

## LEARNERS' ENGAGEMENT WITH TEACHER WCF OR LEARNERS' ENGAGEMENT WITH PEER WCF? LEARNERS' PERSPECTIVES.

**Nirwanto Maruf<sup>1</sup>**

*Universitas Muhammadiyah Gresik*  
[nirwanto.maruf@umg.ac.id](mailto:nirwanto.maruf@umg.ac.id)

**Indyra Mahdiana<sup>2</sup>**

*Universitas Muhammadiyah Gresik*  
[indynamahdii@gmail.com](mailto:indynamahdii@gmail.com)

**Bahar<sup>3</sup>**

*Universitas Fajar*  
[bahar.17070956004@mhs.ac.id](mailto:bahar.17070956004@mhs.ac.id)

### **Abstract**

*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. It is necessary 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. This study aims to reveal learners' perspectives on their engagement with written corrective feedback and learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback (WCF). This quantitative research obtained the data through questionnaires. These questionnaires aim to measure both learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback. The results of the study indicate that learners are more engage and agree with teacher WCF practice (mean 35.5), rather than engagement with peer WCF practice (mean 30.8) since teacher WCF had greater positive impact for learners' writing rather than peer WCF. This researches conclude that learners believe that teacher WCF more useful to locate their errors. Meanwhile, related to peer WCF, learners engage in affective by feeling happy, enthusiastic, and interested in receiving and reading peer WCF.*

**Keywords:** *Written corrective feedback, learners' perspectives, teacher WCF, peer WCF*

### **INTRODUCTION**

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). 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. Moreover, 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).

Studies related to WCF have showed positive effect of written corrective feedback in second language learning (Evans et al., 2011). It is necessary 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 (Ulyah, et al., 2021). 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.

Kang & Han (2015) mention 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 states 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 (WCF) (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.

Previous researchers 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). 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).

This study describes learners' perspectives regard to their engagement 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 (Asari, S., & Maruf, N., 2022).

## RESEARCH METHOD

The research design of this study is quantitative research design since this research focuses on learners' perspective on their engagement with written corrective feedback and learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback (WCF). The instrument used in collecting the data was questionnaires. There are two kinds of questionnaires administered in this research, a questionnaire for learners' engagement with teacher WCF and questionnaire for learners' engagement with peer WCF. The questionnaires were adapted from Tsao et al., (2021). These questionnaires aim to measure both learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback. Each of them consists of nine items. So, each learner filled eighteen items of questionnaire. The answer of each questionnaire item were given a 5-point Likert scale (i.e. strongly disagree=1, disagree=2, neutral=3, agree=4, strongly agree=5). So, the maximum score of each questionnaire was 45. Here, if learners' score of questionnaire below 22.5. It means they possess low engagement with written corrective feedback, meanwhile if learners' score of questionnaire above 22.5, they belong to high engagement with written corrective feedback.

The participants of this study were students of senior high school at 11<sup>th</sup> grade in MA. Masyhadiyah Giri. There were 88 learners which taken from class of XI IPA 1, class of XI IPA 2, and XI IPS. They have learned English as compulsory subject to pass their study at 11<sup>th</sup> grade. Moreover, based on information from their English teacher, these participants had an average ability level in English, especially for writing. It was seen from the English teaching and learning process, including writing on the previous semester.

The study conducted quantitative analysis of learners' questionnaire results by calculating descriptive statistics (i.e., mean, standard deviation, sum and range) of learners' engagement with teacher and peer written corrective feedback through SPSS software by using *Pearson Product Moment* formula. Before conducted the study, researchers needed to ensure the normal distribution of the data by

checking whether a data set was in normal distribution or not. To conduct normality test, the researcher used *Kolmogorov-Smirnov* by using SPSS software.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The result of descriptive statistic for 2 (two) kinds of questionnaires, which were learners' engagement with teacher WCF and learners' engagement with peer WCF, and to determine significance of the difference between the mean scores of learners' engagement with teacher WCF and learners' engagement with peer WCF, the researchers used *Paired Sample T-Tests* since the data was normally distributed. The result of the test was presented in table below:

*Table 1. The Result of Comparison Between Learners' Perspectives on Engagement With Teacher WCF and Engagement with Peer WCF.*

		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Engagement with Teacher WCF - Engagement with Peer WCF	4.68182	4.16760	.44427	3.79879	5.56485	10.538	.000	

The table above shows that the significance level of the difference between learners' engagement with teacher WCF and learners' engagement with peer WCF was 0.000. It was lower than 0.05 which means there is significant difference between learners' engagement with teacher WCF and learners' engagement with peer WCF. Then, in order to determine the direction of significance, the mean of each type of learners' engagement is calculated and presented in the table below:

*Table 2. The Mean of Learners' Perspectives on Engagement With Teacher WCF and Engagement with Peer WCF.*

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Engagement with Teacher WCF	35.5227	88	4.95028	.52770

Engagement with Peer WCF	30.8409	88	4.29083	.45740
--------------------------	---------	----	---------	--------

Table 2 above shows that the mean of learners' perspectives on engagement with teacher WCF is 35.5, while the mean of learners' perspectives on engagement with peer WCF was 30.8. shows  $35.5 > 30.8$ . It means that the *mean* of learners' perspectives on engagement with teacher WCF is greater than the mean of learners' perspectives on engagement with peer WCF. It indicates that learners are more engaged and agree with teacher WCF practice (mean 35.5), rather than engagement with peer WCF practice (mean 30.8) since teacher WCF had greater positive impact for learners' writing rather than peer WCF did.

The research results of the way learners engage with teacher and peer written corrective feedback are divided into 4(four) dimensions of engagement. First, related to behavior engagement with teacher written corrective feedback, most of learners engage in behavior by reading and revising their writing based on teacher written corrective feedback. Meanwhile, related to peer written corrective feedback, most of learners engage in behavior by using peer written corrective feedback as sole reference to revise their writing draft. As stated by (Fredricks et al., 2004) that behavior engagement including positive action, involvement and participation in academic task. In line with this, (Stipek, 2002) stated that behavioral engagement could be including positive behaviors, effort, attention and other participatory in task.

Another study about learners' engage with teacher written corrective feedback also conducted by (Zhang & Hyland, 2018). The results revealed that learners who engage behaviorally, they seem become as "self regulated" learner in which they were metacognitively, motivationally and behaviorally become active learners in learning process. It was similar with this study in which learners do revision by themselves and they also become active in participating written corrective feedback process.

Next, related to cognitive engagement with teacher written corrective feedback, most of learners engage in cognitive by reading, thinking and understanding well about their errors in writing. Not only that, they also think and

memorize their errors when they read teacher written corrective feedback and during the process of revision. It is because they want to revise their writing better and correctly. They know well about their errors and keep it on their minds, so that it did not happen again. Meanwhile, related to peer written corrective feedback, most of learners engage in cognitive by understanding their errors and thinking of revision based on peer written corrective feedback.

Moreover, as stated by (Han & Hyland, 2015) that cognitive engagement concerned on the depth processing of written corrective feedback during revision process. It could be in the form of noticing and understanding the written corrective feedback (Qi & Lapkin, 2001; Sachs & Polio, 2007). Another study about how learners engage with teacher written corrective feedback cognitively also conducted by (Zheng & Yu, 2018). Their study revealed that in processing the written corrective feedback, cognitive engagement with written corrective feedback could be showed in some ways, for examples: learners simply read through the text in conjunction with the teacher's feedback and made modifications in revision, they read the words and phrases which received in WCF and some of them focus in editing the correct answer. This results similar with this study in which learners engage cognitively by reading, thinking and understanding their errors in writing.

Next, related to social engagement with teacher written corrective feedback, most of learners engage in social by interacting with their teacher and classmates in the form of asking and discussing about the content of teacher written corrective feedback. Some of them asked to teacher when they did not understand with the teacher written corrective feedback. Meanwhile, related to peer written corrective feedback, most of learners engage in social by interacting with their teacher and classmates in the form of asking and discussing about the content of peer written corrective feedback.

In line with this, (Svalberg, 2009) stated that social engagement concerned on how to be interactive and initiating. Moreover, research of (Baralt et al., 2016) showed that learners who initiated a social relationship with peers were tend to engage to language task rather than learners who did not have. Then, when it was

connected to engagement on both teacher and peer written corrective feedback, learners would get more insights related teacher and peer written corrective feedback when they share and interact each other. Thus, learners become engage in their social.

Next, related to affective engagement with teacher written corrective feedback, most of learners engage in affective by feeling happy toward teacher written corrective feedback, because they believed that teacher written corrective feedback help them to know about their errors. Thus, it made them ease to revise their writing. Meanwhile, related to peer written corrective feedback, most of learners engage in affective by feeling happy, enthusiastic, and interested in receiving and reading peer WCF. They also felt satisfied with peer written corrective feedback.

It was consistent with statement of (Fredricks et al., 2004) that affective engagement concerned on learners' affective responses, such as sadness, happiness, interest, anxiety, boredom, other emotional aspects. Moreover, (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010) state that affective engagement could influenced by learners' attitudes, beliefs and goals. It was not only influenced on learners' action in responding written corrective feedback, but also could affect to learners' willingness in accepting or retaining the feedback. Another study conducted by (Benson & DeKeyser, 2018) revealed that written corrective feedback is useful for helping to fix grammatical linguistic error It was related with the results of this study in which learners feel happy on receiving written corrective feedback since it helped them to ease revise their writing.

## **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

From the research finding and the discussion above, there are some conclusions which can be concluded such as the way learners engage with teacher WCF in social was by interacting with their teacher and classmates in the form of asking and discussing about the content of teacher WCF. Meanwhile, related to peer WCF, learners engage in social by interacting with their teacher and classmates in the form of asking and discussing about the content of peer written corrective feedback. Meanwhile, learners engage with teacher WCF in affective

was by feeling happy toward teacher WCF, because they believed that teacher WCF helped them to know about their errors. Meanwhile, related to peer WCF, learners engage in affective by feeling happy, enthusiastic, and interested in receiving and reading peer WCF.

## REFERENCES

- Asari, S., & Maruf, N. (2022). Organizational Method of EFL Undergraduate Students' Academic Essay Writing with and Without Pre-Determined Topic. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(3).
- Benson, S., & DeKeyser, R. (2018). Effects of written corrective feedback and language aptitude on verb tense accuracy. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(6), 702–726. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818770921>
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 409–431. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089924>
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.10.002>
- Eslami, Z. R., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Promoting Advantageous Ways for Teachers and Learners to Deal with Corrective Feedback. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 19, 48–65. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2020.19.04>
- Evans, N. W., James Hartshorn, K., & Strong-Krause, D. (2011). The efficacy of dynamic written corrective feedback for university-matriculated ESL learners. *System*, 39(2), 229–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.012>
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School Engagement Potential of The Concept. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109.
- Ha, X. Van, & Murray, J. C. (2020). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820931897>
- 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>
- Iriarte, M. G., & Alastuey, C. B. (2017). *Peer vs. Teacher corrective feedback and its effect on grammar MÁSTER EN FORMACIÓN DEL PROFESORADO DE EDUCACIÓN SECUNDARIA*. Universidad Publica de Navarra.
- Kang, E., & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta-analysis. *Modern Language Journal*, 99(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12189>
- Li, S., & Roshan, S. (2019). The associations between working memory and the effects of four different types of written corrective feedback. *Journal of*

- Second Language Writing*, 45(September 2018), 1–15.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.03.003>
- Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System*, 84, 93–109.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006>
- Mao, S. S., & Crosthwaite, P. (2019). Investigating written corrective feedback: (Mis)alignment of teachers' beliefs and practice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 45(May), 46–60.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.05.004>
- Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2017). Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning. In *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 23, Issue 4). Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315621432>
- 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](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00046-7)
- Sachs, R., & Polio, C. (2007). Learners' Uses Of Two Types Of Written Feedback On A L2 Writing Revision. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 29(1), 67–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2012.10.064>
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective Feedback in Language Teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 1–1144). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410612700>
- Stipek, D. (2002). Good Instruction Is Motivating. *Development of Achievement Motivation*, 309–332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-012750053-9/50014-0>
- 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>
- Svalberg, A. M. L. (2009). Engagement with language: Interrogating a construct. *Language Awareness*, 18(3–4), 242–258.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410903197264>
- Tsao, J. J. (2021). Effects of EFL Learners' L2 Writing Self-efficacy on Engagement with Written Corrective Feedback. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 30(6), 575–584. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00591-9>
- Tsao, J. J., Tseng, W. T., Hsiao, T. Y., Wang, C., & Gao, A. X. (2021). Toward a Motivation-Regulated Learner Engagement WCF Model of L2 Writing Performance. *SAGE Open*, 11(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211023172>
- Ulyah, F., Anwar, K., & Maruf, N. (2021). The Application of English Songs in Teaching Conditional Sentences through Google Classroom. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 4(3).
- Vyatkina, N. (2010). The Effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback in Teaching Beginning German. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(4), 671–689.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2010.01108.x>
- 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>.
- Zheng, Y., Yu, S., Wang, B., & Zhang, Y. (2019). Exploring student engagement with supervisor feedback on master's thesis: Insights from a case study. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 57(2), 186–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2019.1617181>