CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This chapter explains about seven subchapters, namely: background of research, statements of problem, statements of hypothesis, purposes of research, significances of research, scope and limitation, and definition of keyterms.

1.1 Background of Research

Corrective feedback (CF) that refers to responses of learners' utterances which indicate an error both in implicitly or explicitly (Ellis et al., 2006; Nassaji, 2018) has been debatable and controversial issue in second language learning during past few decades (Bitchener et al., 2005; Schenck, 2020; Tang & Liu, 2018; Y. Zhang et al., 2010). It was bringing up to pro and contra issue, since some researchers assert that corrective feedback is effective (Bitchener et al., 2005; Chen & Liu, 2021; Ellis et al., 2006; D. Ferris, 1999; Karim & Nassaji, 2018; Li, 2010; Sheen, 2010; Yousefi & Nassaji, 2021), while others state that corrective feedback is ineffective and harmful (Truscott, 1999).

Corrective feedback is defined as comments related to learners' foreign or second language comprehension or production, especially for accuracy, suitability, appropriateness or correctness (Eslami & Derakhshan, 2020; Li & Vuono, 2019). According to (Sheen & Ellis, 2011) corrective feedback is defined as the feedback which learners receive related to linguistic errors on oral or written production of their second language. Corrective feedback can be provided in the form of oral, called as oral corrective feedback and written, called as written corrective feedback (Li & Vuono, 2019; Nassaji & Kartchava, 2017; Sheen & Ellis, 2011). Then, (Ha & Murray, 2020) simplify the term of oral corrective feedback as the responses on learners' spoken errors. Then, written corrective feedback (WCF) is defined as some responses related to learners' linguistic errors in written and used by teachers to help learners for improving their writing's accuracy (Li & Roshan, 2019; Z. Mao & Lee, 2020).

Moreover, by highlighting into some literatures relate the effect of written corrective feedback in second language writing, scope of research concerned to WCF has been addressed through some various investigations in different context through some multidimensional aspects, both cognitive and affective. Related to cognitive aspects, several studies have investigated whether effects of written corrective feedback are related to language aptitude (Benson & DeKeyser, 2018; Sheen, 2007), linguistic accuracy (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Farrokhi & Sattarpour, 2012; Shintani & Ellis, 2015), working memory (Li & Roshan, 2019). Meanwhile, related to affective aspects, some studies have examined whether effects of WCF are related to learners' attitude (Darabad, 2013; McMartin-Miller, 2014), learners' belief (Han, 2017), learners' anxiety (Tsao et al., 2017; L. J. Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). However, most of studies have generally showed positive effect of written corrective feedback in second language learning (Evans et al., 2011). Thus, by looking at its effect, it can be concluded that the existence of written corrective feedback as one of effective strategies in improving learners' writing ability is established. In other words, written corrective feedback can be considered as one of writing strategies which is good and effective in improving learners' writing ability in second language learning.

However, (Kang & Han, 2015) stated that generally, teachers have spent a great deal of time in providing some kinds of corrections (e.g., grammar, spelling) to another extents (e.g., correcting every error or selectively a few) for their learners writing. (Tsao, 2021) also stated that in providing written corrective feedback, teacher can pay attention and focus to some linguistic errors (i.e., technical details regarding contractions, capitalization, and punctuation; grammatical errors; vocabulary and collocations; content; organizational structure)on learners' writing task. By having this consideration, thus, as a writing teacher, providing feedback and giving review for learners' writing work become their main duty. Thus, feedback which provided by writing teachers on learners' writing task may called as teacher written corrective feedback (Mao and Croshwaite, 2019). Meanwhile, feedback which provided by a learner for another learner's writing task may called as peer written corrective feedback. Peer written

corrective feedback is a respond from Ferris (1999) regarding the weakness of teacher written corrective feedback. (Iriarte& Alastuey, 2017) argued that providing feedback for each learner in class will certainly need a lot of time. Not only that, most of teacher written corrective feedback ask some revisions which contain some requirement sentences that can be a burden for learners.

Spending a lot of time in providing written corrective feedback by responding to some errors on learners writing work (e.g., Kim et al., 2020; Lee, 2019), most of writing teachers may be expecting that their learners have a deeply engaged with that feedback. However, their expectation is not always fulfilled (e.g., Ferris et al., 2013; Lee, 2008). Thus, to help teachers enhance the effect of their written corrective feedback on learners writing ability, teacher needs to understand regarding learners' engagement with written corrective feedback. It is because learner engagement is a main link which connects between the provision of written corrective feedback and the learning outcomes (Han & Hyland, 2015).

Learner engagement with feedback can be defined as responses of learners toward feedback that they received (Ellis, 2010). Moreover, regarding the term of written corrective feedback, learner engagement with written corrective feedback can be defined as the ways that learners respond to written corrective feedback which they receive. Furthermore, (Ellis, 2010) proposed three dimensions of learner engagement with corrective feedback which consist of cognitive, behavior and affective. Cognitive engagement means how learners attend to the corrective feedback which they receive, behavior engagement means how the ways learners revise the errors in their writing works, and affective engagement means how learners respond attitudinally to corrective feedback which they receive. It is important to understand regarding learners' engagement with corrective feedback. By understanding learners' engagement with written corrective feedback, teacher can determine the appropriate type of written corrective feedback which used as effective strategy in improving learners' writing ability.

Studies on learners' engagement with corrective feedback have been done by several researchers. Most of them focused on exploring how was learners' engagement with some types of written corrective feedback (Fan & Xu, 2020;

Koltovskaia, 2020; Uscinski, 2017; Zhang & Hyland, 2018; Zheng & Yu, 2018) and factors affecting learners' engagement (Han, 2017; Han & Xu, 2019; Tsao, 2021; Tsao et al., 2021). Furthermore, research also has shown the effectiveness of written corrective feedback on learners' writing depends on learners' engagement (Tsao et al., 2021). Learners' engagement with written corrective feedback used as main part which connects between provision of written corrective feedback and writing outcomes. In other words, the level of learners' engagement with written corrective feedback will determine learners' writing ability. However, there was little research concerning relationship between learners' engagement with written corrective feedback and writing ability. Thus, this current study completes the existing literatures by examining relationship between learners' engagement with written corrective feedback (both teacher and peer) and learners' writing ability.

Previous studies had shown that learners' engagement with written corrective feedback consist of three dimensions of engagement (i.g., cognitive engagement, behaviour engagement and affective engagement) as stated by Ellis (2010). Thus, some of researches have focused on exploring three dimensions or spesific dimensions (one or two different dimensions) of learners' engagement with written corrective feedback (Fan & Xu, 2020; Koltovskaia, 2020; Tsao et al., 2021; Zhang & Hyland, 2018; Zheng & Yu, 2018). Then, (Svalberg, 2009) had add one more dimension of the three-component construct of learners' engagement,that is, social engagement, which can be defined as becoming interactiveand initiating engagement in langauge teaching and learning process.

Moreover, (Tsao et al., 2021) also combine two dimensions engagement (cognitive, behaviour) of (Ellis, 2010) with social engagement of (Svalberg, 2009) and associate with motivation and writing performance. However, (Tsao et al., 2021) did not examine affective engagement to avoid overlap with the twomotivational constructs (intrinsic and extrinsic) which operationalized in their study. So, they only focused on three dimensions of learners engagement with written corrective feedback (cognitive, behaviour and social engagement). Thus, by completing this, the current study aimed to use four dimensions of learners'

engagement with written corrective feedback (cognitive, behaviour, affective and social engagement) and correlate it with learners' writing ability.

Moreover, by considering to the methodology of research, most of available studies which concerned on exploring learners' engagement with written corrective feedback had use the qualitative design of their methodology (Han, 2017; Han & Xu, 2019; Koltovskaia, 2020; Saeli & Cheng, 2019; Zhang & Hyland, 2018; Zheng & Yu, 2018). It may because there was a limited scale to measure learners' engagement with written corrective feedback. Therefore, this research is interested in using both qualitative and quantitative design for the research methodology in order to make it different than others and also compeleting the existing methodology. Furthermore, in order to make more deep understanding regarding learners' engagement with both teacher and peer corrective feedback, researcher also interested to address how learners engage with both teacher and peer written corrective feedback

From those explanations, it can be understood that this current study aimed to fill the void of the existing studies by considering some gaps, these are: first, there was limited study regarding relationship between learners' engagement with written corrective feedback and writing ability; second, most of studies explored learners' engagement with written corrective feedback by focusing on three or only spesific dimensions of engagement (cognitive, behaviour, affective), while this study concerns on four dimensions of engagement (cognitive, behaviour, affective and social); last, most of studies conducted research on learners' engagement by using qualitative design, while this study uses combination both qualitative andquantitative design. Therefore, this current study is very interesting and useful to be conducted.

This study describes learners' engagement with both teacher and peer written corrective feedback, correlates learners' engagement with teacher and peer written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability, compares both learners' engagement with teacher and peer written corrective feedback and explores how learners' engage with both teacher and peer written corrective feedback. By understanding learners' engagement with teacher and peer written corrective

feedback, teacher can determine the appropriate type of written corrective feedback which used as effective strategy in improving learners' writing ability. Correlating learners' engagement with both teacher and peer written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability will give more valuable and meaningful knowledge regarding the relationship of both aspect, and create a prediction based on those relationships. Then, comparing both learners' engagement with teacher and peer written corrective feedback will give more knowledge regarding the similarity and difference of both aspects. So, it will give more knowledge and comprehension regarding learners' engagement with both teacher and peer written corrective feedback, then evaluate it, whether it can lead to the better writing ability or not.

1.2 Statements of Problem

Based on the background of the study above, six research questions are explored in this study:

1. How is learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback?
2. How is learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback?
3. Is there any significant correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability?
4. Is there any significant correlation between learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability?
5. Is there any significant difference between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback?
6. How do learners engage with both teacher and peer written corrective feedback?

1.3 Statements of Hypothesis

Ha1: There is significant correlation of learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability.

Ha2: There is significant correlation of learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability.

Ha3: There is significant difference between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback.

Ho1: There is no correlation betweenlearners'engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability.

Ho2: There is no correlation between learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability.

Ho3: There is no significant difference between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback.

1.4   Purposes of Research

Based on the research problems, six purposes of research can be formulated as follows:

1. To explain learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback

2. To explain learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback

3. To explain the correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability.

4. To explain the correlation between learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability.

5. To explain the difference between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback.

6. To explain how learners engage with both teacher and peer written corrective feedback.

1.5 Significances of Research

It is expected that this study can be useful for the English teachers, learners and other researchers.

1.5.1 For the English teachers

This research result is expected to be valuable and meaningful in providing solution of writing problems during teaching and learning process. Not only that, teacher also may consider written corrective feedback as one of effective strategy in enhancing learners' engagement and learners' writing ability. Moreover, by understanding learners' engagement of written corrective feedback, teacher will able to choose appropriate type of feedback for their learners.

1.5.2 For learners

This research result can give a comprehension to learners regarding their engagement with written corrective feedback, so, they can determine what is the appropriate method and type of feedback that suitable for themselves in order to improve their writing ability.

1.5.3 For other researchers

This research is expected to give information, model, or reference to be developed for further studies, the researcher hopes that other researchers evaluate, revise, reconstruct, or modify this study and write further studies for other levels and objectives.

1.6 Scope and Limitation

This research has delimitation on describing and comparing both learners' engagement with teacher and peer written corrective feedback, examining its correlation with learners' writing ability and also exploring how learners engage with both teacher and peer written corrective feedback in writing personal letter text at 11th grade of MA. Masyhudiyah Giri, Gresik without considering the teacher's background, the quality of learners' writing and the feedbacks.

1.7 Definition of Key terms

1.7.1 Learners' Engagement

A state in the form of cognitive, behavior, affective and social in learners' learning process, in which learners as the agent of learning process itself.

1.7.2 Written Corrective Feedback

Some responses related to students' linguistic errors in written and used by teachers to help learners for improving their writing's accuracy

1.7.3 Teacher Written Corrective Feedback

Feedback which provided by writing teachers on learners' linguisticerrors regarding technical details (e.g., contractions, capitalization, and punctuation), grammatical errors, vocabulary and collocations, content, and organizational structure in their second language writing

1.7.4 Peer Written Corrective Feedback

Feedback which provided by learners on their peers' linguisticerrors regarding technical details (e.g., contractions, capitalization, and punctuation), grammatical errors, vocabulary and collocations, content, and organizational structure in their second language writing

1.7.5 Writing Ability

Skill which covers the process of using symbols (letters of the alphabet, punctuation and spaces) to communicate thoughts and ideas in a readable form.