EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2024): 8.481 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 11 | Issue:12 |December 2024

LEARNER ENGAGEMENT WITH WRITTEN FEEDBACK: A CASE STUDY OF LOW-PROFICIENCY L2 LEARNERS IN ACADEMIC WRITING

Liu Yuwei
School of Foreign Studies, Zhaoqing University, Zhaoqing, Guangdong, China

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra19469
DOI No: 10.36713/epra19469

ABSTRACT

This study explores the engagement of low-proficiency second language (L2) learners with teacher written corrective feedback (WCF) in academic writing. Drawing upon Fredricks et al.'s (2004) engagement framework, the study investigates students' cognitive, behavioural, and affective dimensions of engagement. Six university students participated, and data were collected through writing drafts, verbal reports, and semi-structured interviews. Findings revealed that students exhibited diverse engagement behaviours, such as strictly following feedback, incorrect rectification, no rectification, and removal. While most students demonstrated behavioural engagement by revising texts, their cognitive engagement varied due to limited understanding of feedback. Students also displayed mixed affective responses, including happiness, confusion, helplessness, and worries, influenced by feedback explicitness and proficiency levels. The study highlights the complexity of learner engagement with WCF and emphasizes the need for teachers to consider individual differences, students' revision processes, and beliefs when evaluating feedback effectiveness.

KEYWORDS: *Teacher Written Corrective Feedback, Learner Engagement, Low-Proficiency L2 Learners, Cognitive Engagement, Behavioural Engagement, Affective Engagement, Academic Writing*

1.INTRODUCTION

The acquisition of a second language such as English is a two-way process that requires the engagement of both the teachers and the teachers (Hyland, 2003). Extensive engagement with specific learning and teaching activities helps English language learners to seize more learning opportunities, test existing language knowledge and consolidate accurate understandings (Yu, Jiang & Zhou, 2023). In the field of second language writing, one of the most prevalent teaching and learning activities is teacher written corrective feedback (WCF), which means that the writing teachers provide grammatical written comments on students' writing drafts. Existing relevant studies on teacher WCF were mainly designed from the teachers' perspectives, focusing on exploring how the English writing teachers can deliver more WCF more effectively. For example, Shintani & Ellis (2013) tried to identify whether direct WCF was more useful than indirect WCF on students' revisions. They found that direct teacher feedback was not effective on the accurate usages of some grammatical forms. However, the study done by Alsuhaibani (2021) showed different findings, suggesting that the teachers should provide more direct feedback to stimulate students' revisions.

As mentioned before, recent studies have shifted the focus from the writing teachers to the students learning English writing. Several researchers concluded that even when feedback was delivered by the same teacher, under the same classroom context and in the same university, the students reacted to their teachers' WCF differently. Additionally, the students experienced different feelings and maintained different attitudes towards teacher WCF (e.g. Fan & Xu, 2020; Ranalli, 2021). Given that the students may engage with teacher WCF differently, which may affect how they take advantage of feedback, more studies are needed to explore from the students' perspectives, to see how students perceive teacher feedback, how they cognitively process feedback, and how they feel about teacher feedback (Moser, 2020).

Thus, to have a better understand of the students' learning process and the students' learning experience, the current study focused on the students' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback. As suggested by previous studies, students could engage with teacher feedback from mainly three aspects, namely cognitive dimensions, behavioural dimensions and affective dimensions. The study tried to explore how low-proficiency students engage with teacher WCF from cognitive, behavioural and affective perspectives.

EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2024): 8.481 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 11 | Issue:12 |December 2024

2.LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher written corrective feedback has been a popular teaching method adopted by language teachers who wish to correct their students' grammatical mistakes. However, many scholars found that the students did not take good advantage of teacher feedback provided on their writing drafts (Moser, 2020). Saeed & Alharbi (2023) discovered discouraging findings from a study in which the students submitted their revised drafts with few adaptations, revisions and rewriting. Zheng & Yu (2018) discovered that for some students, only 30% of the teacher feedback was adopted in their revised drafts.

While previous research has explored teacher written corrective feedback (WCF), the majority focused on exploring the effectiveness of teacher WCF. In other words, many scholars have investigated how the writing teachers could provide more effective and useful corrective feedback.

Despite the recent realization of the importance of learner engagement, till now, there has been limited conceptual framework exploring the concept of learner engagement. Perhaps one of the most systematic frameworks was summarized by Fredricks et al. (2004), who proposed that student engagement should contain at least three aspects, namely cognitive, behavioural and affective dimensions.

Based on Fredricks et al (2004), cognitive engagement refers to the extent of cognitive investigation into processing teacher feedback. To be specific, it includes the depth of processing and the cognitive and metacognitive strategies utilized to process feedback during revision. For the depth of processing, it means that students can process feedback at different cognitive tires, such as noticing the feedback or understanding the feedback partially, or understanding the feedback comprehensively and accurately (Qi & Lapkin, 2001). In addition, the cognitive strategies indicate how students allocate mental resources and proactive thinking regarding the reactions to feedback. For example, for cognitive operations, students may prioritize what kind of grammar errors they corrected firstly when teacher feedback indicated several kinds of errors. Regarding to metacognitive operations, it suggests the manner in which students oversee and calibrate their mental exertion during the revision of teacher feedback. As Ferris et al (2013) suggests, this kind of self-monitoring investigation not only reflects the students' awareness of their cognitive processes, but also showcases students' active involvement in internalizing and acting upon getting a specific learning task.

Regarding behavioural engagement, it pertains to the observable actions students have taken to respond to a specific learning task. In other words, it draws many scholars' attention to investigate how writing students integrate teacher feedback with their original drafts, so that their revised drafts would be a better version (Ferris, 2010).

In terms of affective engagement, it is regarded as an equivalence to the students' attitudes towards teacher feedback (Yang, Wu, Liang & Yang, 2023). In addition, it also includes the specific emotions that are reported by the students upon receiving teacher feedback, along with the shifts in these emotions during the process of text revision (Martin & Rose, 2002).

However, it should be noted that their proposal of learner engagement conceptualized both student engagement with schools as well as specific learning tasks. Thus, to apply this systematic framework to teacher written corrective feedback, several specific concepts should be adapted to suit this specific learning context. Thus, to adapt to the context of teacher WCF, cognitive behavioural indicates how deep students allocate mental resources to process teacher WCF, and their cognitive and metacognitive operations to deal with WCF. For behavioural engagement, it indicates how students make textual revisions based on teacher WCF. For affective engagement, it pertains to students' attitudes towards teacher WCF and the concrete emotions generated upon receiving feedback and during their revision processes (as shown in Table 1).

Table 1: Adapted definitions of student engagement with teacher WCF

Dimensions	Sub-dimensions
Behavioural	1. Student's revision behaviours
Affective	1. Attitudes and its changes 2. Concrete emotions and its changes
Cognitive	1. Depth of processing 2. Students' cognitive and metacognitive strategies

EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2024): 8.481 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 11 | Issue:12 |December 2024

3.METHODS

In order to provide a holistic and robust analysis of learner engagement with teacher written corrective feedback, the study employed a comprehensive methodology involving both qualitative and quantitative approaches. This mixed-method design ensured that the diverse dimensions of engagement, including cognitive, behavioural, and affective aspects, were thoroughly explored. Data collection involved multiple sources, such as writing drafts, verbal reports, and semi-structured interviews, allowing for triangulation and enhancing the reliability of the findings. Through this methodological framework, the study aimed to uncover nuanced insights into how low-proficiency students interacted with feedback and how their unique characteristics influenced their engagement.

3.1 Participants and Context

The research participants were six second-three university students from two teaching classes (Class 1 and Class 2) at a tier-two comprehensive university in the northern China. Their ages were from 19-20, with an average of 19.17. In each class, there were 42 students. The course chosen was *Basic English Writing 2*. All these students were taught by the same teacher Chole (pseudonym).

Chole was purposively chosen since she was the only writing teacher in the targeted university to adopt a process-writing approach when assigning writing homework. To be more specific, Chole utilized a multiple-draft teaching method, where she required her students to submit a first draft, then she delivered written corrective feedback on each of her students' drafts, and then again, she required her students to submit a second draft based on her corrective feedback.

Chole admitted that she learnt this method from her university teacher and found it effective. She believed that only by requiring students to submit multiple drafts can they paid more attention to the teacher feedback. Chole agreed to participate in this research after a careful and meticulous explanation of the current study. Additionally, Chole was told that she had the right to terminate the study whenever she wanted, or when she did not feel comfortable about it.

In terms of the students, three suitable students from each of Chole's class was targeted. The researcher arranged an informal meeting with the students where the researcher explain the research objectives, procedures and timetable in detail. The students were also specifically told that their participation of not would not affect their course performance. Also, the data collected from them would be kept confidential. Ast last, they were told that they had the rights to withdraw from the study whenever they wanted. After this explanation, all six students agreed to join the study. The following table was the detailed information of the six students.

Table 2: the basic information of the students

Name (all pseudonyms)	Class	Gender	Age	Ranking in year-1 academic performance	Ranking in *Basic English Writing 2*
Hannah	1	Female	19	42	38
Sherry	1	Female	19	40	39
Xenia	1	Female	20	41	40
Sharon	2	Female	19	39	42
Fiona	2	Female	19	41	39
Yuki	2	Female	19	40	41

3.2 Data Collection

To make allowance for the research validity and trustworthiness, data triangulation was utilized in the current research (Fairbrother, 2014). Multiple sources of data were collected to improve the data validation. Firstly, the students' writing drafts, including their original drafts as well as their revised drafts, were collected. Secondly, the verbal reports done immediately after students' revisions were conducted to see how students perceived their revision processes and their revision products. Thirdly, interviews were carried out to the students to generate more data about the students' cognitive and affective engagement (Benson, 2013). What is more, two interviews with Chole were also carried out to get a comprehensive knowledge of how her written corrective feedback was delivered.

As suggested before, the course chosen was *Basic English Writing 2*, taught by Chole. Three students from each of Chole's class (Class 1 and Class 2) were chosen. Thus, six students in total participated in the current study. During the research period, Chole assigned two writing assignment. For each assignment, Chole required her

students to submit two drafts. One original draft and a revised draft based on Chole's individual teacher written corrective feedback. Therefore, in total, 24 (2*2*6) students' written drafts were collected.

For the students' verbal reports, each student was told to arrange a meeting with the research when they decide to revise their drafts. Then, the research booked a quite tutorial room where the student carried out her revision. During the revision, the students were encouraged to behave as he/she usually did. The researcher sat next to the students, not too far that she cannot detect anything, yet not too close to distract the students. The revision process was recorded with the students' consents. Then, immediately after the completion of the students' revisions, they were required to conduct their verbal reports, where they were encouraged to express how they felt, how they reacted to and how they cognitively processed teacher written corrective feedback. Specifically, the researcher pointed at each feedback point and the students needed to explain why she/he did the specific revision and how she/he understood the feedback.

In addition, two semi-structured interviews with the students were conducted at the beginning and the end of the research period. The first interview was mainly about exploring the students' learning background and feedback experience. The second interview mainly aimed at detecting the students' overall teacher feedback feelings and experience. For each interview, it lasted for about 30-40 minutes, and was audio-recorded with the students' permissions. The language used in the interview was chosen by the students, and all of them chose their first language (i.e. Chinese).

3.3 Data Analysis

Previous studies have detected that the types of corrective feedback may influence how students' revision behaviours, thus the teacher feedback was differentiated from direct and indirect feedback based on Ellis' (2009) categorization.

For the students' writing drafts, their original and revised drafts of each writing homework were compared to detect any changes as their behavioural engagement. Informed by the previous studies done by Han and Hyland (2015) and also grounded in the current study, textual changes were observed as how students engaged behaviourally with teacher WCF. To summarize, four revision types were observed: strictly follow (SF), incorrect rectification (IR), no rectification (NR) and Removal (Rm).

The semi-structure interviews with the students (12 pieces) and also with the teacher (2 pieces) were transcribed verbatim and translated from Chinese into English. The transcripts were checked by the student participants and the teacher participant to make sure there were no misunderstanding. As for the verbal reports, they were also transcribed verbatim and translated from Chinese into English when necessary. Since this two research methods were designed to mainly detect the students' cognitive and affective engagement, they were analysed under the guidance of the framework of learner engagement with teacher written corrective feedback, which was displayed in Section 2.2. Any relevant excerpts from the two methods were extracted and went through serious and multiple rounds of investigation.

To initiate the analysis, a meticulous selection of the data was conducted, with the aim of retaining only those segments that reflected information regarding the different aspects of student engagement. Subsequently, the selected data underwent further stratification based on the cognitive, affective, and behavioural dimensions, along with their respective sub-dimensions. This categorization was crucial for a more nuanced understanding of the multifaceted nature of student engagement.

Ultimately, cross-case comparisons were employed as a means to detect the presence of recurrent or analogous themes across different cases (Benson, 2013). By implementing this approach, it became possible to discern overarching patterns and commonalities, which could offer valuable insights into the broader phenomenon of student engagement with WCF and enhance the generalizability of the findings.

It should be noted that another colleague who holds a Doctor's Degree in Applied Linguistics was employed as an extra coder to code 20% of the data of the students' writing drafts, semi-structured interviews and verbal reports. Originally, the agreement rate was about 86%, and after two rounds of discussions, the agreement rate increased to 100%.

4.FINDINGS

The findings of this study illuminate the intricate ways in which students engage with teacher written corrective feedback across cognitive, behavioural, and affective dimensions. The results indicate that students exhibit varied

patterns of engagement that are shaped by individual proficiency levels, their attitudes towards feedback, and the explicitness of the feedback provided. Through a detailed analysis of writing drafts, verbal reports, and interviews, this section provides a comprehensive examination of the students' responses to teacher feedback, offering valuable insights into their engagement processes.

4.1 Students' Affective Engagement

According to the engagement framework, students' affective engagement could be understood as the students' attitudes towards feedback and also the teacher. In addition, it also indicated concrete emotions generated when receiving feedback and also when doing revisions (Ferris, Liu, Sinha & Senna, 2013).

All of the students indicated that they would like to receive feedback and appreciate the teacher's work to provide individual feedback. For example. Yuki expressed that she was grateful for the teacher for providing such detailed feedback. Fiona also suggested that receiving written feedback helped her to make her second draft a better one. Xenia praised the usage of WCF, suggesting that WCF enabled her to realize some errors that she was not aware before.

In terms of concrete emotions, the students have demonstrated various patterns. In common, happiness, confusion, helplessness and worries were found among all the students when dealing with different feedback points. Yuki was happy to see one of her sentences in draft one was correct, since she was not sure about the usages when she firstly wrote the draft. All students expressed being confused with some feedback, especially when it was delivered indirectly, such as circling or underlining. Below are several examples:

Example 1:
Original draft in Fiona's writing task one: The old leaders <u>were</u> also young
(Teacher WCF: underlining the word of "were")

Revised draft: The old leaders were also young.

Example 2:
Original draft in Xenia's writing task one: <u>Letting</u> the society <u>as an example</u>, it just like our bodies…
(Teacher WCF: underlining the word "letting…as an example")

Revised draft: Using the society as examples, it just like our bodies…

For both Fiona and Xenia, they both expressed being confused when facing difficult feedback. Usually, this feedback was delivered indirectly, by underlining. This was related to their proficiency levels. For Fiona, she has learnt the concept of the simple present tense and the past tense. However, she did not acquire the ability to apply this knowledge to real learning context. For Xenia, however, she did not have the knowledge of the phrase "take something as an example", so when she was given the feedback, she had no idea when went wrong.

Furthermore, when the low-proficiency students experienced more confusions and did not know how to correct their drafts, their negative feelings became more serious, and sometimes evolved into helplessness. For Hannah, she expressed being helpless when she received feedback on her second writing draft:

> *I sometimes feel helpless when I try to revise some errors based on my teacher's written corrective feedback, because I really do not know how to revise them. For example, for these underlining feedback points (pointing to several indirect feedback), I do not even know what have been wrong. So, I have to guess the errors and make revisions. Sometimes I am just worried that when I have not provided the correct revision, my teacher will regard me as being not serious about the feedback*. (2nd verbal report)

However, when the researcher asked her whether she would like to receive no feedback in her future writing drafts, she still expressed her willingness to receive:

Well, I still would like to receive feedback. At least I know what has been wrong on my drafts. Even when sometimes I do not know how to correct them, I think I can become more active and ask the teacher or my friends. But at least, when given feedback, I know how good or bad is my writing (2nd verbal report).

4.2 Students' Behavioural Engagement

Since previous studies suggested that different types of teacher feedback would influence student engagement (Kahu, 2013). In the following section, some basic information regarding the general patters of teacher WCF were

EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2024): 8.481 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 11 | Issue:12 |December 2024

provided.

Based on the six students' writing drafts (24 drafts), it could be calculated that Chole delivered 113 written corrective feedback points. The following table provided detailed feedback information for each student. On average, each student received more than 18 WCF points on two of their writing drafts.

Table 3: WCF on two writing drafts received by each student in Chole's class

Name (All Pseudonyms)	Class	Total WCF points
Hannah	1	15
Sherry	1	21
Xenia	1	20
Sharon	2	21
Fiona	2	16
Yuki	2	20
Total	N/A	113

Regarding the explicitness of teacher WCF, it was found that Chole provided both direct and indirect teacher feedback. Comparatively, more direct feedback was given (71.68%) on her students' writing drafts than indirect feedback (28.32%) (as suggested in Table 4). This finding agreed with previous study from Zheng and Yu (2018) that over 60% of teacher feedback was delivered directly.

Table 4: Explicitness of WCF

WCF	No.
Direct	77 (68.14%)
Indirect	36 (31.82%)
Total	113

In terms of behavioural engagement, it was understood as the revision categories. Informed by the previous categorization of modification operations in Zhang and K. Hyland's (2018) study, four revision types were concluded: strictly follow (SF), incorrect rectification (IR), no rectification (NR) and Removal (Rm). For the type of "strictly follow", it indicated that students made revisions based on the teacher's direct written feedback. For the type of "incorrect rectification", it suggested that although some revisions were made, they were partially or not accurate. As for "no rectification", it suggested that although the teacher corrected a specific error, the students did not make any revisions on the false usage of the target language. For the last type "removal", it was manifested when the students chose to delete the erroneous usage of a grammatical structure (shown in Table 5).

Table 5: Revision behaviours among the six students

Revision Actions	Hannah	Sherry	Xenia	Sharon	Fiona	Yuki	Total
Strictly Follow	10	12	11	9	14	13	69
Incorrect Rectification	4	4	4	5	1	4	22
No Rectification	1	2	2	4	0	2	11
Removal	0	3	3	3	1	1	11
Total	15	21	20	21	16	20	113

In general, for the most of the teacher indirect feedback, all six students decided to adopt the direct corrections. For example, the teacher added "s" to the word "supporter" in the sentence "The supporter support we elect young people as the leaders of organizations." in her first writing homework. Fo Hannah, she accepted this feedback right away, commenting that:

> *Since the teacher already correct this for me, I think I should just adopt it.. I know I should come up with my own solutions, but I just can't…because I know my English is not that good. So I always trust the teacher.* (1st verbal report)

Hannah's words are representative, since for most low-proficient students in the current study, they held the belief that the teacher was a much more proficient and authoritative language learner than them (Storch & Wigglesworth,

2010). So, when direct feedback was provided, what they usually do was to adopt the feedback.

However, it was surprising to find that even when the feedback was provided directly, it was not adopted completely by the students. There are 8 out of the 77 direct feedback that received no revisions. The reasons were twofold: the students' beliefs in its triviality, or the unintentional ignorance. For example, the teacher underlined the beginning of each line of Sherry's paragraphs in her 1st writing, and suggested that "leave two blank spaces for the beginning of each paragraph". However, Sherry only corrected her first and second paragraphs, leaving her third and fourth paragraphs unchanged. When asked, she replied:

> *I think I just forget it, because I don't think it is not a big deal. Now people are always using computers laptops or iPad to write, the software such as Word or PPT will correct it for us.* (2nd verbal report)

When Sharon firstly admitted that she forgot to correct the feedback, her comment revealed an underlying reason for her forgetting: her belief in the unimportance of the error.

The low-proficiency students also showed a higher rate of no revision (9.73%) and removal (9.73%), which was higher than that reported in previous studies (e.g. Zheng & Yu, 2018). For example, the teacher underlined the sentence "…, it is obvious that I will electing young people as the leaders of the organization". However, because of this indirect feedback, Sharon cannot figure out what was wrong with the sentence. She replied in her 1st verbal report:

> *The teacher underlines this sentence. I just do not know what happened. Maybe because the content is not relevant? But when I read it again, I think the content is okay. But since the teacher has already indicated it, I choose to delete it.*

The researcher kept on asking "why haven't you kept the original draft? Maybe the teacher has misunderstood you?", Sharon commented:

> *I know my English level is poor, so if the teacher has corrected something in my draft, I think there is something wrong, and I just cannot figure out. So finally, I decide to delete the sentence, to show my teacher that I take her feedback seriously.* (1st verbal report)

The choice Sharon made in her revision was worth investigation. According to her own words, she did not just make a revision based on her understanding of the feedback, but also based on the consideration of what the revision may indicate to her teacher. When she thought that "no revision" could indicate not taking the feedback seriously to the teacher, she decided to at least have a response to the feedback even when she was not sure how to correct it.

The incorrect revision indicated that the students' proficiency levels and the type of teacher feedback did have a great influence on their behavioural engagement with teacher feedback. For example, in Fiona's draft:

> Original draft: Nowadays, there is an argument about <u>whether should we</u> elect the young people or the old to be the leader of a company or an institution.
> (Teacher WCF: underlining the words "whether should we")
>
> Revised draft: Nowadays, there is an argument about whether can we elect the young people or the old to be the leader of a company or an institution.

Although Fiona had responses to the teacher feedback, her correction was incorrect. This was actually resulted from her superficial cognitive engagement, which will be discussed in Section 4.3.

4.3 Students' Cognitive Engagement

To explore the students' cognitive engagement, the study looked at the depth of processing students showed in their revisions, and also the mental effort devoted in making corrections. For example, in Fiona's case:

> Original draft: Nowadays, there is an argument about <u>whether should we</u> elect the young people or the old to be the leader of a company or an institution.
> (Teacher WCF: underlining the words "whether should we")

> Revised draft: Nowadays, there is an argument about whether can we elect the young people or the old to be the leader of a company or an institution.

When Fiona explained her revision, she responded:

> *For this underlining, I think the teacher indicates that I need to refer to the writing task. According to the writing homework, it says something about "but some people say that young people can also be a leader". It uses "can" rather than "should". So, I think I should change it*. (1st verbal report)

For Fiona, she believed that the reason for the teacher feedback was because of the wrong usage of the modal verb. However, the accurate answer was that in the clause that starts with "whether", the word order should follow the rules of a statement form, rather than an interrogative form. So, the accurate way to correct it should be "there is an argument about whether we should elect the young people or the old to be the leader of a company or an institution.". However, because of the students' proficiency levels, she located the wrong grammatical rules. Thus, her understanding of the feedback was in accurate.

5.DISCUSSION

In terms of behavioural engagement, the students showed their reactions to feedback in different ways, namely strictly follow, incorrect rectification, no rectification and removal (Kahu, 2013). What was surprising was that even when the students were provided explicit feedback, they may not always accept the feedback. Two reasons were found: they sometimes simply forget and/or their beliefs in the triviality of the errors. When Sherry believed that format was not an important issue for writing, she did not take the direct feedback seriously. In addition, when the students believed that they made no revisions because they simply forgot, the teachers need to push them to ask a more meaningful question: why did they forget? Was that because of their carelessness or because of a more fundamental reason of their belief in the insignificance of the feedback.

In terms of cognitive feedback, the students showed various levels of processing when dealing with teacher WCF. Some feedback points were accurately understood, while some feedback points were inaccurately comprehended (Hyland, 2003). For the low-proficiency students, they encountered more situations where they could not understand feedback.

In terms of affective feedback, it included the students' attitudes as well as their concrete emotions (Mahfoodh, 2017). All students agreed that they would like to have feedback. Yet, this positive attitude did not always result in positive emotions. Overall, four types of emotions were found: happiness, confusion, helplessness and worries. This indicated that even within the affective dimensions, their sub-dimensions were not always interrelated.

6.CONCLUSION

The current study explored how low-proficiency students engaged with teacher written corrective feedback from cognitive, behavioural and affective perspectives. In the three dimensions, each individual student showed different experience and patterns (Ferris, 2006). This indicated the complexity of learner engagement in the context of second language writing research. A deeper behavioural engagement may not always indicate a higher level of cognitive and affective engagement. For example, a student may make an accurate revision based on the teacher direct written corrective feedback. However, in his/her verbal report, the student could not provide an accurate explanation of the target form. Also, emotionally, she may express confusion towards the feedback. There were cases where the students understood the feedback, but made no revisions according to it. One of the reasons was because their beliefs. Once the students held the idea that the errors indicated by the feedback was not important, or the error could be avoided by taking the advantage of modern technology, they became less conscious about the errors. This led to the result that they understood the errors correctly but made no revisions to correct the errors.

Based on the findings, the writing teachers should be aware of the individual differences and evaluated the effectiveness of their feedback not only based on the revision results, but more importantly the revision process (Han & Hyland, 2015). One of the limitations of the study concerned with its qualitative methods. Since the study only involved six students, its generalization should be noted (Benson, 2013).

REFERENCES

1. *Alsuhaibani, Z. (2021). Corrective Feedback Controversies in Language Learning: Focus on Direct Written Corrective Feedback. International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies, 8(4), 35–43.*

2. *BENSON, P. (2013). Qualitative methods: Overview. In Qualitative methods: Overview. Wiley-Blackwell.*
3. *Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. ELT Journal, 63(2), 97–107. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023*
4. *Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 50, 100775-. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100775*
5. *Ferris, D. R. (2010). SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING RESEARCH AND*
6. *WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN SLA: Intersections and Practical Applications. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32(2), 181–201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490*
7. *Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland, & F. Hyland*
8. *(Eds.). Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.*
9. *Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. Journal of Second Language Writing, 22, 307–329.*
10. *FAIRBROTHER, G. P. (2014). Quantitative and qualitative approaches to comparative education. In Quantitative and qualitative approaches to comparative education. Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong; Springer.*
11. *Fredricks, J., P. C. Blumenfeld, and A. Paris. 2004. 'School engagement: potential of the concept, state of the evidence'. Review of Educational Research, 74(1): 59–109*
12. *Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring learner engagement with written corrective*
13. *feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom. Journal of Second Language Writing, 30, 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.002*
14. *Hyland, K. (2003). Second language writing. Cambridge University Press.*
15. *Kahu, E. R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. Studies in Higher Education, 38(5), 758–773.*
16. *Mahfoodh, O. (2017). I feel disappointed: EFL university students' emotional responses towards teacher written feedback. Assessing Writing, 31, 53–72*
17. *Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2002). Working with discourse. London: Continuum.*
18. *Moser, A. (2020). Written Corrective Feedback: The Role of Learner Engagement: A Practical Approach (1st ed.). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63994-5*
19. *Qi, D. S., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Exploring the role of noticing in a three-stage second language writing task. Journal of Second Language Writing, 10(4), 277–303.*
20. *Ranalli, J. (2021). L2 student engagement with automated feedback on writing: Potential for learning and issues of trust. Journal of Second Language Writing, 52, 100816-. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100816*
21. *Saeed, M. A., & Alharbi, M. A. (2023). Towards fostering Saudi EFL learners' collaborative engagement and feedback literacy in writing. Assessing Writing, 56, 100721-. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100721*
22. *Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. Journal of Second Language Writing, 22(3), 286–306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.011*
23. *Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32, 303–334.*
24. *YANG, L., WU, Y., LIANG, Y., & YANG, M. (2023). Unpacking the complexities of emotional responses to external feedback, internal feedback orientation and emotion regulation in higher education: A qualitative exploration. System. DOI: 10.3390/systems11060315*
25. *YU, S., JIANG, L., & ZHOU, N. (2023). The impact of L2 writing instructional approaches on student writing motivation and engagement. Language Teaching Research. DOI: 10.1177/1362168820957024*
26. *Zhang, Z. V., & Hyland, K. (2022). Fostering student engagement with feedback: An integrated approach. Assessing Writing, 51, 100586.*
27. *Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. Assessing Writing, 37, 13-24.*