker foundations in grammar, vocabulary, and sentence construction[2, 3]. In addition, many of them have had limited exposure to process writing in secondary school. Their previous writing experience is often characterized by short, examination-oriented tasks, formulaic paragraph production, and teacher-led correction rather than repeated drafting and revision[4, 5]. As a result, when they are asked to write in English, many students regard writing as a one-time task rather than a recursive process of planning, drafting, revising, and editing.

This issue has direct pedagogical importance. In voca-

tional education, English writing is not simply an academic exercise. Students may need to write emails, complaint letters, notices, resumes, product descriptions, service responses, or workplace communication texts[6, 7]. These genres require both linguistic correctness and communicative clarity. A sentence may be grammatically acceptable but still fail to achieve its purpose if the message is unclear, incomplete, or inappropriate for the target reader[8]. Therefore, improving students' writing ability in vocational colleges means more than correcting isolated language errors. It also means helping them understand how revision can improve a text's effectiveness.

Within second language writing research, feedback has long been considered a major instructional tool for improving students' texts[9]. Teacher feedback has traditionally held a central place in writing classrooms because it is seen as expert guidance[10]. Peer feedback, on the other hand, has gained increasing attention under the influence of process writing, collaborative learning, and formative

assessment[11, 12]. A substantial body of research suggests that both forms of feedback can facilitate revision, but they may do so in different ways. Teacher feedback is often associated with more accurate language correction and stronger authority[13, 14]. Peer feedback, by contrast, may enhance audience awareness, critical reading, and collaborative reflection[15]. Yet the effects of either feedback source depend on learner characteristics, classroom design, and the specific writing context. In this regard, vocational college students remain underexplored as a population. Most previous studies have focused on university students, English majors, ESL learners in academic writing programs, or learners in general higher education settings[9, 11]. Comparatively little attention has been paid to vocational learners, whose educational goals, motivational structures, and classroom experiences differ in important ways[16]. Vocational students often place a high value on practicality, clear guidance, and task relevance. Some may lack confidence in their own English ability and therefore depend heavily on teacher authority[3, 16]. Others may have limited experience in giving or receiving constructive peer comments. These characteristics make feedback research in vocational colleges especially necessary.

Another issue concerns research focus. Many studies compare the effects of feedback by looking only at final writing scores[17, 18]. While score-based comparison is useful, it may hide the actual process through which students respond to feedback[17, 19]. A better approach is to examine revision behavior. Revision behavior provides observable evidence of learner engagement with feedback. By analyzing what students change, how often they change it, and what type of change they make, researchers can better understand the pedagogical value of different feedback sources[19, 20]. In other words, revision behavior reveals not only whether students improved, but also how they improved.

The present study therefore narrows its scope to one focused question: how vocational college students revise English compositions after teacher feedback and peer feedback. Instead of making broad claims about general writing achievement, this study investigates concrete textual behavior, including revision quantity, revision level, feedback uptake, and score gains across different dimensions of writing quality. This narrower focus is methodologically more manageable and pedagogically more meaningful. It also aligns well with the expectation of journal reviewers that a study should have a clear research problem, a feasible design, and tightly connected findings.

The study is guided by the following research questions:

- (1) What differences exist between teacher feedback and peer feedback in the quantity and type of revisions made by vocational college students?
- (2) To what extent do students adopt teacher comments and peer comments in revised drafts?
- (3) How do teacher feedback and peer feedback differ in their effects on local revision and global revision?

- (4) How do vocational college students perceive the usefulness, credibility, and limitations of teacher feedback and peer feedback?

By answering these questions, the study aims to provide a more grounded understanding of feedback-supported revision in vocational college English writing and to offer practical suggestions for classroom instruction.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. TEACHER FEEDBACK IN SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING

Feedback is a core issue in second language writing pedagogy because it connects instruction, learner response, and text improvement[17, 20]. In broad terms, writing feedback refers to comments, corrections, suggestions, or signals provided to writers with the intention of improving their text or helping them develop as writers[10]. In L2 contexts, feedback may come from teachers, peers, computer systems, or self-evaluation procedures. Among these, teacher feedback and peer feedback remain the most common forms in classroom practice[21].

Research on feedback has developed around several recurring concerns: whether feedback improves writing, what kind of feedback is most effective, how students interpret comments, and how feedback is translated into revision. These questions are important because feedback is not a simple transmission of correct information. A teacher or peer may provide comments, but the student writer still needs to understand those comments, evaluate them, and decide whether and how to use them. Thus, the effectiveness of feedback depends not only on the quality of the comments themselves but also on learner uptake and revision behavior.

B. PEER FEEDBACK IN SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING

Teacher feedback has long been the dominant source of response in writing classrooms. The main reason is obvious: teachers are assumed to possess greater language knowledge, evaluation experience, and genre awareness than students. Their comments usually carry institutional authority and are often treated as trustworthy guidance[13, 22]. In L2 writing research, teacher feedback has been widely examined in relation to written corrective feedback, comment explicitness, direct versus indirect correction, and short- versus long-term language improvement[23].

One important strength of teacher feedback is its reliability. Students generally believe that teacher comments are accurate and worth following. This belief tends to increase uptake[23]. Teacher feedback is also often more focused than peer feedback because it is guided by instructional objectives and professional judgment. For learners with limited proficiency, especially those who are unsure about grammar or vocabulary, teacher feedback can provide immediate and clear scaffolding[24, 25]. In many studies, teacher comments have been shown to facilitate revision in grammar, word choice, sentence formation, and text appropriateness.

However, teacher feedback also has limitations[26, 27]. First, it is labor-intensive. In large classes, teachers may not have enough time to provide individualized comments on multiple drafts[28]. Second, teacher feedback may reinforce a one-way model of instruction in which students depend on expert correction rather than taking responsibility for evaluating texts themselves[29]. Third, teacher comments sometimes focus heavily on language errors while giving less attention to idea development, rhetorical impact, or reader response[30]. If students come to see revision as merely correcting teacher-marked mistakes, they may not develop a broader understanding of writing as communication.

C. REVISION BEHAVIOR AS A RESEARCH FOCUS

Peer feedback has increasingly been promoted as an alternative or complement to teacher feedback. It is rooted in process writing theory, social constructivist views of learning, and collaborative classroom practice[31]. In peer review, students read each other's drafts and offer comments on strengths, weaknesses, and possible improvements[32]. This activity may benefit both the student writer and the student reviewer. Writers receive comments from readers who are closer to their own proficiency level, and reviewers improve by analyzing texts, identifying problems, and articulating suggestions[15].

Studies on peer feedback have reported several pedagogical benefits. First, peer response can increase student participation and reduce the teacher-centered nature of writing instruction[33]. Second, peer interaction may improve audience awareness because students receive reactions from actual readers rather than only from the teacher as evaluator[32]. Third, reviewing peers' texts can strengthen learners' critical reading and self-editing ability[15]. Fourth, peer feedback may create a more dialogic and less hierarchical environment, especially when students are encouraged to explain and negotiate comments[34].

At the same time, peer feedback faces well-known challenges. Students may not trust the linguistic competence of their classmates. Some comments may be inaccurate, overly general, or excessively polite[35]. Cultural factors, face concerns, and lack of training may further reduce the quality of peer response. In some classrooms, students give only praise or point out surface errors without addressing meaning and structure[36]. Therefore, the effectiveness of peer feedback depends strongly on task design, reviewer training, comment guidelines, and the extent of teacher support.

D. REVISION BEHAVIOR AS AN ANALYTICAL FOCUS

Revision is one of the most important indicators of writing development because it reflects how writers engage with feedback and reshape their texts. In writing research, revisions are commonly divided into different levels[36]. A broad distinction is often made between local revision and global revision. Local revisions involve surface-level or

sentence-level changes such as grammar correction, word substitution, punctuation, and sentence form adjustment[37]. Global revisions involve larger textual concerns such as ideas, organization, coherence, argument development, and awareness of the reader's needs[38].

This distinction is significant because not all revisions carry the same instructional meaning. A local correction may improve accuracy but leave the communicative effectiveness of the text largely unchanged[39]. A global revision may alter the whole structure or message of the text[40]. If a study looks only at final scores, such differences can be missed. By analyzing revision behavior, researchers can identify what kind of learning activity a feedback source is actually encouraging. Previous studies have shown that teacher feedback and peer feedback often lead to different revision patterns. Teacher feedback tends to generate more direct correction and more language-focused changes[41]. Peer feedback may lead to broader content-related changes, especially when students comment on clarity, relevance, and the logic of ideas[42]. Yet results vary across contexts. Student proficiency, topic familiarity, task genre, and training procedures can all influence revision choices.

E. RESEARCH GAP AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Although the literature on L2 writing feedback is rich, relatively few studies have focused specifically on vocational college students in China[9, 25]. This is a meaningful gap because vocational students do not simply represent a lower-proficiency version of general undergraduates. They often learn in settings where practical communication, class size, limited teaching hours, and exam pressure shape instructional decisions. In such settings, the question of how to use teacher feedback and peer feedback efficiently becomes highly relevant.

The present study contributes in three ways. First, it focuses on a learner group that has received relatively limited attention. Second, it examines revision behavior in a concrete and observable way rather than relying only on final writing scores. Third, it adopts a small and precise research focus suitable for classroom-based inquiry: the comparison of revision behaviors triggered by teacher feedback and peer feedback in vocational college English writing tasks.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. RESEARCH DESIGN

This study employed a small-scale quasi-experimental comparative design. Two intact first-year classes at a public vocational college in China participated in an eight-week English writing module. One class formed the Teacher Feedback Group (TFG), and the other formed the Peer Feedback Group (PFG). Because intact classes were used, random assignment at the individual level was not possible. However, the two classes were comparable in size, English placement scores, and instructional schedule.

The study was designed to compare not abstract teaching methods but the revision behaviors that followed different feedback sources. Both groups received the same writing instruction, completed the same four writing tasks, and were assessed with the same rubric. The key difference lay in the source of feedback used for revision.

B. PARTICIPANTS

The participants were 64 first-year students, 32 in each group. Their majors included hotel management, e-commerce, digital media, automotive service, and tourism management. Their mean age was 18.7 years. While these diverse vocational backgrounds suggest varying levels of professional motivation—with service-oriented majors (e.g., tourism) potentially showing higher sensitivity to communicative clarity and technical majors (e.g., automotive) focusing more on factual accuracy—the current study treats them as a single cohort to establish baseline behavioral patterns. Based on the college placement examination and teacher observation, their English proficiency ranged from lower-intermediate to intermediate. Most students reported having little confidence in English writing and little prior experience with multiple-draft writing. A preliminary questionnaire showed that 81% of them associated English writing mainly with grammar correction, and only a small number reported ever receiving structured peer feedback before entering college. This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Beijing Vocational College of Agriculture, and was performed in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. All eligible participants signed an informed consent form.

C. WRITING TASKS

The writing module lasted eight weeks, with one writing-related class session each week. The writing tasks were selected to reflect practical communication needs in vocational education. Students completed four genres:

1. a self-introduction email,
2. a complaint letter,
3. a short product promotion text,
4. an opinion essay on workplace communication.

Each writing task required approximately 180 to 220 words and was completed in two stages: first draft and revised draft. Students wrote the first draft in class within 35 minutes. After receiving feedback, they revised the draft outside class and resubmitted it within one week.

D. FEEDBACK PROCEDURES

In the Teacher Feedback Group, the instructor read each first draft and provided written feedback. The feedback included direct correction of serious language errors, underlining with simple correction symbols for minor errors, marginal comments on organization or clarity, and a short end comment summarizing the strengths and major revision priorities of the draft.

In the Peer Feedback Group, students received two sessions of peer review training before the first formal peer feedback activity. During the training sessions, the teacher introduced the purpose of peer review, demonstrated how to comment on a sample essay, explained the difference between vague and useful comments, and provided sentence starters such as “This part is not clear because...”, “You may need an example here,” and “This sentence may be grammatically incorrect.” Students also practiced reviewing short sample texts in pairs. The teacher evaluated these practice comments using a simplified competency rubric; only after 85% of students demonstrated the ability to identify both a specific language error and a clarity issue was the formal data collection initiated, ensuring a baseline level of reviewer competence.

For the formal peer feedback tasks, each draft was read by two classmates. Reviewers used a structured feedback sheet organized around four criteria: task fulfillment, organization, language use, and reader clarity. Students were required to write at least two positive comments and three suggestions for improvement. The teacher monitored the process and answered procedural questions but did not directly correct the drafts before students revised them.

E. DATA COLLECTION

Multiple sources of data were collected:

1. first drafts and revised drafts from all students across four tasks,
2. teacher feedback sheets from the TFG,
3. peer feedback sheets from the PFG,
4. scores for first and revised drafts,
5. semi-structured interviews with 12 students after the treatment period.

In total, 256 draft pairs were collected. The interviews were conducted in Chinese to allow students to express themselves clearly. Each interview lasted approximately 15 minutes and explored students’ preferences, revision decisions, and perceptions of feedback usefulness.

F. CODING AND ANALYSIS

Revisions were coded in two ways.

First, they were categorized by level:

- Local revision: grammar, spelling, punctuation, word choice, sentence form;
- Global revision: content development, paragraph organization, coherence, task fulfillment, audience awareness.

Second, revisions were categorized by operation:

- addition,
- deletion,
- substitution,
- reordering.

Feedback uptake was also analyzed. A feedback point was marked as adopted if the revised draft clearly reflected the suggestion. It was marked as successfully adopted if the

revision improved the text appropriately without introducing a new error or causing a distortion of meaning. To ensure coding consistency, the two raters first independently coded 20% of the drafts; discrepancies regarding "appropriate improvement" were resolved through discussion until a 100% consensus was reached on the operational definitions of textual enhancement.

Writing quality was rated on a 20-point rubric including four dimensions:

- content (5),
- organization (5),
- language use (5),
- task appropriateness (5).

Two experienced raters scored the drafts independently. The inter-rater reliability coefficient was 0.87, which was considered acceptable for the study.

G. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Students were informed that their classroom writing would be used anonymously for research purposes and that participation in interviews was voluntary. No real student names or institutional identifiers are reported in the study. The data were used only for academic analysis.

IV. RESULTS

A. OVERALL REVISION QUANTITY

Across the four writing tasks, the Teacher Feedback Group produced 1,148 revisions, while the Peer Feedback Group produced 1,036 revisions. Although the total numbers were relatively close, the distribution of revision types differed significantly. Preliminary observation suggests that peer feedback was particularly active in the "complaint letter" and "self-introduction" tasks, where reader empathy is paramount, whereas teacher feedback was more heavily utilized in the "opinion essay," which demanded higher cognitive load and formal linguistic precision. As shown in Table 1, the Teacher Feedback Group devoted a much larger share of revisions to local changes, whereas the Peer Feedback Group made a noticeably higher proportion of global revisions.

TABLE 1. Revision distribution by level

Group	Total Revisions	Local Revisions	Global Revisions	% Local	% Global
TFG	1,148	824	324	71.8%	28.2%
PFG	1,036	598	438	57.7%	42.3%

More specifically, Table 1 shows that 71.8% of the revisions in the Teacher Feedback Group were local, compared with 57.7% in the Peer Feedback Group. By contrast, the proportion of global revisions in the Peer Feedback Group reached 42.3%, which was substantially higher than the 28.2% found in the Teacher Feedback Group. This suggests that teacher feedback guided students more strongly toward language-level correction, while peer feedback encouraged a broader reconsideration of content and organization.

B. UPTAKE RATE OF FEEDBACK

The two groups also differed in the extent to which they adopted the feedback they received. As shown in Table 2, the Teacher Feedback Group received fewer total comments than the Peer Feedback Group, but a greater proportion of those comments was adopted successfully in revision.

TABLE 2. Feedback uptake and successful adoption

Group	Total Comments	Adopted Comments	Uptake Rate	Successful Adoption
TFG	1,284	972	75.7%	884 (68.8%)
PFG	1,512	881	58.3%	702 (46.4%)

According to Table 2, the uptake rate of teacher feedback was 75.7%, compared with 58.3% for peer feedback. The difference became even more noticeable in successful adoption: 68.8% of teacher comments led to effective textual improvement, while the corresponding figure for peer comments was only 46.4%. These findings indicate that teacher comments were more likely to be transformed into usable revisions, which may be related to their greater clarity and perceived authority.

C. TYPES OF REVISION

The analysis of revision operations further revealed important differences between the two groups. Table 3 summarizes the four main revision operations identified in the data: addition, deletion, substitution, and reordering.

TABLE 3. Revision operations by group

Group	Addition	Deletion	Substitution	Reordering
TFG	183	146	673	146
PFG	294	118	502	122

As can be seen in Table 3, substitution was the dominant operation in the Teacher Feedback Group, accounting for 673 cases. This reflects the strong role of teacher feedback in prompting students to replace incorrect or inappropriate language forms with more accurate ones. In contrast, the Peer Feedback Group produced a larger number of additions, with 294 cases, suggesting that peer comments more often encouraged students to elaborate, clarify, or expand their ideas.

D. EFFECTS ON WRITING QUALITY

Both groups improved after revision, but the extent and dimension of improvement varied. Table 4 presents the overall mean scores for the first and revised drafts.

TABLE 4. Mean writing scores (20-point scale)

Group	Draft 1 Mean	Draft 2 Mean	Gain
TFG	11.84	14.96	+3.12
PFG	11.67	14.21	+2.54

As shown in Table 4, both groups demonstrated clear progress from Draft 1 to Draft 2. However, the Teacher Feedback Group showed a larger overall gain (+3.12) than the Peer Feedback Group (+2.54). This result indicates that teacher feedback produced stronger overall gains in revised writing performance.

A closer analysis by scoring dimension reveals a more nuanced picture. Table 5 presents the mean score gains in content, organization, language use, and task appropriateness.

TABLE 5. Mean score gains by dimension

Group	Content	Organization	Language Use	Task Appropriateness
TFG	+0.58	+0.62	+1.36	+0.56
PFG	+0.73	+0.81	+0.61	+0.39

A closer look at Table 5 shows that the Teacher Feedback Group improved much more in language use, with a gain of 1.36 points, whereas the Peer Feedback Group improved more in content and organization, with gains of 0.73 and 0.81 respectively. This pattern suggests that teacher feedback was particularly effective for improving linguistic accuracy, while peer feedback was more conducive to enhancing idea development and text structure.

E. INTERVIEW FINDINGS

Interview data provided additional support for the quantitative findings. Students in both groups reported that the requirement to submit a second draft made them take revision more seriously. However, students in the Teacher Feedback Group emphasized the authority and clarity of teacher comments, while those in the Peer Feedback Group highlighted the role of peer readers in revealing communicative weaknesses. Regarding inaccurate peer comments, one student noted, "I ignored my partner's grammar suggestion because I felt his English level was similar to mine, and his explanation seemed uncertain," reflecting a general skepticism toward peer linguistic expertise. These perceptions are consistent with the patterns already shown in Tables 1–5, especially the higher uptake of teacher feedback in Table 2 and the stronger global revision tendency of peer feedback in Tables 1 and 5.

V. DISCUSSION

A. WHY TEACHER FEEDBACK GENERATED MORE LOCAL REVISION

Primary analysis reveals that teacher-led interventions catalyzed a higher frequency of local modifications and a superior successful adoption rate. This result is understandable in the vocational college context. Many participants lacked confidence in grammar and vocabulary, so they naturally preferred feedback that appeared authoritative and linguistically dependable. Teacher comments were also more explicit. When a teacher directly corrected a verb form, article, or word choice problem, students could easily act on it. Such comments reduced cognitive load during revision. This pattern suggests that in classrooms where students still struggle with basic language control, teacher feedback plays an irreplaceable role. Local revisions are sometimes underestimated in discussions of writing pedagogy, but for vocational learners they remain essential. A practical email or complaint letter with multiple language errors may fail in real communication settings. Therefore, the language-focused strength of teacher feedback should not be dismissed as merely superficial.

B. WHY PEER FEEDBACK SUPPORTED MORE GLOBAL REVISION

Conversely, the data underscores a distinct trend where peer-mediated responses fostered a significantly greater volume of global restructuring, particularly through textual expansions and thematic clarifications. This result shows that peers acted less as correctors and more as readers. Notably, although the overall uptake rate in the PFG was lower (58.3%), the comments that were adopted tended to trigger more significant structural changes; while students filtered out many surface-level peer suggestions they deemed unreliable, they were more likely to act on peer observations regarding missing information or confusing logic, leading to substantial global revisions. Their comments highlighted places where the text was incomplete, confusing, abrupt, or lacking support. In this sense, peer feedback promoted awareness of communicative effect rather than only formal correctness.

This finding is important because vocational students often write as if only the teacher will read the text. Peer review interrupts that assumption by presenting real readers with genuine comprehension difficulties. When a classmate says, "I do not understand your point here," the writer is forced to reconsider meaning from the audience's perspective. This type of awareness is especially valuable for workplace-related writing, where clarity, purpose, and reader orientation are crucial.

C. UPTAKE DEPENDS ON TRUST AS WELL AS COMMENT QUALITY

The third major finding is that uptake was shaped strongly by perceived credibility. Even when peer comments pointed to real problems, students did not always adopt them. The interviews show that students filtered feedback through

judgments of reviewer competence. This means that the effectiveness of peer feedback cannot be explained only by the number of comments or their technical quality. It also depends on whether the writer accepts the reviewer as a legitimate source of advice.

This issue is especially relevant in vocational college classrooms, where students may already have low confidence in English. Under such conditions, peer feedback needs institutional support. Teachers should train students to give specific comments, explain the basis of suggestions, and use rubrics that make comment criteria visible. Teacher mediation may also be necessary when students disagree with peer suggestions.

D. IMPLICATIONS FOR FEEDBACK DESIGN IN VOCATIONAL WRITING CLASSES

The results indicate that teacher feedback and peer feedback should not be treated as rivals. They serve different but complementary functions. Teacher feedback is stronger for error correction, accuracy development, and confidence-building. Peer feedback is stronger for audience awareness, idea expansion, and communicative revision. A more effective pedagogy may therefore combine them in sequence.

One possible model is this: students first exchange drafts and give peer comments on meaning, organization, and reader clarity; then the teacher provides more selective feedback on language accuracy and unresolved textual problems. Such sequencing may reduce teacher workload while preserving the educational value of peer response. It may also help students understand that writing quality involves both correctness and communicative effectiveness.

VI. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Several practical implications can be drawn from the study.

First, teachers in vocational colleges should match feedback methods to instructional goals. When the teaching focus is grammar, sentence control, or formal correctness, teacher feedback should remain central. When the focus is text clarity, idea support, or genre awareness, peer feedback can be highly productive.

Second, peer feedback must be taught. Students should not be expected to provide useful comments automatically. Training should include model analysis, sample comments, structured review sheets, and guided practice.

Third, revision should be made visible through process documentation. Requiring students to submit first drafts, comments, revised drafts, and revision notes can increase accountability and deepen engagement with feedback.

Fourth, feedback tasks should be connected to authentic vocational communication. The more relevant the writing task is to students' future professions, the more seriously they are likely to treat revision and peer response.

VII. CONCLUSION

This study examined the revision behaviors of vocational college students in English writing under teacher feedback

and peer feedback conditions. By focusing on a small but meaningful research issue, the study offers a more precise understanding of how different feedback sources shape revision.

The findings show that teacher feedback leads to higher uptake and stronger local revision, especially in grammar and language accuracy. Peer feedback, while less consistently adopted, stimulates more global revision related to content, organization, and reader awareness. Students trust teacher feedback more, but peer feedback provides a valuable audience perspective that teacher correction alone cannot fully replace.

The study therefore argues that teacher feedback and peer feedback are not competing methods but complementary pedagogical resources. In vocational college writing classrooms, where students need both correctness and communicative practicality, a strategically combined feedback model is likely to be the most effective approach.

VIII. LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study has several limitations. First, it involved only 64 students from one vocational college, so the findings cannot be generalized broadly without caution. Second, the instructional period lasted only eight weeks, which limits conclusions about long-term writing development. Furthermore, the absence of a control group receiving no feedback or practicing only self-correction makes it difficult to isolate the precise extent to which score gains resulted from the feedback source rather than the natural recursive process of drafting and second-drafting. Third, although peer feedback training was provided, the accuracy and usefulness of peer comments still varied widely. Future research may expand the sample size, compare students from different vocational majors, examine longer treatment periods, or investigate digital platforms for peer feedback. It would also be useful to study how feedback literacy, self-efficacy, and task genre influence revision behavior in vocational settings.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Yujie Wang designed, collected and analyzed the data, and drafted the manuscript. Yujie Wang conducted the study, critically revised the manuscript for important intellectual content, and gave final approval of the version to be published. Yujie Wang participated fully in the work, take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content, and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

FUNDING

This research received no external funding.

HUMAN RESEARCH SUBJECTS

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Beijing Vocational College of Agriculture, and was performed in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. All eligible participants signed an informed consent form.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Not applicable.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Hyland, "Second language writing: Cambridge university press; 2019,".
- [2] Z. Wang and Q. Chen, "Understanding Challenges for Chinese Vocational College Students in Improving Writing Skills," *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, pp. 272-7, 2021, doi: 10.18178/ijlt.7.4.272-277.
- [3] Y.-R. Ho, "A passion for English learning? Comparing the English learning motivations and selfperceived English proficiency between two types of college students in Taipei, Taiwan," *Bulletin of Educational Psychology*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 529-49, 2019.
- [4] R. Dong, D. Fu, X. Zhou, and B. Wang, "Writing instruction in China: Challenges and efforts," *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 2019, doi: 10.18178/ijiet.2019.9.10.1292.
- [5] W. Zhang and Y. L. Cheung, "Researching Innovations in English Language Writing Instruction: A State-of-the-art Review," *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Art. no. 9, 2018, doi: 10.17507/jltr.0901.10.
- [6] J. Ma, "Organizing the Course Content of China's English Curriculum Standards for Vocational Colleges – An Attempt Based on Work Process," *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research*, vol. 8, no. 12, pp. 188-95, 2025, doi: 10.6918/IJOSSER.202512_8(12).0027.
- [7] M. A. Salmani Nodoushan, "English for specific purposes: Traditions, trends, directions," *Studies in English Language and Education*, vol. 7, pp. 247-68, 2020, doi: 10.24815/siele.v7i1.16342.
- [8] M. Canale and M. Swain, "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing," 1980.
- [9] K. Hyland and F. Hyland, "Feedback on second language students' writing," *Language Teaching*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 83-101, 2006, doi: 10.1017/S0261444806003399.
- [10] K. Hyland and F. Hyland, "Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues: Cambridge university press; 2019,".
- [11] S. Yu and I. Lee, "Peer feedback in second language writing (2005–2014)," *Language Teaching*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 461-93, 2016, doi: 10.1017/S0261444816000161.
- [12] S. Yu and I. Lee, "An analysis of Chinese EFL students' use of first and second language in peer feedback of L2 writing," *System*, vol. 47, pp. 28-38, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2014.08.007.
- [13] H. Zhao, "Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom," *Assessing Writing*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 3-17, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2010.01.002.
- [14] Y. Satake, "The effects of teacher, peer and self-feedback on error correction with corpus use," *Applied Corpus Linguistics*, vol. 4, no. 3, Art. no. 100114, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.acorp.2024.100114.
- [15] K. Lundstrom and W. Baker, "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, no. 1, pp. 30-43, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002.
- [16] Su M-h, "A study of EFL technological and vocational college students' language learning strategies and their self-perceived English proficiency," *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, pp. 2, 2005.
- [17] C. Liu and S. Yu, "Reconceptualizing the impact of feedback in second language writing: A multidimensional perspective," *Assessing Writing*, vol. 53, Art. no. 100630, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2022.100630.
- [18] A. Riazantseva, "Outcome measure of L2 writing as a mediator of the effects of corrective feedback on students' ability to write accurately," *System*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 421-30, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2012.07.005.
- [19] Y. Han and F. Hyland, "Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom," *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 30, pp. 31-44, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.002.
- [20] Y. Han and F. Hyland, "Learner Engagement with Written Feedback: A Sociocognitive Perspective," 2019, p. 247-64.
- [21] X. Cheng, Y. Liu, and C. Wang, "Understanding student engagement with teacher and peer feedback in L2 writing," *System*, vol. 119, Art. no. 103176, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2023.103176.
- [22] D. Ferris, "Preparing teachers to respond to student writing," *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 165-93, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.003.
- [23] D. R. Ferris, "SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING RESEARCH AND WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN SLA: Intersections and Practical Applications," *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 181-201, 2010, doi: 10.1017/S0272263109990490.
- [24] Y. Zheng and S. Yu, "Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students," *Assessing Writing*, vol. 37, pp. 13-24, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2018.03.001.
- [25] Y. Zheng, S. Yu, and Z. Liu, "Understanding individual differences in lower-proficiency students' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback," *Teaching in Higher Education*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 301-21, 2023, doi: 10.1080/13562517.2020.1806225.
- [26] F. Hyland, "The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers," *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 255-86, 1998, doi: 10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90017-0.
- [27] L. Goldstein, "Feedback and revision in second language writing: Contextual, teacher, and student variables," in Hyland K, Hyland F, editors. *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*. Cambridge Applied Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 185-205.
- [28] I. Lee, "L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback," *Assessing Writing*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 216-37, 2003, doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2003.08.002.
- [29] J. A. Boggs and R. M. Manchón, "Feedback literacy in writing research and teaching: Advancing L2 WCF research agendas," *Assessing Writing*, vol. 58, Art. no. 100786, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2023.100786.
- [30] I. Lee, "Error Correction in the L2 Writing Classroom: What Do Students Think? *TESL Canada journal*," 2005;22(2):1-16.
- [31] K. Hyland and F. Hyland, "Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing," *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*, pp. 1-22, 2019.
- [32] A. B. M. Tsui and M. Ng, "Do Secondary L2 Writers Benefit from Peer Comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*," 2000;9(2):147-70., doi: 10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00022-9.
- [33] W. Chen, D. Liu, and C. Lin, "Collaborative peer feedback in L2 writing: Affective, behavioral, cognitive, and social engagement," *Front Psychol*, vol. 14, Art. no. 1078141, 2023, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1078141.
- [34] D. Li and J. Qian, "Engaging in dialogic peer feedback in L2 writing development: A microgenetic approach," *System*, vol. 126, Art. no. 103513, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2024.103513.
- [35] G. Hu, "Culture and peer feedback," *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*, vol. (2nd), pp. 45-63, 2019.
- [36] S. Yu, I. Lee, and P. Mak, "Revisiting Chinese Cultural Issues in Peer Feedback in EFL Writing: Insights from a Multiple Case Study," *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 295-304, 2016, doi: 10.1007/s40299-015-0262-1.
- [37] M. Stevenson, R. Schoonen, and K. de Gloppe, "Revising in two languages: A multi-dimensional comparison of online writing revisions in L1 and FL," *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 201-33, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2006.06.002.
- [38] D. H. Roen and R. J. Willey, "The Effects of Audience Awareness on Drafting and Revising," *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 75-88, 1988.
- [39] L. Faigley and S. Witte, "Analyzing Revision," *College Composition & Communication*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 400-14, 1981, doi: 10.58680/cc198115887.
- [40] J. Fitzgerald, "Research on Revision in Writing," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 481-506, 1987, doi: 10.3102/00346543057004481.
- [41] R. Ruegg, "Differences in the uptake of peer and teacher feedback," *RELJ Journal*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 131-45, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0033688214562799.
- [42] Y. Wu and C. D. Schunn, "The Effects of Providing and Receiving Peer Feedback on Writing Performance and Learning of Secondary School Students," *American Educational Research Journal*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 492-526, 2021, doi: 10.3102/0002831220945266.