Learners' Engagement and Perception on Corrective Feedback of Online Tools towards Students' Essay Writing in EFL Context

Muh Junaidi[1], Muh Hisbullah[2], M. Imam Burhanudin[3], Baiq Siti Aulia Hovia[4], Abdul Azizurrohman[5]

[1]Universitas Nahdlatul Wathan Mataram
Muhjunaidi13@gmail.com
[2]Universitas Nahdlatul Wathan Mataram
hisbullah.muh@gmail.com
[3]Universitas Nahdlatul Wathan Mataram
imamnada326@gmail.com
[4]Universitas Nahdlatul Wathan Mataram
auliakhoviya3881@gmail.com
[5]Universitas Nahdlatul Wathan Mataram
azizurrohmanabdul@gmail.com

Abstract

Written, oral and online corrective feedback have become interesting topic for developing learners' writing skills in a second or foreign language context. The study aims at discovering the correlation between Learners' engagement and perception on the use of online tools towards Students' writing. Determining students perception on online CF was also the main concern. Multiple correlation used for analyzing data collected from 150 respondents through questionnaires and academic writing test. The study reveals that coefficient correlation between learners' Engagement and perception. is .996 and significant value 2-tailed is .000, which is greater than p-value .05. Furthermore, The Sig value of F change is.000, lower than the 0.05 p-value threshold; the value R.996 which is higher than sig. 0.05. Hence, it is a considerable and an extremely high degree association between students' level of involvement and perceptions of students' essay writing abilities. Values of students' perception in percentage distribution indicate the preference of online CF in terms of perceived usefulness, ease of use, self-efficacy and behavioral intention. Further study may concern on multifactorial analysis for providing more comprehensive study.

Keywords: *Engagement, perception, online corrective feedback*

1. INTRODUCTION

Written corrective feedback is an important process in developing learners' writing skill. Writing paragraphs, essays and other academic texts are still challenging for undergraduate students in Indonesia. Such a problem is derived from many factors. However, one of the most pivotal ones is learners' engagement in teaching and learning process. Most of teacher is by no mean ignoring its importance for students' learning outcomes. In other words, the problem of students' writing is not solely on what to write and how to write, but how to create learning process much more engaging.

Many studies have been conducted on theoretical and practical bases of corrective feedback in SL/FL writing development. Oral and written corrective feedback researches have been over decades. As Ellis (2010) reveals the progression concern of oral CF encompass descriptive studies dealing with taxonomy of CF strategies (Allwright, 1975; Chaudron, 1977) to experimental studies focusing on the effect of CF strategies second language development (Roy Lyster, 2004). It differs from the progression of written CF which focus mainly on experimental studies regarding with the effect of written CF improving learners' revision of original text (Fathman, A. K & Whalley, 1990) to the effect of WCF in terms grammatical accuracy used in a new piece of writing (Bitchener, 2008; Sheen, 2007).

Current studies of written CF have contributed to theoretical and practical significance. Studies aimed at finding out the effectiveness of written CF in improving grammatical accuracy (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009; Farrokhi & Sattarpour, 2011; Sheen, 2007; Shintani & Ellis, 2015). The studies mainly focused on direct and focused WCF and found the treatment group outperform than control group. Meanwhiles, a number of studies focusing on perception and written CF (Ene & Kosobucki, 2016; Han, 2017; Simard et al., 2015). These studies attempt to decipher teacher's or students' perception on providing WCF. The findings are student tend to WCF in a comprehensive way.

Engagement, multifaceted construct is important because it is related to the interaction of cognitive, behavior and affective engagement. Some research on written corrective feedback (henceforth WCF) and learners' engagement (Han, 2017; Han & Hyland, 2019a). Based on the previous studies, it is lack of research that examines such factors especially in English foreign language context like in Indonesia. In addition, the challenge of providing feedback is dealing with effectiveness, saving time in improving learners' writing skill. It is caused by the quality of engagement students through the use of online tools, such as interactive sheets, short videos, Grammarly, Prowritingaid, and Quillbot.

The development of writing choice is influenced by how learners' engagement to WCF given by teachers. For example, cognitive engagement requires learners to have literacy to the feedback provided. Then, how do they respond to feedback? Engagement can be questioning, revising or rewriting the text. Furthermore, the frequency and attitude of learners towards feedback will affect the extent to which they are motivated for the writing process. Few studies examine WCF and engagement but look at aspects of engagement partially. For example, just focus on researching cognitive engagement or behavior only.

This study aims at figuring out correlation between learners' engagement and Perception on the use of online tool towards corrective feedback. Furthermore, the study is to decipher learners' perception on online tools used in providing corrective feedback.

A great number studies on written corrective feedback have been held for decades. Most of studies are mainly focused on the effectiveness of WCF on text revision and a new piece of writing (e.g. (Bitchener, 2008, 2009; Ellis et al., 2008; and others). Few studies address the impact of individual variations to WCF. For instance, learners' engagement is very much influencing the effectiveness of corrective feedback

Engagement has been one of the main aspects in teaching and learning process. It is a pivotal one that is under-researched. Few studies have been explored attempting to find out its effect and correlation with written corrective feedback. The effectiveness of WCF counts on individual and contextual factors. Such factors interact with engagement. Engagement is multifaceted dimension. As Ellis pinpoint engagement has to do with students' response and reaction encompassing cognitive, behavioral and affective factors (Ellis, 2010).

A number of current studies reveals that learners are more deeply-engaged with WCF than others (e.g., Ferris, 2013; Zhang & Hyland, 2018). This is individual variations including innate characteristics such as proficiency (e.g., Qi & Lapkin, 2001; Zheng & Yu, 2018) and dynamic ones like motivation (Goldstein, 2006) and belief (Han, 2017). Learner characteristics such as competence (Lee, 2008), aptitude (Shintani & Ellis, 2015), and learner views (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010) also have a role in mediating these differences in WCF involvement.

Kormos (2012) also remarked that different people's motivations, backgrounds, and other circumstances moderate the extent to which second language writers make use of the chances presented by second language writing processes. However, there is currently a lack of research on the impact of certain learner traits in moderating learner engagement with WCF (Bitchener, 2012), and much less emphasis has been dedicated to learner beliefs (Rummel & Bitchener, 2015).

In addition to influencing instructors' decision-making while offering WCF, learners' beliefs may also assist explain variances among learners' engagement with WCF and learning outcomes (e.g., (Bitchener, 2012; Ellis, 2010; Han, 2017; Han & Hyland, 2015, 2019a)

Learner engagement with WCF is a multi-faceted phenomenon comprising of cognitive, behavioral, and emotive components. Cognitive engagement, as defined by (Ellis, 2010), is the degree to which

students actively process WCF and the extent to which they develop metacognitive and cognitive processes to aid in this processing. Behavioral involvement incorporates modifications prompted by WCF, as well as visible activities to create revisions (e.g., contacting others and online resources) and to internalize goal structures (e.g., maintaining an error record) (e.g., keeping an error log). Learners' emotional reactions to receiving, processing, and using WCF are all part of their affective engagement (Han & Hyland, 2015).

Han (2017) makes an effort to probe the dynamic relationship between student beliefs and WCF participation. The results show that the interactions and conflicts between person-related beliefs, task-related beliefs, and strategy-related beliefs moderate the relationship between these factors and learners 'engagement.

There is a reciprocal relationship between learner beliefs and learner engagement; for instance, when students acquire experience processing and utilizing WCF, their views about it might become more nuanced and well-grounded.

By consistently exposing students to WCF, giving students numerous opportunities to revise their drafts over the course of a semester or semesters, providing explicit instruction for exploiting the language learning potential embedded in WCF, and encouraging constant reflections on beliefs and experiences, it is possible to foster the development of beliefs that are conducive to deep engagement with WCF. He finds that there is a two-way street between student belief and student participation.

Caruso (2019) held the study on the use of online tool for CF in second language learning. The study indicates that the online tools helped students have a better understanding of the importance of the feedback process and increased literacy in language learning strategies, which possibly enables them to make informed judgements about their learning [30]. In particular, the dialogic feedback process facilitated by the interactive coversheet made students more engaged and active participants, which can help them to reflect on their learning, and which can have an impact on the development of student understanding of their subject and their learning.

Recent studies indicate a little research on learners' engagement, WCF and the use of online tools. Based on the relevant theories and current empirical research, this study aims at finding correlation between learners' engagement and perception the use of online tools on students' academic writing performance in increasing learners' engagement in providing WCF.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses correlational research design i.e. multiple correlation, involving multiple variables; learners' engagement, WCF, and online tools as independent variables and Students' writing performance as the dependent variables. It is used to determine the degree of relations of the variables. The population are all students of English Department, FKIP University of Nahdlatul Wathan Mataram. 150 students are selected as the samples this study representing the population.

The data are collected through questionnaires and test. The instrument consists of test and a number of questions in close-ended questionnaires. Questionnaires are used to get information on correlation of learners' engagement and Perception on the use of online tools toward corrective feedback. Meanwhile, test of academic writing provides information on students' writing performance. The data collected will be analyzed using SPSS. Multiple correlation analyses are used for analyzing the relationship of learners' engagement and students' perception on CF. Furthermore, it is used for figuring out the degree of relationship in the form of predicting variable affecting learners; engagement and perception on CF mediated by online tools.

In order to collect data for the study, students were asked to write essays and fill out questionnaires that covered their participation with and perceptions of the usage of online resources. For learners' engagement, It adopted (Caruso et al., 2019) and modified according to the purpose and the setting of the research. In order to address the students' perception, it adopted and adjusted measurement of perception (Al-Maroof et al., 2021), which includes perceived usefulness, perceives ease, perceived self-efficacy and behavioral intention on online corrective feedback. The Google form was utilized to disseminate the-

Table 1. Test validity and reliability

No item	r-count	r-Table (148)	sig.	Criteria	No item	r-count	r-Table (148)	sig.	Criteria
CE1	.597**	0.159	0.00	valid	PU01	.550**	0.159	0.00	valid
CE2	.569**	0.159	0.00	valid	PUO2	.514**	0.159	0.00	valid
CE3	.652**	0.159	0.00	valid	PUO3	.578**	0.159	0.00	valid
CE4	.678**	0.159	0.00	valid	PUO4	.586**	0.159	0.00	valid
CE5	.671**	0.159	0.00	valid	PUO5	.647**	0.159	0.00	valid
CE6	.594**	0.159	0.00	valid	PSE6	.545**	0.159	0.00	valid
EE7	.718**	0.159	0.00	valid	PSE7	.689**	0.159	0.00	valid
EE8	.680**	0.159	0.00	valid	PSE8	.675**	0.159	0.00	valid
EE9	.739**	0.159	0.00	valid	PEO9	.675**	0.159	0.00	valid
EE10	.598**	0.159	0.00	valid	PEO10	.624**	0.159	0.00	valid
BE11	.629**	0.159	0.00	valid	PEO11	.563**	0.159	0.00	valid
BE12	.631**	0.159	0.00	valid	BIO12	.618**	0.159	0.00	valid
BE13	.666**	0.159	0.00	valid	BIO13	.611**	0.159	0.00	valid
BE14	.600**	0.159	0.00	valid	BIO14	.595**	0.159	0.00	valid

Table 2. Reliability Statistic

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.949	28

-questionnaires, and a total of 150 students served as respondents. In addition, students' written work for the TOEFL was graded using a criterion specifically designed for evaluating essay writing. In order to ensure the instrument's validity and reliability, questionnaires were made available to participants in advance of the data collection phase.

As can be noticed in table 1 and table 2., all of the questions pertaining to engagement on a cognitive, emotional, and behavioral level reveal that the r-count of each question is greater than r-table.159. In addition, the significant value of.000 is lower than the value of.05. Accordingly, each and every one of them has merit. In terms of the validity of students' perceptions on the use of online resources, the data demonstrate that r-count is greater than r-table,.159, and sig. value is lower than.05. Thus, none of the questions may be considered invalid. In the meantime, the Cronbach Alpha for the reliability of the surveys, as indicated in the table, is.949. This value is greater than.05. In light of this, the answers to 28 questions about the engagement and perception may be reliable.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The study reveals the correlation between engagement and perception on Students' Essay writing of online corrective feedback. The findings are indicated in the following tables. Prior to multiple correlation as shown in table 3, 4 and 5, the normality test is analyzed represented in table 3. Furthermore,-

Table 3. normality test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		Student Engagement	Perception	Students' Essay Writing Performance
N		150	150	150
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	46.8807	47.3754	53.5133
	Std. Deviation	8.43739	8.76170	8.65036
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.066	.086	.071
	Positive	.066	.086	.071
	Negative	-.059	-.059	-.069
Test Statistic		.066	.086	.071
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200[c,d]	.009[c]	.063[c]
a. Test distribution is Normal. b. Calculated from data.				

-the distribution of engagement and perception are shown in table 6 and 7, showing value of cognitive, emotional and behavioral engagement, perceived usefulness, ease, self-efficacy and behavioral intention.

In the table 3 shows significant value of Students' engagement, perception and Students' essay writing are .200, .009 and .063 respectively. The values obtained are higher than p-value .05. It means the distribution of data do not violate the normal distribution.

Table 4. Partial correlation; perception as control variable

Correlations

Control Variables			Student Engagement	Students' Essay Writing Performance	Perception
-none-[a]	Student Engagement	Correlation	1.000	.996	.939
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		df	0	148	148
	Students' Essay Writing Performance	Correlation	.996	1.000	.934
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		df	148	0	148
	Perception	Correlation	.939	.934	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		df	148	148	0
Perception	Student Engagement	Correlation	1.000	.965	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	
		df	0	147	
	Students' Essay Writing Performance	Correlation	.965	1.000	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	
		df	147	0	

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

In the table 4 Indicate the coefficient correlation between Students' engagement and essay writing with students' perception on online tools as control variable is .996 and significant value 2-tailed is .000,

greater than p-value .05. It can be concluded that the correlation between engagement on the use of online tools and essay writing is positive and significant. In addition, the correlation .996 categorized as very strong degree of associations.

As can be observed in the table 5, the coefficient of correlation between students' perceptions and their performance in terms of essay writing while using online tools like Grammarly, Pro-writing Aids, and Quillbot is.934, and the sig value of.000 is lower than the p-value of.05. It is obvious that there is a high degree of relationship as well as a substantial and positive correlation, even without Learners' engagement serving as a control variable. Despite this, the results indicate that the correlation is -.032 and that the sig. value is.698. It suggests that there is a negative correlation as well as a drop in the significance of the link, going from a high correlation to a weak correlation.

Table 5. partial correlation; Students' Engagement as control variable

Correlations					
Control Variables			Students' Essay Writing Performance	Perception	Student Engagement
-none-[a]	Students' Essay Writing Performance	Correlation	1.000	.934	.996
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		df	0	148	148
	Perception	Correlation	.934	1.000	.939
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		df	148	0	148
	Student Engagement	Correlation	.996	.939	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		df	148	148	0
Student Engagement	Students' Essay Writing Performance	Correlation	1.000	-.032	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.698	
		df	0	147	
	Perception	Correlation	-.032	1.000	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.698	.	
		df	147	0	
a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.					

The finding proves null Hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. For this reason, it can be concluded that there is significant and strongly positive correlation between students' engagement and perception on the uses of online tools towards students' essay writing.

Table 6. Simultaneous Correlations

Model Summary									
					Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.996ᵃ	.991	.991	.81881	.991	8241.497	2	147	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Perception, Student Engagement

Referring to the information shown in table 6, the Sig value of F change is.000. It is lower than the 0.05 p-value threshold. This indicates that there is a considerable association between students' level of involvement and perceptions of students' essay writing abilities. In addition, the degree of correlation, which is reflected by the value R.996 in table 5. This indicates that there is an extremely high degree of relationship between those variables.

Perception of perceived usefulness on online CF showed 44 % allowing the pleasure; 40.0% facilitating to learn anywhere; 36.7% accessible for corrective feedback; 39.3 % understanding error and mistakes. Meanwhile, Perception of self-efficacy indicated 39.3 allowing confident and comfortable with online tools; 44.0 enjoying the ease of employing online tools; 34.0% encouraged while using online-learning material and comments. Perceived on the ease of use of online CF 38.7% easy to use; 42.0% easer feedback. Perception on Behavioral intention, 39.3% intend to use online CF, 34.0% intend to use online CF independently. This seems to be students' preference as to the use of online CF that support their writing process.

Table 7. Frequency Distribution for Perception on Online CF

Frequency in Percentage of Students' Perception on Online Corrective feedback						
Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
A. Perceived Usefulness of online tools						
1. Online writing tools allow students to learn at their pleasure.	24.0	44.0	24.7	5.3	2.0	3.42
2. Online tools facilitate the ability for anyone to learn regardless of their location.	0	23.3	40.0	32.0	4.7	3.09
3. There are online tools (*Quillbot, ProWritingaids, Grammarly*) accessible that facilitate electronic feedback writing.	36.7	28.0	30.7	2.7	2.0	3.42
4. Online tools help me to understand more about errors and mistakes in composing.	35.3	39.3	18.7	5.3	1.3	3.57
5. Online tools enable teacher-student interaction without face-to-face discussions	20.7	40.7	30.0	6.0	2.7	3.31
B. Perceived Self-Efficacy of Online Tools						
6. I am confident and comfortable with online tools.	20.0	39.3	34.0	4.0	2.7	3.31
7. I enjoy the ease of employing online tools.	22.0	44.0	28.7	4.0	1.3	3.57
8. I am encouraged while using online-learning material and comments.	23.3	34.0	30.7	10.7	1.3	3.57
C. Perceived Ease of Use of Online Tools						
9. I believe online tools for giving feedback are easy to use.	25.3	38.7	29.3	5.3	1.3	3.57
10. Online tools make it easier to obtain feedback.	23.3	42.0	27.3	6.7	0.7	3.80
11. I feel that utilizing an online tools service may make the learning process easier.	33.3	35.3	24.7	4.0	2.7	3.31
D. Behavioral Intention of Online tools						
12. I intend to utilize online tools to help my studying and writing.	0	34.7	42.0	20.0	3.3	3.23
13. I would really like to enhance my academic knowledge with the most recent changes using internet tools.	0	30.0	34.7	28.0	7.3	2.90
14. It is my intention to utilize tools found online as independent and cost-free learning tools.	31.3	34.0	27.3	4.7	2.7	3.31

Following the research findings, there is a considerable relationship between the level of involvement students have in their online corrective feedback and academic essays writing they do. Even when its association is interrupted by the perceptions, it only undergoes a little decrease, dropping from a coefficient correlation of.996 to.965; nonetheless, its sig value continues to be.000. For that reason, students' engagement significantly correlate with perception on the use of online corrective feedback for students' writing. This finding is in line with previous study on the importance of engagement and perception in CF (Caruso et al., 2019; Han, 2017; Han & Hyland, 2019b; Moser, 2020; Price et al., 2010; Yu et al., 2020; Zheng & Yu, 2018)

Online corrective feedback on students' academic writing is supported by a number of factors, one of the most important of which is the learners' engagement, which includes cognitive, emotional, and behavioral dimensions (Ellis, 2010; Han, 2019; Moser, 2020). Cognitive engagement encompasses activities such as analyzing the student's writing in comparison to online corrective feedback, practicing independent comprehension, reading carefully while receiving CF, attempting to improve the student's writing, and expanding both their vocabulary and their grammatical structure. Feeling calm, interested, glad, liked, and motivated while receiving online corrective feedback all fall under the category of behavioral engagement. Behavioral engagement includes activities such as taking notes, delivering assignments on time, questioning the lecturer to see whether or not they have the issue, and talking about any challenges encountered with other classmates.

Students' perceptions, meanwhile, address issues of perceived usefulness, self-efficacy, simplicity of use, and behavioral intention. Perceived usefulness of online tools encompasses allowing learner learn with pleasure, facilitating to learn anywhere, accessible online tools, understanding more error and mistake, and enabling Teacher-student interaction without face-to-face discussion. this corroborate with previos study support the importance use of online CF for students' writing (Bridge & Appleyard, 2008; Chen et al., 2016; Gong et al., 2019).

4. CONCLUSION

The multilayer construct, engagement is one of the most important parts of the teaching and learning process, especially for the development of language acquisition skills. In accordance with the results of this study, there is a substantial association between students' level of involvement and perception and composing academic essays. When offering corrective feedback available on the internet, it is important to take into account the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement of the student. The perception that

students have on the usefulness of online tools for providing corrective feedback is another individual factor that needs to be taken into consideration. It is also strongly related with the manner in which students engage with the corrective feedback provided by online tools in the process of enhancing students' academic essay writing. It is possible that more research on the analysis of multifactor utilizing regression will prove to be beneficial in providing significantly more in-depth information on the impacts of each factor.

REFERENCES

Al-Maroof, R. S., Alhumaid, K., & Salloum, S. (2021). The continuous intention to use e-learning, from two different perspectives. *Education Sciences*, *11*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11010006

Allwright, R. (1975). New Direction s in Second Language Learning, Teaching and Bilingual Education. In M. K. and D. Burt (Ed.), *Los Angeles*. H.C.TESOL.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*(2), 102–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004

Bitchener, J. (2009). Measuring the effectiveness of written corrective feedback: A response to "Overgeneralization from a narrow focus: A response to Bitchener (2008)." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *18*(4), 276–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.06.001

Bitchener, J. (2012). A reflection on "the language learning potential" of written CF. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(4), 348–363. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.006

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The value of a focused approach to written corrective feedback. *ELT Journal*, *63*(3), 204–211. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn043

Bridge, P., & Appleyard, R. (2008). A comparison of electronic and paper-based assignment submission and feedback. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *39*(4), 644–650. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00753.x

Caruso, M., Fraschini, N., & Kuuse, S. (2019). Online tools for feedback engagement in second language learning. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, *9*(1), 58–78. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.2019010104

Chaudron, C. (1977). a Descriptive Model of Discourse in the Corrective Treatment of Learners' Errors. *Language Learning*, *27*(1), 29–46. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1977.tb00290.x

Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: a case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *1*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y

Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 335–349. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990544

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, *36*(3), 353–371. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001

Ene, E., & Kosobucki, V. (2016). Rubrics and corrective feedback in ESL writing: A longitudinal case

study of an L2 writer. *Assessing Writing*, *30*, 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.06.003

Farrokhi, F., & Sattarpour, S. (2011). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy of Iranian EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *1*(12), 1797–1803. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.12.1797-1803

Fathman, A. K & Whalley, E. (1990). Second Language Writing: Research insight for the classroom. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second Language Writing: Research insight for the classroom* (pp. 178–190). Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2013). Teaching L2 Composition. In *Teaching L2 Composition*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203813003

Goldstein, L. (2006). Feedback in second language writing. In F. Hyland, K & Huland (Ed.), *CUP* (1st ed). Cambridge University Press.

Gong, Q., Kawasaki, K., Yeung, W. L., Zhang, G., & Dobinson, T. (2019). *Students' Perceptions of the Use of Video Recording in Additional Language Oral Assessments*. 133–152. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01255-7_8

Han, Y. (2017). Mediating and being mediated: Learner beliefs and learner engagement with written corrective feedback. *System*, *69*, 133–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.07.003

Han, Y. (2019). Written corrective feedback from an ecological perspective: The interaction between the context and individual learners. *System*, *80*, 288–303. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.12.009

Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring learner engagement with written corrective 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

Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2019a). Academic emotions in written corrective feedback situations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *38*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.12.003

Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2019b). Learner Engagement with Written Feedback. *Feedback in Second Language Writing*, 247–264. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547.015

Kormos, J. (2012). The role of individual differences in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(4), 390–403. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.003

Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*(2), 69–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.10.001

Moser, A. (2020). Written Corrective Feedback: The Role of Learner Engagement. In *Springer*.

Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., & O'Donovan, B. (2010). Feedback: All that effort, but what is the effect? *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *35*(3), 277–289. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541007

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00046-7

Roy Lyster. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26*(3), 339–432. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263104263021

Rummel, S., & Bitchener, J. (2015). The effectiveness of written corrective feedback and the impact LAO

learners' beliefs have on uptake. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *38*(1), 64–82. https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.38.1.04rum

Sheen, Y. (2007). *The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners ' Acquisition of Articles*. *41*(2), 255–283.

Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2015). Does language analytical ability mediate the effect of written feedback on grammatical accuracy in second language writing? *System*, *49*, 110–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.01.006

Simard, D., Guénette, D., & Bergeron, A. (2015). L2 learners' interpretation and understanding of written corrective feedback: insights from their metalinguistic reflections. *Language Awareness*, *24*(3), 233–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2015.1076432

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing: Case studies. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* (Vol. 32, Issue 2). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990532

Yu, S., Jiang, L., & Zhou, N. (2020). Investigating what feedback practices contribute to students' writing motivation and engagement in Chinese EFL context: A large scale study. *Assessing Writing*, *44*(February), 100451. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100451

Zhang, Z. (Victor), & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, *36*(February), 90–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004

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*(January), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.03.001