
1. Introduction

Effective feedback is essential to support the learning process, especially in highly complex and demanding tasks, such as the preparation of a research project and the writing of an academic thesis. The thesis as the culminating academic task is central for successful graduation (Grohnert et al., 2024, p. 1) and serves as a “bridge from the world of study to the world of scholarship” (Ylijoki, 2001, cited by Neupane Bastola & Hu, 2023, p. 1; cf. T. Wang & Li, 2011, pp. 101–102). For many students, the Master thesis reports on the first independent research project that they had conducted over an extended period of time, typically spanning six months or more (as reviewed by Grohnert et al., 2024, p. 2). To create this final product, novice scholars must acquire a wide range of competencies and overcome various challenges of their research journey. In this process, they need to complete several steps and develop specialized competencies, including the search for and delimitation of a researchable topic, the synthesis of scholarly literature, the crafting of suitable conceptual, pedagogical and methodological frameworks (Neupane Bastola & Hu, 2023, p. 5), the development of independent research skills in data collection, analysis, critical reflection and interpretation as well as in time management, problem-solving and mastering academic genres for presenting their findings in oral and written ways (cf. K. Hyland, 2009; Lei & Pramoolsook, 2020, p. 166; Millin et al., 2022, p. 233).

Accordingly, thesis supervision is a cornerstone of graduate and postgraduate education. Within this context, feedback plays a pivotal role in guiding students through the complex and often unfamiliar terrain of research planning and thesis writing (cf. Grohnert et al., 2024, p. 2). In this respect, feedback can be considered as a form of “advanced academic training” (Kumar & Stracke, 2007, p. 462) or “hands-on coaching within a wider context of reflective practice” (M. Pearson & Brew, 2002, p. 141) and thus as a “major source of supervisees’ learning and improvement” (Gezahegn & Gedamu, 2023, p. 1). Despite its importance and the increasing numbers of students striving for a Master degree (statistics reviewed by Grohnert et al., 2024, p. 13), empirical evidence on thesis supervision and effective feedback processes in research planning and academic writing is limited. This particularly pertains to peer feedback in digitally mediated learning environments at postgraduate level. Indeed, recent reviews have shown that teachers’ text-based feedback on written assignments still represents the most common feedback direction and format in higher education (Kurt & Karabulut, 2024, p. 4, preprint; Thennakoon, 2023, p. 2). Given the high numbers of thesis writers, supervisory feedback is often characterized by brief corrective comments (Pachuashvili, 2024, p. 227) provided in a unidirectional manner (Schluer, 2021b, p. 160; 2023b, p. 2).

Moreover, as independent research is often considered a solitary process, there hardly exist any structured ways to foster peer support in postgraduate education. Consequently, thesis writers frequently rely on occasional feedback by their supervisors, even though peer feedback might not only fulfil social and motivational purposes, but could also advance the research

process on cognitive and metacognitive dimensions (see overview in Schluer, 2022a, p. 39). By experiencing and reflecting on feedback from the perspectives as producers and recipients, students could profit from peer review in numerous ways, particularly in teacher education where it can serve as a model for their own future teaching. Additionally, with the increasing digitalization, new opportunities for feedback exchanges are enabled that require critical reflection and examination.

The present book therefore examines the use of digital feedback methods in one of the most crucial phases of academic studies in higher education, which is the planning and writing of the Master thesis or doctoral dissertation. Specifically, it responds to five major gaps in the field: (1) the limited focus on peer feedback as compared to instructor feedback, (2) the narrow range of assignment types under investigation, (3) the underutilization of alternative, especially digital, feedback methods, (4) the lack of attention to feedback as a dialogic and student-centered process, and (5) the insufficient analysis of how feedback varies across tools and modes in relation to learner perceptions in their roles as feedback providers and recipients.

Against this background, the present study seeks to explore peer feedback perceptions and practices via different digital media at successive stages of the research planning process. Data were collected in the TESOL Research Colloquium (TRC), a course designed to support Master and (aspiring) doctoral students in planning individual research projects within the field of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). More precisely, the colloquium guides participants through key phases of their research journey, such as formulating research questions, selecting appropriate research methods, and presenting their research in written and multimodal ways. Given the heterogeneity of the participants, who differ in their academic backgrounds, teaching experience, linguistic and cultural profiles as well as thematic interests, the course intends to capitalize on this diversity by adopting a peer learning approach. More specifically, the TRC aims to foster collaborative learning culture within an open feedback environment (cf. Wood, 2019), where students continuously share their progress and exchange feedback. To this end, the colloquium integrates various digital tools for synchronous and asynchronous feedback, including cloud-based digital boards, recorded feedback (audio, video, screencast), online forums, and videoconferences. In that regard, the study examines the ways in which students exchange and evaluate digital peer feedback in three different formats and research phases: (1) peer feedback on cloud-based digital boards for finding and refining a research topic, (2) digitally recorded peer feedback (audio, video, screencast) to develop a research design and outline, and (3) peer feedback in online forums to comment on students' screen-recorded project presentations.

By examining feedback practices and perceptions, the study seeks to enhance the pedagogical design of research support in higher education. It is situated within a larger project –

*Pedagogical Guidance for Using Digital Feedback*¹ – which explores the didactic potential of feedback technologies in promoting collaboration and learner agency, increasing teaching quality, and tailoring support to individual needs (Schluer, 2024h). In doing so, the study extends prior research by considering feedback not merely as a corrective mechanism, but as a dynamic and pedagogically embedded dialogic practice that enhances student learning, digital literacy, and professional development.

To achieve these aims, the book consists of six parts and is structured as follows: Chapter 2 provides a conceptual and empirical review of digital peer feedback in research planning and academic writing to situate the current study within existing scholarship. To begin with, it sketches the contemporary conceptualization of feedback as a dialogic practice (sections 2.1 and 2.2) and outlines the potentials of peer feedback (section 2.3). Subsequently, section 2.4 summarizes prior research on feedback in thesis supervision while discussing the roles of students and supervisors, feedback functions and contents, as well as linguistic and cultural factors that can influence students' engagement with and responses to the feedback they obtain. Next, section 2.5 presents different phases of the research planning and academic writing process to build a foundation for the pedagogical planning of the feedback intervention in the current study. In that regard, section 2.6 characterizes different digital feedback methods that were employed in the present work.

To address the research gap and answer the resultant research questions (see section 2.7), chapter 3 provides details on the methodological design. This includes general considerations about pedagogical design (section 3.1) as well as information about the specific approaches that were adopted in the current intervention. Notably, this involves inquiry-based learning (section 3.2) and the establishment of an open, digitally mediated feedback environment (section 3.3). Afterwards, section 3.4 elaborates on the assignment types and feedback procedures that were applied in the different phases of research planning. Moving from pedagogical considerations to the empirical design of the study, the following sections inform the readers about the research context and target population (section 3.5), the research approach (section 3.6), instruments and data sources (section 3.7) as well as assumptions and hypotheses that were advanced prior to data collection (section 3.8). The subsequent sections 3.9 and 3.10 describe the analytical procedure, along with considerations about validity and reliability (section 3.11).

Next, the comprehensive chapter 4 presents the findings for the three feedback formats and research phases in a detailed manner. It starts with an overview of the data corpus (section 4.1) and background information about the participants (section 4.2). The ensuing presentation of results is divided into three major parts. First, sections 4.3 to 4.5 focus on the specific results

¹ The project "Didaktische Orientierung für digitales Feedback (Pedagogical guidance for using digital feedback): Digital Feedback Map (DFM)" was funded by the *Stiftung Innovation in der Hochschullehre* (project ID: FRFMM-181/2022, project duration: 09/2022-11/2023).

obtained from the three formative surveys, followed by a brief intermediate summary of the survey results in section 4.6. Second, sections 4.7 to 4.9 concentrate on the findings from the feedback analyses of the digital boards, recorded files, and online forums, respectively. Each of these sections contains an overview of the codings as well as detailed results of the feedback characteristics, contents, structures and purposes, their linguistic, non-verbal and technological features as well as observable follow-up interactions and (cross-)references. Based on this elaborate presentation of the feedback products in the separate phases, section 4.10 offers a comparative analysis along these central dimensions. Finally, in the third part, results from the summative course evaluation survey will be presented (section 4.11) and compared to previous years that did not yet incorporate the present pedagogical design (section 4.12).

After this extensive presentation of findings from the survey and the feedback analyses, chapter 5 begins with a structured summary of results in response to the four major research questions (section 5.1), along with a joint consideration across the different feedback formats (section 5.2). Immediately afterwards, section 5.3 compares the key findings from the current research to preceding studies, concentrating on the roles of peers, technologies, and pedagogies. Building on the limitations of the present work (see section 5.4), sections 5.5 and 5.6 will showcase the planned modifications in research design and suggest additional options for the empirical investigation of digital feedback in the research planning process. The remaining sections of the discussion chapter will offer empirically grounded recommendations for future teaching practices as well as additional practical suggestions, including possible variations of digital feedback methods, such as the incorporation of artificial intelligence (AI) in the research and writing process (section 5.7). These changes in pedagogical design require a willingness to engage in continuous professional development, which is why section 5.8 shifts attention to peer feedback among teachers or thesis supervisors, participatory pedagogies as well as participatory research.

Finally, the concluding chapter 6 will present closing remarks and set the stage for follow-up work in higher education research and teaching. Overall, this book thus intends to offer insights for researchers, educators, and program designers alike, who are open to engage with feedback as a pedagogically meaningful and technologically supported practice. In particular, it advocates for a shift toward dialogic, learner-centered feedback cultures in higher education – cultures that recognize the complementary roles of peers, pedagogies, and technologies in fostering academic development.

2. Literature Review

The concept of feedback has evolved over time and has been shaped by scholarly and pedagogical work in numerous disciplines (see e.g. reviews by Nieminen et al., 2022, pp. 99–104; Schluer et al., 2023). Accordingly, there is a great diversity of practical applications (see review by Brück-Hübner & Schluer, 2023; Schluer & Brück-Hübner, 2025) and individual understandings of this notion. The next sections therefore outline the conceptualization of feedback and feedback literacy that informed the present research (sections 2.1 and 2.2). With its dedicated focus on peer feedback, the subsequent section 2.3 will carve out several benefits and associated challenges, resulting in specific training needs to foster reciprocal learning. Despite its many affordances, peer feedback has hardly been incorporated and investigated in the realm of research planning and thesis supervision. Instead, thesis writing has mostly been considered a solitary process in higher education which is mainly dependent on occasional feedback by the supervisor. Section 2.4 therefore synthesizes prior research on supervisory feedback in the research planning and writing process, discusses underlying models of student and teacher roles and reviews several factors, such as feedback functions and contents, linguistic and cultural aspects as well as different engagement dimensions that influence the feedback process and uptake. Since the current research aims to examine peer feedback exchanges at diverse phases of the research planning process, the ensuing section 2.5 briefly characterizes the different stages. Even though digital tools enable multimodal communication in unprecedented ways, their potentials for facilitating peer feedback at different stages of the research process have been underexplored. Section 2.6 therefore defines those digital feedback methods that will be examined in the present work. Given the paucity of relevant previous work on digital peer feedback in research planning, the chapter will close by specifying the research questions that the empirical part seeks to answer (section 2.7).

2.1. Conceptualization of Feedback

Due to its high impact on learning success (see e.g. Hattie, 2009; Wisniewski et al., 2020), feedback has gained substantial attention in educational contexts. Over time and across disciplines, research studies and scholarly discourse have led to a variety of definitions, principles, frameworks, and understandings (Coppens et al., 2025, p. 173; Matthews et al., 2024, p. 26; Nieminen et al., 2022, pp. 99–104; cf. the review by Schluer et al., 2023). It has hence been understood through various theoretical lenses, including information transmission, social constructivism, socio-material perspectives and ecological approaches, each offering different insights into how feedback processes might work (Lu et al., 2024, p. 2; Schluer, 2022a, p. 16).

Nowadays, **feedback** is increasingly conceptualized as a dynamic, interactive and multi-directional process in contextually rich and situated learning ecologies (Deehan et al., 2023, p. 2) instead of a simple one-way transmission of information from experts (teachers) to

learners (e.g. Carless, 2022; see also the review by Schluer, 2022a, p. 16). In line with the general educational discourse, a shift from teacher-centered to student-centered approaches has thus occurred (Carless, 2022), with an emphasis on what learners need rather than what teachers do (Soltani & Zhang, 2025, p. 425; cf. Brück-Hübner, 2024). This change positions students as (pro-)active agents in the feedback process seeking to enhance their learning (Carless & Boud, 2018; Molloy et al., 2020). Since feedback involves interactive exchanges, it has been argued that feedback givers and receivers need to adopt different but shared responsibilities to make feedback processes successful (cf. e.g. Nash & Winstone, 2017; L. Yang, 2021, p. 67). Scholars therefore drew attention to the “relational dynamic[s]” (Matthews et al., 2024, p. 27) and principles of reciprocity that need special consideration within co-created interaction spaces. Accordingly, contemporary frameworks emphasize feedback processes as dynamic, dialogic and iterative in which learners play an active role by eliciting, providing, processing, and using feedback (Carless & Boud, 2018) during interactions with teachers, peers, technologies as well as other people and resources. This understanding complies with socio-constructivist and socio-material approaches (Chong, 2021; 2022; Gravett, 2022).

Socio-constructivist approaches emphasize the co-construction of knowledge through dialogue, reflection, collaboration and negotiation (cf. Carless & Young, 2024, p. 9; Price et al., 2011, cited in Carless, 2019, p. 705; see also Brück-Hübner, 2024, p. 102) and view feedback as essential to self-regulated learning (Malecka et al., 2022, p. 911) and competence development. Key concepts in that regard are “learner agency and pro-activity”, as “feedback is only taken up when students perceive themselves as agents of their own change” (Carless & Young, 2024, p. 3). Agency in this context refers to “the degree to which learners are able to make purposeful decisions in the feedback process” (Deehan et al., 2023, p. 2). Accordingly, from a socio-constructivist frame, feedback is understood as an interactive “process through which students make sense of performance-relevant information and use it to develop their work and/or their learning strategies” (Carless & Young, 2024, p. 2; cf. Soltani & Zhang, 2025, pp. 427–428).

These feedback (inter-)actions are entangled in a complex web of factors, as captured by **ecological** systems theory (originally developed by Bronfenbrenner, 1977, 1979, and applied to feedback encounters by Ajjawi et al., 2017; all sources cited in S. Chen & Nieminen, 2024, pp. 694–695). It comprises

- the immediate micro-system of the feedback encounter;
- the meso-system of, e.g., the classroom (including pedagogical feedback designs);
- the exo-system of classroom-external social settings, such as feedback culture in the family;
- the macro-system of broader institutional, sociocultural, -political and -economical influences;

- the chrono-system of timescapes, such as students' previous feedback experiences and transitions to new contexts (Ajjawi et al., 2017, quoted by S. Chen & Nieminen, 2024, p. 695).

As each of these systems influences the ways in which feedback exchanges (can) occur, they must be carefully considered in interventions that aim to foster feedback literacy (see section 2.2). Clearly, then, feedback processes are not just individual and (meta-)cognitive in nature, but also social, relational and emotional (Carless & Young, 2024, p. 8) as well as situated and dynamic. Relationship-building and trust are therefore crucial for effective feedback uptake (cf. Carless & Young, 2024, p. 8; Sato & Ballinger, 2012, pp. 172–173). This includes the creation of a positive and supportive learning environment (as reviewed by S. Chen & Nieminen, 2024, p. 702), characterized by trust between students and teachers as well as among peers. Moreover, learners' perception of the trustworthiness of information provided by digital tools (cf. Schmied, 2023) and other media (e.g. websites, videos, books) can have an impact on their learning.

Consequently, **socio-material perspectives** on the feedback process have been developed, which consider the roles of media and materials more profoundly (Chong, 2021; 2022; Gravett, 2022). From the sociomaterial standpoint, feedback must be understood within the specific digital environments in which it occurs, which means recognizing its interactions with individual, interpersonal, sociocultural, affective and situational factors (see the review by Schluer & Liu, 2024; cf. Tai et al., 2023, p. 201). Therein, tools and technologies not only enable but also constrain feedback practices (Tai et al., 2023, p. 202), for instance regarding learners' agency in feedback seeking, provision, processing and utilization (Nieminen et al., 2022, p. 95; cf. Laflen, 2023, p. 2; Kurt & Karabulut, 2024, p. 21, preprint). Thorne (2016), for example, found that learners' engagement with, preference for and utilization of particular tools is also affected by their perception of the tool features, which in turn can be shaped by personal and sociocultural factors and thus promote or inhibit communicative exchanges. It is therefore essential for the feedback participants to become aware of tool limitations and affordances so that they can exploit digital tools in an appropriate manner and reconfigure learning spaces through negotiation (cf. Schluer & Liu, 2024, p. 126). In educational contexts, it is consequently crucial to foster students' reflection on how tools and technologies shape their feedback exchanges, as will be attempted in the current study (see especially the formative surveys in section 3.7). Likewise, a thorough examination of how learners engage with feedback through their linguistic, cultural, and modal repertoires for particular learning tasks within specific socio-material environments is needed to derive recommendations for their effective use.

Interpersonal exchanges and interactions with media are thus influenced by affective, linguistic, cultural, and other contextual variables (Schluer & Liu, 2024). Instead of regarding these factors as hindrances to feedback processes and uptake, they should be "recognized as resources and assets" (Soltani & Zhang, 2025, p. 425). Certainly, this requires manifold skills

from the feedback participants who need to be united in their efforts to advance learning. The collaboration can occur through the negotiation of meanings and ideas (Soltani & Zhang, 2025, pp. 440–441), the co-creation of communication rules and feedback principles, as well as regular reflections on the usefulness and efficacy (Schluer & Liu, 2024, p. 141). Feedback is thus “a dynamic process” (Gan et al., 2025, p. 279) that depends on the feedback literacy of all interactants, as will be further explained below.

2.2. Feedback Literacy

Feedback literacy is a fundamental asset for the teaching and learning process and can hence be profitable for both sides. According to current conceptualizations, the notion includes two key dimensions: student feedback literacy, where learners actively seek, comprehend, and apply feedback (Carless & Boud, 2018, p. 1316), and teacher feedback literacy, where educators create supportive learning environments that facilitate effective feedback interactions and help students develop self-regulation skills (Boud & Dawson, 2023; Carless & Winstone, 2023, p. 153). Increasingly, however, there is a call to move beyond binary distinctions between student and teacher feedback literacy, so to recognize their shared responsibilities and interactions in the feedback process (Schluer et al., 2023, p. 156). In the end, the development of feedback literacy can flourish from collaborative efforts among various social agents who participate in the joint creation of knowledge and understanding (cf. Soltani & Zhang, 2025, p. 440). It thus involves openness and learning from all participants in a co-created social interaction space mediated by materials, (digital) tools as well as agents’ identities, communicative resources and strategies (e.g. language use, feedback skills, cultural factors). Simultaneously, this framework seeks to break down dominant power structures (Schluer et al., 2023, p. 159) for which peer feedback (section 2.3) and assessment co-design through pedagogical partnerships (section 5.8.3) can fulfil important functions. To lay a theoretical foundation, the notions of student feedback literacy and teacher feedback literacy will be elaborated in the next paragraphs before the focus will be shifted to peer feedback.

Generally, the concept of **learner feedback literacy** foregrounds student agency in the feedback process, not only to improve the current task, but also to develop self-regulatory strategies for future learning (as reviewed by Carless & Young, 2024, p. 2). Elaborating on the work by Sutton (2012), Carless and Boud (2018) defined feedback literacy as “the understandings, capacities and dispositions needed to make sense of information and use it to enhance work or learning strategies” (p. 1316). More precisely, it involves “appreciating the value of feedback; seeking and generating feedback; sense-making of feedback information; [...] develop[ing] [...] capacities in making academic judgments; working with emotions;” and taking actions for feedback uptake (Carless & Boud, 2018, cited by Carless & Young, 2024, p. 3).

To capture the learner perspective more profoundly, Molloy et al. (2020) analyzed learners’ views and proposed a learning-centered feedback literacy framework which encompasses

seven interrelated dimensions (p. 538). Each of these dimensions is complex in nature, with some key aspects highlighted below. Overall, the framework can be used for course planning (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 536) and for guiding students in actively engaging with and utilizing feedback to improve their learning strategies and outcomes. The authors also emphasized the importance of introducing feedback-related strategies early in the curriculum (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 537; see also Schluer, 2024i) to progressively develop students' feedback literacy.

First, students are encouraged to commit to feedback as a tool and catalyst for continual improvement by developing a mindset that sees feedback as essential for growth (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 530; cf. growth mindset by Dweck, 1999, cited in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006, p. 212). Second, the framework emphasizes the importance of "appreciat[ing] feedback as an active process" (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 530). In that regard, learners need to recognize their responsibility for identifying their own learning needs (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 530) and proactively resort to suitable resources. This includes, for example, "'early' feedback loop[s], by seeking advice from peers and making refinements before submitting assignments" (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 534). Moreover, they should continuously take opportunities to refine their evaluative judgment over time (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 530). Overlapping with this dimension, the third one focuses on students' elicitation of information, where learners are expected to proactively seek feedback from a variety of sources, such as peers, teachers, or others (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 531). They should learn to engage in meaningful dialogue to clarify expectations and standards while considering a multiplicity of perspectives (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 531). Next, the fourth dimension, processing feedback (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 531), highlights the need for students to critically analyze the received information, to extract actionable insights and apply them effectively to enhance their work (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 532).

The fifth dimension, in turn, addresses emotional aspects of feedback, which can affect information processing and interpersonal relations in manifold ways (see also S. Chen & Nieminen, 2024, p. 693). The dimension comprises students' openness towards receiving (critical) feedback as well as volition to engage with the information and continue the learning dialogue as needed (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 532). It includes managing emotional challenges, which might arise from the communication style of the persons and the media involved in the feedback process (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 533). Indeed, prior research has produced mixed findings about the role of emotions, as they are shaped by personal histories, cultural aspects, interpersonal relations and situational factors (S. Chen & Nieminen, 2024, pp. 693, 705). On the one hand, critical feedback can threaten students' self-image and motivation as well as interpersonal relationships and their perception of the value of feedback in general (as reviewed by Carless & Young, 2024, pp. 2, 6, 9). On the other hand, positive feedback might cause dissatisfaction among those students who are eager to improve, whereas others consider it as important for developing confidence and motivation (Hui et al., 2024, p. 343). It has been argued that trust-building in a supportive learning atmosphere is crucial to recognize the benefits of both positive and

negative feedback (cf. the review by S. Chen & Nieminen, 2024, pp. 702–703). For instance, a student in the research by Carless and Young (2024) developed her capacity “in turning self-criticism or teacher critique into driving forces for feedback uptake” (p. 10). As the authors explained,

“over time [she] perceived value in feedback information that she had previously downplayed, evidencing development in the dimension of appreciating feedback. She developed enhanced emotional equilibrium in responding to critical feedback, perceiving it more as a potential for growth and less as an indicator of flaws.” (Carless & Young, 2024, p. 10)

In the end, also teachers’ emotions might affect “students’ emotions in feedback encounters” (S. Chen & Nieminen, 2024, p. 706), thus necessitating an open and trustful interaction space (p. 702). Especially when students transition from one classroom context (or even one academic culture) to another, they are likely to face differences in the learning and feedback culture (S. Chen & Nieminen, 2024, p. 704). To avoid or resolve emotional barriers as well as clarify expectations, feedback training for students and staff becomes crucial (cf. the review by S. Chen & Nieminen, 2024, p. 703).

Proceeding to the sixth dimension of Molloy et al.’s (2020) framework, we find that the reciprocity of the feedback process needs to be recognized by the learners (p. 533). They should be guided to understand and feel comfortable in their complementary and mutually supportive roles as both receivers and providers of feedback (Molloy et al., 2020, pp. 533, 536). The ability to engage in feedback dialogues also requires sensitivity to relational dynamics as well as cultural aspects to reach deeper learning (Molloy et al., 2020, pp. 533, 536). Finally, the seventh dimension focuses on enacting the outcomes of feedback provision (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 533). This involves setting goals, recording and analyzing feedback information, planning to apply feedback in future tasks, as well as continuously monitoring progress and subsequently setting new objectives (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 534). By doing so, students may realize the complexity of the feedback process, which not only comprises the feedback event itself, but also preparatory stages and follow-up actions (Molloy et al., 2020, p. 536; see also seventh dimension in the feedback taxonomy by Schluer & Brück-Hübner, 2025). In the end, this may help to ensure that feedback is used for long-term improvement rather than seen as a one-time intervention.

Similar to the notion of feedback literacy, the concept of “feedback orientation” has been in use (Coppens et al., 2025, p. 176). It was “defined by London and Smither (2002, p. 81) as ‘an individual’s overall receptivity to feedback, including comfort with feedback, tendency to seek feedback and process it mindfully, and the likelihood of acting on the feedback to guide behaviour change and performance improvement’” (as quoted in Coppens et al., 2025, p. 176). It appears to foreground agents’ attitudes and perceptions towards feedback and their roles in the feedback process, which is likely to influence their engagement and feedback use (cf. L.