

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURES

This chapter explains some related theories which used to support the study. It consists of seven subchapters, these are writing ability, corrective feedback, written corrective feedback, teacher written corrective feedback versus peer written corrective feedback, learners' engagement, learners' engagement with written corrective feedback, learners' engagement with written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability.

2.1 Writing Skill

Writing can be considered as one of important and fundamental skill in mastering English as foreign language (Ahmadi et al., 2012; Bakry & Alsamadani, 2015; Graham, 2019; Tanyer, 2015). It has main role in delivering some thoughts, ideas, feelings and desires of someone, so that others can be understand (Jabali, 2018). More than this, writing contains a complex cognitive process (Akkaya & Kirmizi, 2010; Cheung, 2016) in which learners need extract ideas from long-term memory and reorganized it during learning process of transcript (Sarica & Usluel, 2016). It had been seen as a difficult skill to be mastered by learners, so that it needs considerable amount time to practice their writing skill (Jabali, 2018; Kongsuebchart & Suppasetsee, 2018). In line with this, (Hashemian & Heidari, 2013) also stated that writing is difficult skill because writer needs to take some writing aspects together (e.g., spelling, punctuation, content, vocabulary, organization, etc) during writing process.

According to (Akkaya & Kirmizi, 2010), writing refers to an expression regarding feeling, ideas, hopes and plans which conveyed in written form. Moreover, writing ability can be defined as skill which covers the process of using symbols (letters of the alphabet, punctuation and spaces) to communicate thoughts and ideas in a readable form. Generally, writing ability has close relationship with grammar skill (Romano, 2019). It was being inseparable part of syntactic, lexical, discourse and other aspects of linguistic. Thus, in achieving good writing ability,

it is needed for having good grammar. As stated by (Mazgutova & Kormos, 2015) that grammar complexity has an important role in measuring learners' writing progress and achievement writing success. Moreover, in EFL context, the grammar accuracy was being an important aspect in achieving good writing ability. Since, accuracy in use of inflection in writing has been used as indicator of native and non-native successful academic writing (Romano, 2019). In line with this, (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010) also stated that written accuracy is one of ability which L2 writers possess in achieving non-native academic writing.

However, according to (Bitchener et al., 2005), most of type errors on grammar accuracy in L2 writers can be found on the use of prepositions, the past simple tense, and the definite article. Then, (Romano, 2019) also added that non-native texts are dominated by errors in the use of tense and agreement. By looking to this case, if written corrective feedback can target treatable errors in learners' writing texts with one or two feedback sessions and repeat the treatment with other problematic error categories, this may be all that is needed to increase and improve learners' writing ability.

2.2. Teaching and Learning Writing

By considering the importance of writing skill in English for foreign language, thus teaching and learning writing become important to be conducted. However, learning writing becomes difficult and challenging activity for learners. They often find some difficulties during the process of writing. As stated by (Gao, 2007) that learners often feel confused regarding words choice, correct grammar, organization and how to generate the ideas when they do writing. Not only that, learners seem have less knowledge regarding how to write a text based on appropriate standard of writing and how to develop their creative writing process. Moreover, in writing process, learners need to write a text based on both appropriate rhetorically and linguistically (Firkins et al., 2007). Therefore, in learning writing, learners need to pay attention to some aspects of writing, such as structure, grammar, content, vocabulary, organization, etc.

By considering complex aspects of writing, thus teaching learners to write is also become challenging task for a teacher (Barkaoui, 2007; Gao, 2007). In process of teaching writing, teachers not only teach learners regarding the ways to develop ideas in writing, but also need to focus on how to write a text with correct grammatically and systematically. Moreover, according to (Curry & Hewings, 2003), the teachers' purposes for asking learners to write are: first, it used as assessment; second, it enables learners for being critical thinking; third, it develops learners' learning after having class meetings; fourth, it enhances learners' communication skill; last, it trained learners for being professionals in particular disciplines on the future.

In achieving good writing outcomes, teachers should having good preparations regarding learning materials, methods, tasks, and others before teaching writing process. Not only that, teachers also need to consider and understand about some focuses in teaching writing. According to (Hyland, 2003), some different focuses of teaching writing can be consist of: language structures, text functions, themes or topics, creative expression, composing processes, content, genre and contexts of writing. Moreover, in the teaching writing practice, most of teachers tend to adopt some focuses of methods and collaborate them based on teaching situations and teachers' belief regarding how learners learn to write.

Several studies had been conducted to examine the effect of some teaching writing methods in improving learners' writing ability. (Sarica & Usluel, 2016) had examine teaching writing by using digital storytelling and its effect on the visual memory capacity and learners' writing skills. The results showed that the use of digital storytelling can give significant improvement on learners' visual memory capacity and their writing. Another study by (Bai et al., 2020) investigated 291 upper-grade (4th-6th grades) Hongkong primary learners' by using self-regulated writing strategies and the results showed that Hongkong upper-grade primary students gained a medium level of self-regulated writing strategy in writing with planning strategies conducted most frequently and self-initiation and revising strategies least frequently.

Furthermore, (Zhang, 2015) examine the effects of a reading–writing integrated task and comprehensive corrective feedback on learners’ writing development. The results found that reading–writing integrated task group and comprehensive corrective feedback group showed significantly better performance than the control group, with the comprehensive corrective feedback group performing slightly better than reading–writing integrated task group. Thus, corrective feedback can be used as one of writing strategies in teaching writing to improve better writing skill of English for foreign language learners.

2.3. Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback can be defined as responses toward learners’ utterances which indicate linguistic errors (Ellis et al., 2006). Then, according to (Li & Vuono, 2019), corrective feedback refers to comments regarding suitability or accuracy of learners’ comprehension or production of second language. The feedback which learners receive can be related to linguistic errors on both learners’ oral and written production of second language (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). Thus, in providing corrective feedback can be 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). Oral corrective feedback refers to responses on learners’ spoken errors (Ha & Murray, 2020). Meanwhile, written corrective feedback refers to responses related to learners’ linguistic errors in written and used by teachers to help in improving learners’ writing accuracy (Li & Roshan, 2019; Z. Mao & Lee, 2020). However, in this current study, researcher only concerns on written corrective feedback.

There has been controversial issue during past few decades regarding corrective feedback (Bitchener et al., 2005; Schenck, 2020; Tang & Liu, 2018; Y. Zhang et al., 2010), since (Truscott, 1999) stated that corrective feedback was ineffective and harmful. However, others stated that correcttive feedback was effective to improve learners’ writing (Bitchener et al., 2005; Chen & Liu, 2021; Ellis et al., 2006; D. Ferris, 1999; Karim & Nassaji, 2018; Li, 2010; Sheen, 2010; Yousefi & Nassaji, 2021). Moreover, (Ahangari & Amirzadeh, 2011) stated that

corrective feedback is useful tool for helping teachers in preventing learners' fossilized errors and make learners have progress in their language learning. (Sheen & Ellis, 2011) also added that the use of corrective feedback is to facilitate learners for having self-correct (uptaking the correction by revising the error). Thus, when learners are having self-correct, that will be a learning.

Most of studies regarding corrective feedback have reported that it is effective in improving learners' writing in second language (Bitchener, 2008). For example, (Basturkmen & Fu, 2021) which suggest that corrective feedback is used to promote the accuracy and fluency of the development of second language grammar. Therefore, in having accuracy and fluency classroom task, teachers can implement a corrective feedback. Moreover, studies by (Guchte et al., 2015; Sato & Lyster, 2012) had examine the effects certain type of corrective feedback (prompts and recasts) on fluency development in oral production. Their research results showed that both prompts group and recasts group improved learners' oral fluency after receiving corrective feedback treatment.

The above current researches have reported regarding the effectiveness of corrective feedback. It was in line with (Sheen & Ellis, 2011) which concluded that corrective feedback, both in oral and written is effective to facilitate learners in improving their linguistic accuracy. Therefore, corrective feedback promotes language acquisition.

2.4 Written Corrective Feedback

Talking about written corrective feedback, there were several researches which defined written corrective feedback in similar way. Begin from the simple one that written corrective feedback is some responses related to students' linguistic errors in written and used by teachers to help learners for improving their writing's accuracy (Li & Roshan, 2019; Z. Mao & Lee, 2020). This means that everything written by teacher related to linguistic error made by learners on their writing work, it is called as written corrective feedback. Move to more complete understanding related written corrective feedback, (Bitchener& Knoch, 2010; Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019) defined written corrective feedback as feedback

which provided by teacher related students' assignment and use for helping students to understand their error and let them making such as revision based on the feedback.

Most of recent studies regarding written corrective feedback have found its positive effects on second language writing (Benson & DeKeyser, 2018; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; N. Fan & Ma, 2018; Kim et al., 2020; Nemati et al., 2019; Rummel & Bitchener, 2015; Vyatkina, 2010). According to (Benson & DeKeyser, 2018) which conducted an experimental research regarding effect type of written corrective feedback (direct and metalinguistic written corrective feedback) on grammatical accuracy of verb tense had showed that both treatment feedback groups (direct and metalinguistic written corrective feedback) performed better than control group (no written corrective feedback) by showing an improvements in grammatical accuracy of both verb tenses structures (simple past tense and the present perfect tense). By considering this result, this study also confirmed to previous studies which have found that written corrective feedback is useful for different types of grammatical linguistic errors.

Next, another research by (Kim et al., 2020) regarding effect type of written corrective feedback (direct and indirect synchronous written corrective feedback) on writing showed that both direct and indirect synchronous written corrective feedback are useful and it successfully reduces time consumption in doing error writing correction for writing instructor. Moreover, research conducted by (Nemati et al., 2019) reported that there was positive effect of focused direct and focused indirect written corrective feedback on explicit and implicit knowledge by Iranian beginner learners in EFL context. (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008) also have investigated about the effectiveness of written corrective feedback towards international and migrant English for Second Language (ESL) learner writing, and the results showed that learners who received written corrective feedback outperformed those who did not receive written corrective feedback. In other words, learners who received written corrective feedback significantly improved their accuracy on English writing. In line with this, research by (Kang & Han,

2015) also revealed that written corrective feedback had an effect on improving the grammatical accuracy of learners' second language writing.

Furthermore, by having deep understanding regarding written corrective feedback, some studies had assert that it is useful and give some benefits for the learners (Bitchener, 2008; Ekanayaka & Ellis, 2020; Lim & Renandya, 2020; Luquin & Mayo, 2021). Written corrective feedback is effective in improving learners' writing whether they revise their writing or not. Then, when learners revise their writing errors, they will have more attention to have a correction and it will bring up to the language development (Ekanayaka & Ellis, 2020). However, (Lim & Renandya, 2020) suggest that teachers may continue to provide feedback for learners, due to written corrective feedback can improve accuracy of learner' writing second language learning. In line with this, the study results of (Kurzer, 2017) also indicated that dynamic written corrective feedback can be used as effective tool to improve linguistic accuracy.

2.5 Teacher Written Corrective Feedback Versus Peer Written Corrective Feedback

Teacher written corrective feedback refers to feedback which provided by writing teachers on learners' writing task (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019). Moreover, (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010) have defined feedback as the information given by teachers to improve learners' understanding and performance, helping learners to know their errors and let them having any corrections. However, feedback which provided by a learner for another learner's writing task may called as peer written corrective feedback. So, in determining the definition of teacher and peer written corrective feedback, it lays on the subject (who is doing the written corrective feedback itself). If written corrective feedback done by teacher, it may called as teacher written corrective feedback. Meanwhile, if written corrective feedback done by peer, it may called as peer written corrective feedback. In peer written corrective feedback, teacher can give an oppurtinity to evaluate and correct learners' writing task to their peer. It could be as one of effective solutions in

solving problem related to time-consuming in doing teacher written corrective feedback.

As a writing teacher, providing feedback and giving review for learners' writing work become their main duty. 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 (Tsao, 2021). Moreover, according to (Pearson, 2018) teachers can give specific comments and targeting a certain part of the text when giving feedback. (Ferris, 2014) suggested that teachers may provide both constructive criticism and encouragement. Then, in delivering comments, teachers may consider questions form, rather than imperatives form. Therefore, writing teacher must consider well some important points to respond on learners' writing, since teacher has main role in determining a successful corrective feedback. Furthermore, successful written corrective feedback can be achieved if teacher runs it well. Providing suitable feedback for learners become one of teachers' skill which needed to be mastered as part of good formative assessment. Appropriate and clear feedback can give useful information for learners, so they can understand easily about their linguistic error, why it happen and how to correct it. Thus, they can motivate themselves to improve their language writing.

Through some explanations above, it can be seen the importance of teacher written corrective feedback. However, there were some studies which examine and evaluate the practice of teacher written corrective feedback. Some of them argued that providing teacher written corrective feedback by responding to linguistic errors on learners' writing task one by one will certainly need a lot of time (Iriarte & Alastuey, 2017; Kim et al., 2020; Lee, 2008, 2019). Not only that, most of teacher written corrective feedback ask some revisions which contain some requirement sentences that can be a burden for learners (Iriarte & Alastuey, 2017). Teachers' comments in their written corrective feedback can be a burden and give effect to learners' psychology aspect. Learners' become unconfidence to write their ideas. Sometimes, teachers' correction or comments also often unclear,

confusing and ambiguous, of course it will affect to how learners respond to teacher written corrective feedback. It can potentially make miscommunication and miscomprehension among learners. Moreover, (Ferris, 2014) also emphasized that for writing teachers, responding to learners' writing is needed critical effort and often make frustrated.

To overcome the weakness of teacher written corrective feedback, then peer written corrective feedback can be used as another option, especially in reducing time-consuming in teacher written corrective feedback. In peer written corrective feedback, a learner will have duty like their teacher by doing correction to another learners' (peer) writing task. According to (Byrd, 2003) peer feedback may facilitate learners to improve skills which can be used in their editing works and also improve learners' confidence in writing. In line with this, (Rouhi et al., 2020) stated that peer feedback may facilitate learners in developing their writing skill and let them having self-evaluate regarding their compositions. Moreover, according to (Hu & Lam, 2010), peer corrective feedback may build a socio-interactive environment, so learners are motivated to scaffold each other and it can reduce their dependence on teacher. Therefore, peer written corrective feedback can be used as alternative in enhance learners' writing skill.

Study which conducted by (Ho et al., 2020) investigated the quality and effects of written peer feedback on learners' revisions. By comparing learners' initial and revised writing drafts after receive written peer feedback, the results showed that the writing quality of revision drafts was significantly improved. It can be seen from the number of peer comments were revision-oriented which higher than the number of mis-corrections. Another study by (Shang, 2019) which examined the effects of electronic feedback of online peer feedback and automated corrective feedback on learners' writing performance showed that online peer feedback was significantly improves learners' sentence writing, grammatical errors, lexical item errors comparing to automated corrective feedback. Likewise, (Mahvelati, 2021) also asserted that peer feedback may as effective as or even more effective than teacher feedback. It builds and enhances learners' sense of responsibility and critical thinking on their own learning,

enables valuable peer interaction, fosters independent and active learning, and enables learners' metacognition awareness.

Although the practice of peer written corrective feedback in some several studies had reach on its effectiveness in improving learners' writing, however other studies showed the different results and asserted that peer writtten corrective feedback might not be as useful as expected (e.g., Diab, 2010; McDonough, 2004; Miao et al., 2006; Philp et al., 2010; Yoshida, 2008). It is because learners may not have knowledge regarding linguistic errors on peer's writing task, may not believe to their peer's written corrective feedback or may be learners prefer tend to teacher written corrective feedback (Diab, 2010). Furthermore, according to (McDonough, 2004; Miao et al., 2006; Yoshida, 2008) peer corrective feedback may often lack of pedagogical force comparing to teacher corrective feedback. It is because learners' may not fully pay attention to their peer's written corrective feedback since they do not believe to their peer's linguistic competences.

However, both teacher written corective feedback and peer written corrective feedback may have their own strengths and weaknesses. Both teacher written corrective feedback and peer written corrective feedback may be affected by some factors, including individual differences (such as anxiety, efficacy, motivation, age, etc) among the learners. (Tsao et al., 2017) suggested that writing teacher needs consider some learners' individual differences when conducting both teacher and peer written corrective feedback in actual teaching and learning process. Therefore, in pedagogical practices, teacher need to have well preparation and ensure the classroom rules when implementing written corrective feedback. So, the practice of written corrective feedback can be successful and effective to improve learners' writing ability.

In comparing the effectiveness between teacher written corrective feedback and peer written corrective feedback, some researches had been conducted. Study by (Miao et al., 2006) which comparing the practice between teacher and peer corrective feedback in writing class showed that teacher corrective feedback has bigger effect than peer corrective feedback in improving learners' writing. It also showed that peer corrective feedback can help to activate learners' autonomy and

used as complement while having teacher corrective feedback. In line with this, a meta-analysis study by (Thirakunkovit & Chamcharatsri, 2019) also showed that teacher feedback gives bigger effect than peer feedback in writing. It is because the learners know that their writing paper will be graded by the teacher, so they will prefer revise their writing paper based on teachers' correction. Of course, it will affect to the practice of peer feedback.

Moreover, research results of (Ruegg, 2015) also showed that learners pay more their attention on teacher feedback, rather than on peer feedback regarding their effort in revising their writing paper based on the feedback they received. Similar result is also shown by study of (Zhao, 2010) in which learners prefer used more teacher feedback than peer feedback on their revision draft of writing. It may because learners' opinion that teacher feedback is more important and trustworthy than peer feedback. However, different result is shown by (Gielen et al., 2010) in which their study showed that there was no significance difference on learners' progress writing between learners' who receive teacher feedback and peer feedback. Therefore, it can be concluded that both teacher and peer corrective feedback has each advantages and disadvantages.

Furthermore, (Ruegg, 2015) suggested that in receiving both teacher and peer corrective feedback, learners should be told explicitly that a feedback is only a suggestion, so whether they implement the suggestion or not, it depends on the learners. By consider this, learners will feel free and seem not having any burdens when they receive teacher or peer written corrective feedback. If they are enjoy and think positively regarding teacher and peer written corrective feedback, they are feel motivated in enhancing their writing ability. Thus, to achieve successful teacher and peer written corrective feedback in enhancing learners' writing ability, it can be evaluated and seen from how learners engage with teacher or peer written corrective feedback which they receive. 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).

2.6 Learners' Engagement

Engagement is considered as one of substantial predictor of learners' learning (Zheng et al., 2019). It becomes very central in classroom teaching and learning (Arifani & Suryanti, 2019). (Svalberg, 2009) defined learners' engagement as state in the form of cognitive, affective and social in learners' learning process, in which learners as the agent of learning process itself. Extend from this statement, (Reeve et al., 2019) come to more complex definition that learners' engagement should direct to three purposes, including making academic progress, satisfying learners' motivation and creating motivationally supportive learning environments for learners. Researches related to learners' engagement has already brought to the conceptual framework of learners' engagement which consists of three dimensions of engagement: behavioral engagement, cognitive engagement and affective engagement. Behavioral engagement focused on learners' involvement in their tasks and activities, cognitive engagement focused on learners' understanding related some ideas, knowledge and information and affective engagement focused on learners' emotional responses during learning process. (Fredricks et al., 2004, 2005; Zheng et al., 2019; Zheng & Yu, 2018).

Moreover, in achieving main language skill of English foreign language (i.e., listening, reading, speaking, and writing), including parts of skill (e.g., grammar and vocabulary), English foreign language teachers certainly hope that their learners can be as highly engaged as possible in learning process (Sadoughi & Hejazi, 2021). In addition, (Oga-baldwin & Nakata, 2017) stated that when learners are engaged maximally in their study, certainly they are on task, thinking or even enjoying their learning process. Therefore, engagement in class may activate learners' positive affect sense, interest and desire in English at the end of their learning process. Moreover, in maximizing learners' engagement in foreign language teaching and learning, (Sadoughi & Hejazi, 2021) suggested that teachers need to take kind of some measures to foster learners' positive emotions in order to optimize their engagement by offering positive emotional and appraisal support. For example, teachers may give meaningful supports in the form of useful feedbacks and suggestions during learning process. Not only that,

teachers may also enhance learners' sense of involving the class and respect with others by adopting, adapting or developing learning materials based on learners' need and interest.

Studies on learners' engagement have been done by several researchers. (Yu et al., 2019) studied to examine English-majored undergraduate learners' motivation and engagement in Chinese English as a foreign language (EFL) writing classes by using adapted Motivation and Engagement Scale for University/College Learners (MES-UC) found that learners were generally motivated to write in English and engaged in the second language (L2) writing courses. Another research by (Dao & McDonough, 2018) studied about effect of proficiency on Vietnamese EFL learners' engagement in peer interaction revealed that the core learners showed greater cognitive and social engagement and reported higher emotional engagement when interacting with higher proficiency partners.

2.7 Learners' Engagement with Written Corrective Feedback

The importance of learners' engagement with written corrective feedback plays pivotal role in determining good writing outcomes. As stated by (Han & Hyland, 2015) that learners' engagement is a main connector between the provision of written corrective feedback and learning outcomes. Moreover, (Ellis, 2010) argued that learner engagement plays a main role in mediating between provisions of corrective feedback and learning outcomes. From this explanation, it can be concluded that the importance of learner engagement with written corrective feedback plays central role in determining good writing outcomes.

Therefore, it is important to let learners involved in responding written corrective feedback, from both teacher and peer, since it will help learners have clear understanding related to teachers or peer written corrective feedback and how it will effect to their writing improvement. The successful teachers' teaching strategy in providing written corrective feedback for learners also could be seen by understanding learners' engagement. That was whether they were actively and positively engage or not with written corrective feedback. In line with this, (Zhang

& Hyland, 2018) assert that the provision of feedback does not automatically make the improvement of learners' writing improvement. However, it needs effective learners' engagement to lead on benefits of feedback. Moreover, since students as the executor in revising error based written corrective feedback, they play an important role in their own learning success, so they have to tend to be active and engage with written corrective feedback (Zheng & Yu, 2018).

(Ellis, 2010) defined learners' engagement with feedback as responses of learners toward feedback that they receive. Then, related to written corrective feedback, it is defined as the ways learners respond to written corrective feedback which they receive. Moreover, (Ellis, 2010) proposed learner engagement with corrective feedback which consist of cognitive, behavior and affective. Cognitive engagement is defined as how learners attend to the corrective feedback which they receive, then behavior engagement is defined as how the ways learners revise the errors in their writing works, and affective engagement is defined as how learners respond attitudinally to corrective feedback which they receive. Furthermore, there was an additional one dimension of learners' engagement by (Svalberg, 2009), namely social engagement. It is defined as becoming interactive and initiating engagement in language teaching and learning process. Moreover, in this current study, researchers combine these four dimensions of learners' engagement (i.e., cognitive, behavior, affective and social) to correlate with teacher and peer written corrective feedback and to explore how learners engage with written corrective feedback based on combination of these four dimensions.

According to (Price et al., 2011), having feedback without an engagement may become ineffective. (Zhang & Hyland, 2018) stated that the provision of feedback does not directly lead on the enhancement of learners' writing ability. However, in achieving benefits of feedback, it is needed an effective learners' engagement. (Hyland & Hyland, 2006) also argued that in facilitating learners' engagement with written corrective feedback, teachers need promote learners to interpret and provide good use of their comments. 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.

By looking to the importance of learners' engagement in implementing written corrective feedback, several recent studies have examined English as a foreign language (EFL) learners engage with corrective feedback (Han, 2017; Han & Hyland, 2015; Zheng & Yu, 2018). (Han & Hyland, 2015) investigated four non-English major Chinese EFL learners which were conducted to explore how learners cognitively, behaviorally, and affectively engage with WCF. The results showed that individual differences in learner engagement with WCF, which may be attributed partly to learners' beliefs and experiences about WCF and L2 writing, their L2 learning goals, and to the interactional context in which WCF was received and processed. Then, findings of this study suggest that teachers need to have a thorough understanding of students' backgrounds and beliefs and they should carefully plan their WCF strategies to enhance students' engagement with WCF. Another study conducted by (Zheng & Yu, 2018) explored how 12 Chinese LP students engaged affectively, behaviorally and cognitively with teacher WCF in EFL writing. It was found that students' lower English proficiency may negatively influence their cognitive and behavioral engagement with WCF and cause imbalances among the three sub-dimensions of engagement.

2.8 Learners' Engagement with Written Corrective Feedback and Writing Ability

According to (Ellis, 2010) stated that learners' engagement play a vital role as mediators between provisions of corrective feedback and learning outcomes. Although learners' engagement with feedback had main role in second language learning development, however it still remains widely under-researched area in second language writing (Handley et al., 2011; Zhang & Hyland, 2018). Some of available studies have been examined learners' engagement with different types of feedback and its effect on writing ability (Y. Fan & Xu, 2020; Koltovskaia, 2020; Uscinski, 2017; Zhang & Hyland, 2018; Zheng & Yu, 2018), while other

researches explored factors which affected on learners' engagement with feedback (Han, 2017; Han & Xu, 2019; Tsao, 2021; Tsao et al., 2021).

Study by (Uscinski, 2017) which focused on exploring learners' engagement with direct written corrective feedback and meta awareness of learners' drafts corrections have reported that both learners' engagement and meta awareness can be influenced by pedagogical factors (i.e., delivery method of the feedback). Furthermore, direct written corrective feedback can be more beneficial if the comments or clear explanations regarding learners' error have been delivered written well on the paper margin. Another study by (Zhang & Hyland, 2018) showed that different types of formative assessment may facilitate on improving learners' engagement in writing. They also argued that engagement is key factor to get success on formative assessment in writing teaching and learning. Besides, (Han, 2017) had examined learners' belief in relation to learners' engagement with written corrective feedback. The result showed that learners' belief was mediated by learners' engagement with written corrective feedback. Thus, in providing written corrective feedback, teachers need consider about learners' belief and enhance it in order to lead on learners' deep engagement with written corrective feedback.

Furthermore, research has revealed that the effectiveness of written corrective feedback on writing ability lays on learners' engagement with written corrective feedback (Tsao et al., 2021). However, study regarding the relationship between learners' engagement with written corrective feedback and writing ability is still limited. Study which conducted by (Tsao et al., 2021) examined inner causal relationships between motivation, learner engagement with written corrective feedback and writing performance. The results showed that both intrinsic motivation and learner engagement with written corrective feedback could effect directly on learners' writing scores. Moreover, learners' engagement with written corrective feedback also became more powerful predictor of writing performance rather than intrinsic motivation.

Furthermore, in conducted their research, (Tsao et al., 2021) combine two dimensions engagement (cognitive, behaviour) of (Ellis, 2010) with social

engagement of (Svalberg, 2009). In addition, (Tsao et al., 2021) also did not examine affective engagement in order to avoid overlap with the motivation variable which also examined in their study. Another limitations of their study were they use quantitative research method by applying some questionnaires, without doing an interview, observation regarding how learners engage with other types of feedback, and analysis learners' written texts.

Therefore, in order to complete the limitation study of (Tsao et al., 2021), this current study conducted to describe learners' engagement with both teacher and peer written corrective feedback, compare between learners' engagement with both teacher and peer written corrective feedback, examine the relationship between learners' engagement with written corrective feedback (both teacher and peer) and learners' writing ability, and explore how learners engage with both teacher and peer written corrective feedback.

In addition, to give more comprehensive understanding regarding the theories of this study, the researcher presented theoretical framework in Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1. Theoretical Framework of the Study

