International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science

ISSN: 2582-0745
Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

“I INTENTIONALLY KEEP MY ORIGINAL TEXTS": HIGH-PROFICIENCY STUDENTS’ ENGAGEMENT WITH TEACHER WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

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

https://doi.org/10.54922/IJEHSS.2024.0853

ABSTRACT
Since Truscott (1996) questioned the efficacy of written corrective feedback (WCF) on English learners’ writing improvement, a significant body of research has explored its impact. However, studies predominantly treat learners as passive recipients of WCF, neglecting their cognitive, behavioral, and affective engagement with feedback. This study investigates how high-proficiency EFL students engage with teacher-provided WCF in an authentic classroom setting. By employing qualitative methods, including analysis of drafts, verbal reports, and interviews, findings reveal that learner engagement is multi-dimensional, dynamic, and influenced by individual beliefs and contextual factors. Implications for teaching strategies and learner-centered feedback approaches are discussed.

Keywords: Written Corrective Feedback, Learner Engagement, Efl Writing, Cognitive Strategies, Behavioral Strategies, Affective Engagement.

1. INTRODUCTION
Since Truscott (1996) questioned the efficacy of written corrective feedback (WCF) on English learners’ writing improvement, there have been a growing number of articles exploring whether correcting language learners’ grammatical errors on their written compositions can have an effect on the students’ writing performance (e.g. Bitchener & Knoch, 2009; Sheen, 2010; Yoo, 2009). WCF-related articles are numbered among the most frequently cited and downloaded ones in *the journal of second language writing* database (Ferris, Liu, Sinha & Senna, 2013). This indicated that WCF has been a highly concerned topic in the field of second language writing.
Written corrective feedback (WCF), also known as grammar correction, linguistic correction, or written error correction, refers to the grammatical written feedback language teachers provide on the students’ written drafts (Ellis, 2005; Lee, 2013). This approach has been popular among L2 teachers, regardless of different learning contexts such as ESL or EFL context. Despite its popularity, the teachers adopting this approach always report a lot of suffering, confusion and concerns about the provision of WCF (Doughty, 2003). Most teachers have reported spending a lot of time and energy on delivering WCF to each individual student’ draft. Yet, they have also found some of their students make the same or similar linguistic errors again and again on their drafts (Yu & Lee, 2014).
Prior studies have focused on identifying what WCF can have a better influence on student’s writing abilities (Bitchener, 2008; Mackey & Oliver, 2002). For example, Bitchener et al. (2005) found that WCF can aid students’ acquisition of simple English forms such as the English articles and the simple past tense. Ferris and Roberts (2001) also suggested improved accuracy in their students’ revised texts after they received and reacted to teachers’ WCF. While these studies

ISSN: 2582-0745
Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

provided insights in understanding the importance of WCF (Gao & Wang, 2022), it regarded the recipients of WCF as passive learners. However, in the learning process, students are one of the most critical ingredients of effective learning. Thus, there should be more studies exploring WCF from the students' perspectives, to see how the students react to, feel about and engage with WCF (Christenson, Reschly & Wylie, 2012; Kahu, 2013).

Recognizing this importance, fewer researchers have started to explore WCF from the students' perspective (Derakhshan, 2022). For example, how students perceive WCF and how their perceptions influence their usage of WCF (e.g. Weaver, 2006). There are also several studies exploring EFL students' cognitive processing of WCF (e.g. Moser, 2020; Park & Ahn. 2022). However, there is still limited attention given to student engagement with WCF. Fewer evidence has been collected to explore students' cognitive, behavioural and affective engagement with WCF. With the aim of facilitating English teachers in providing more efficient WCF feedback, it is necessary and vital to understand how the students engage with teacher feedback that focuses on grammatical issues (Pearson, 2024).

Thus, this article aims to explore how high proficiency students engage with teacher WCF from cognitive, behavioural and affective perspectives in an authentic classroom context. One teacher adopting process-writing approach and six students of hers at a Chinese university were purposively selected as research participants. The study contributes to the field of WCF by providing evidence from the students' perspectives, to better understand how students take advantage of WCF to help their revisions and writings.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Previous Studies on the Effectiveness of WCF

Among the existing relevant articles, most research adopted a quantitative method to examine the types of WCF which could be more effective on improving the students' writing accuracy and performance (e.g. Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Ferris, 2006). For example, Sachs and Polio (2007) included reformulation and direct WCF as two feedback forms and compared the effects of the two types on student's writing texts. They found that students performed better under the direct feedback condition than the reformulation treatment. Bitchener et al. (2005) specifically explored the effects of direct WCF accompanied with a five-minute oral student-teacher conference on three error types including prepositions, the past simple tense and the articles. The result showed that the accuracy on the usages of the simple past tense and the definite article has improved. In addition, Sheen (2007) explored whether WCF could influence ESL learners' usages of English articles in narrative writing by collecting data from an error correction quiz, a dictation quiz and also a writing task. The study supported the argument that WCF can improve students' abilities to use English articles.

There has been a strand of studies comparing the effects of direct and indirect feedback (e.g. Karim, & Nassaj, 2020; Ng & Ishak, 2018). The former referred to the teacher written feedback that has already provided the students with the correct target language forms. The latter referred the form of feedback that indicated there were grammatical errors on the students' drafts, yet no correct forms were provided to the students (Ferris, 2006; Sheppard, 1992). In the review article from Bitchener and Knoch (2008), five studies were conducted to explore the usefulness of both direct and indirect WCF. Two studies reported that no difference was found regarding the two types of WCF. Two studies reported that the students' texts receiving indirect WCF became more

ISSN: 2582-0745
Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

accurately after students' revisions. However, one study showed contrast findings and argued that direct WCF benefits students more (Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2006; Lalande, 1982; Robb et al., 1986; Semke, 1984).

2.2 Student Engagement with WCF

Within the WCF mechanism, learner engagement plays a crucial role as it acts as a mediator between the teachers' provision of WCF and students' learning outcomes (Han & Hyland, 2015). While prior WCF-related studies focused more on the outcomes of student's writing, there has been a trend to explore the process through which the students react to, feel about and attend to WCF. However, prior understandings of learner engagement have been various and targeted different aspects of how students reacted to feedback. For example, Qu and Lapkin (2001) explored how deep the students cognitively processed WCF. Ferris et al., (2013) regarded the students' cognitive awareness of monitoring the revision process and editing as their engagement performances. The student writers' willingness and commitment to providing linguistic explanations on their grammatical errors was also used as the research focus in the study of Evans, Hartshorn, McCollum, & Wolfersberger (2010). Despite the fact that these studies have informed researchers and writing teachers about how students engage with WCF, there remains a certain level of confusion and uncertainty about what constitutes learner engagement, especially in the context of understanding WCF.

Ellis (2009) proposed a conceptual framework for student engagement with corrective feedback, and this framework has been regarded as one of the most clearly articulated definition of student engagement. Ellis perceived learner engagement as how language learners respond to the feedback they received from their teachers. In his framework, student engagement could be explored in three dimensions: the cognitive dimension, the behavioural dimension and the attitudinal dimension. For the cognitive dimension, it could be understood as how much students have invested cognitively in understanding WCF and making revisions. The behavioural engagement delved into the revision behaviours generated by WCF (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2015). For the last attitudinal dimension, it pertained to students' specific emotions generated upon receiving feedback and the processes where the students utilized WCF to revise their texts. In also included individual attitudes such as like and dislike the feedback provision approach (Ellis, 2009; Wood. 2017).

However, it should also be noted that Ellis's (2010) framework was originally designed to target correct feedback in general. Since this study focuses more on written corrective feedback, it is necessary to make adjustments to consider the complex and specific characteristics of learner engagement with written forms of corrective feedback (Han & Hyland, 2015). Firstly, compared to the oral form of corrective feedback, written feedback could provide more time for the students to process. Therefore, the depth of processing may be more extensive when exploring the written feedback. Therefore, the researcher needs to be more careful to detect any other levels of processing rather than just noticing and understanding. Additionally, after the provision of WCF, students are often given more time and agency to correct their drafts. This may enable them to adopt cognitive strategies such as reasoning and metacognitive strategies such as planning and monitoring (Zhang & Zhang, 2024). As for the behavioural engagement with WCF, in addition to the changes made from the students' first drafts to their second drafts, their observable actions in employing cognitive (e.g. checking the dictionaries and consulting their friends and the teachers) and metacognitive strategies (e.g. different way to maintain their focus) should also be taken into account. Lastly, according to Martain and Rose (2002), affective engagement involves three major

ISSN: 2582-0745
Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

categories: affect (i.e. expressing specific emotions), judgement (i.e. evaluating character) and appreciation (i.e. assessing the value of objects). Thus, in the context of WCF, the affective component of student engagement with WCF was defined as the emotions and feelings students expressed upon receiving feedback, along with those emotions displayed during revision process. Judgement referred to how students perceived the teacher who provided WCF. Lastly, appreciation was characterized by personal evaluations of admiration or disapproval of WCF. Moreover, since the engagement process with WCF is much longer than that with oral corrective feedback, any emotional and attitudinal changes should also be observed and included as a sub-dimension of affective engagement (Zhang & Hyland, 2022).
To conclude, student engagement firstly should be regarded as a multi-dimensional construct, which includes behavioural, affective and cognitive dimensions. Then in the context of WCF, the operational definitions should be more specific (as explained in Table 1).

Table 1: Operational definitions of student engagement with WCF

Dimensions	**Sub-dimensions**
Behavioural	1.Student's revision behaviours 2.Observable actions employing cognitive and metacognitive strategies
Affective	1.Affect and its changes 2.Judgement and its changes 3.Appreciation and its changes
Cognitive	1.Depth of processing 2.Students' cognitive and metacognitive strategies

3. METHODS

3.1 Context and Participants

The study was conducted at a mainland China university and involved six year-2 English-major students from the two classes (Class A and Class B) taught by the same teacher. In each class, there were approximately 44 students. In terms of the course, it was *Basic English Writing*. For each week, the students had one and a half hour seminars with a ten-minute break halfway through each class.
Purposive sampling was used to target both participant teacher and participant students. Since neither the University nor the English department set requirements for writing tasks, the teachers had the freedom to design their own writing tasks and stipulate the relevant requirements. Consequently, Alice (a pseudonym) was chosen as an ideal teacher participant since she adopted process writing approach.
In her *Basic English Writing 2* course, her year-2 students were required to engage in a feedback-revision cycle, which included handing-in a first draft, receiving teacher WCF and subsequently producing a second draft based on WCF. After explanation of the current study, Alice agreed to participate.
Alice obtained a Master degree in linguistics. Due to her own teaching and learning experience, she held the belief that process writing was an effective way to improve writing skills. During the

ISSN: 2582-0745
Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

16-week writing course, Alice assigned two writing tasks, with the requirement for the students to write both a 200-word original draft and a revised draft based on her written corrective feedback. Alice also believed that feedback was an integral part in English writing courses, and multiple drafts were more beneficial for the students. To conclude, during the research period, two writing tasks were assigned to the students. To complete each task, the students needed to compose a first draft (i.e. the original draft), receive teacher feedback on linguistic points, and subsequently submit a second draft (i.e. revised draft).

Participant students were chosen from Alice's two writing courses (i.e. Class A and Class B). Given the fact that the study focused on high-proficiency students, the following standards were employed to identify suitable candidates: 1) the students' academic performance rankings from their first year of college; 2) rankings obtained in the course of *Basic English Writing 1*; 3) Alice's recommendations and 4) students' willingness to join the study.

The study was originally designed to choose the top 1% from each of Alice's two classes (each class has 44 students). However, one student in Class A, although ranked top 2 among the whole class, her writing scores did not meet the standard. Thus, the study selected three students from each class as suitable participants. Table 2 presented all six students' basic information.

Table 2: the profile of student participants

Name	Class	Gender	Age	Ranking in year-1 academic performance	Ranking in *Basic English Writing 1*
Betty	A	Female	19	4	1
Cherry	A	Female	19	1	3
Doris	A	Female	20	3	2
Eddie	B	Male	19	3	2
Floria	B	Female	20	1	1
Grace	B	Female	19	2	3

3.2 Data Collection

The study followed a qualitative research approach and adopted data triangulation, utilizing multiple sources of data to reinforce data reliability and trustworthiness (Denzin, Lincoln, Giardina & Cannella, 2024). The study lasted for 16 weeks and the data collected included 1) students' writing drafts; 2) the teacher WCF provided on students' drafts; 3) students' immediate verbal reports and 4) students' interviews.

During the 16 weeks of research, the teacher assigned two writing tasks. For each writing task, a revision cycle was adopted. In other words, the students were required to submit an original draft, then they were provided WCF, and consequently, they needed to submit a revised draft based on WCF. Thus, each students submitted four drafts (2*2) during the research period. In total, 24 (2*2*6) writing drafts were collected.

Then, the students needed to decide the specific time for their revisions and met up with the researcher in a quiet meeting room to complete their revisions. This enabled the researcher to carry out the verbal report approach immediately after the students' revisions. In other words, the researcher observed the revision process of each student and after the observation, the student

verbally reported their thoughts and operations during their revisions. In total, data were collected regarding twelve verbal reports.

Lastly, two one-on-one semi-structured interviews were conducted with the students at week 2 and week 16. The first interview was more about the personal profile, prior feedback experience and beliefs in English writing and WCF approach. For the second interview, the questions were more about the students' feedback experience of the two writing tasks. Also, any changes in students' feedback engagement and beliefs were observed. On average, each interview lasted for about thirty minutes. For both interviews, the students were encouraged to bring their writing drafts with WCF as prompts to remind the students of their prior experience of WCF. With consents from the students, their revision processes were video-taped. Also, all of their verbal reports and interviews were audio-recorded.

3.3 Data Analysis

3.3.1 Analysis of the Students' Drafts and Teacher WCF

Since prior studies argued that different WCF types may affected students' revision (Hartshorn et al., 2010;), the WCF collected in the study was categorized based on Ellis's (2009) framework, which categorized WCF into direct and indirect feedback.

The analysis of students' drafts with WCF aimed mainly to explore students' behavioural engagement. Thus, it focused on the textual changes students made from their original drafts to their revised drafts. These changes were understood as the types of revision actions. Based on prior studies (Han & Hyland, 2015) and grounded in the current study, five types of revision actions were finally identified. They were: accurately follow (AF); initial impetus (II); inaccurate revision (IR); no revision (NR); deletion (Dl).

An additional coder, who was an English university teacher with a ten-year teaching experience, was invited to code 30% of the students' drafts, WCF, interviews and verbal reports independently. Subsequently, the coded documents were compared with those done by the researcher to derive an inter-coder agreement, which was about 81.4%. Afterwards, the differences were discussed until an agreement was reached.

3.3.2 Analysis of Verbal Reports and Interviews

Content analysis was applied to the data generated from verbal reports and interviews, which were firstly transcribed by the researcher and then checked by the extra coder. Also, the transcripts were member-checked to ensure it was transcribed objectively and correctly.

Firstly, previous studies indicated that students may check dictionaries and/or asked friends to help their revisions (Fan & Xu, 2020), which could be understood as the observable cognitive or metacognitive strategies. Thus, drawing on the data form the students' revisions, along with their verbal reports and interviews, the study focused on probing into what strategies that can be observed in facilitating students' revisions.

Student's cognitive and affective engagement also depended on the data from the students' interviews and verbal reports. Following the conceptual framework of student engagement with WCF displayed in Section 2.2, any relevant data that was deemed relevant to student engagement was carefully examined. According to Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2013), initial coding, focused and theoretical coding were adopted as the coding process. Firstly, the data was carefully selected so that only those revealing engagement-level information was remained. Then, the data was further divided based on cognitive, affective and behavioural dimensions and their sub-

dimensions. Finally, cross-case comparisons were adopted to see whether there were repeated or similar themes (Saldaña, 2013).

4. FINDINGS

4.1 General Teacher Feedback Patterns

In total, Alice delivered 106 written correct feedback (WCF) points to her students. Specifically, each student received more than 13 feedback points in two of their writing tasks (shown in Table 3).

Table 3: WCF point in the six students' first drafts regarding their two writing tasks

Student	Toal WCF
Betty	14
Cherry	24
Doris	17
Eddie	20
Floria	13
Grace	18
Total	106

In terms of the feedback form (shown in Table 4), both direct and indirect feedback were provided by the teacher. Specifically, direct WCF points accounted for a higher percentage (55.7) than the indirect feedback (44.3%).

Table 4: Directness of WCF

WCF types	No.
Direct	59 (55.7%)
Indirect	47 (44.3%)
Total	106

Additionally, there were various types of indirect feedback delivered by Alice. Sometimes, she underlined the grammatical problems; At times, she underlined some sentences accompanied by a question mark. Also, from time to time, she underlined and provided comments on the errors. Table 5 provided elaborations on these categories:

Table 5: Categories of indirect WCF

Indirect WCF categories	**Example**
Underlining	…, machines are taking over many human jobs and make our life easier (WCF: underlining)
Underlining with a question mark	Humans do more thinking problems : ? (WCF: underlining and a question mark)
Underlining with comments	I am inclined to be cohesive with the world… Word choice problem (WCF: underlining with the comment "word choice problem")

4.2 Student Engagement with WCF

4.2.1 Affective Engagement

According to Martain and Rose (2002), affective engagement with WCF could be understood as 1) students' specific emotions upon receiving feedback and concrete emotions generated during revision process; 2) students' opinions towards the teacher who delivered WCF; and 3) students' evaluations of WCF.

The data suggested that for the last two sub-construct of affective engagement, the majority of students shared similar ideas. In terms of judgement, all students expressed gratitude towards the teacher who provided WCF, acknowledging the effort and time their teachers devoted to deliver feedback to the whole class. Floria's comment could be a representative example of collective views of all student participants:

> I really like the fact that the Alice provided feedback on my draft…I think the teacher must have put a lot of time and effort into this, since there are 44 students in our class. And I know she also teachers Class A. That's a lot (of work)! (2nd interview)

A subsequent question was asked by the researcher after Floria's comment to see whether this acknowledge affected her revision. Floria remarked:

> Yes! Definitely! Seeing that she cares so much about my writing, I just tell myself that I need to take my revision seriously. I don't want to let her or her hard work go to waste. (2nd interview)

As for appreciation, all students expressed expectation and admiration for WCF, with none considering it as operational. However, some students did indicate preferences regarding the types of WCF. However, their preference seemed to relate to error type. For example, Betty specifically stated that she preferred direct feedback, especially when the error was about word choice problems. For example, the teacher commented "inappropriate word choice" on her sentence "I am inclined to be cohesive with the word…". She replied that she did not know which word was inappropriate and thus she decided to keep her original version.

In terms of affect, six concrete emotions were identified, which were happy, excited, confused, stressed, disappointed and neutral. However, compared to judgment and appreciation, there were fewer similar emotion patterns among students. It seemed that students generated various emotions under different situations.

Four out of six students indicated being happy upon and/or during their revisions. Cherry stated being happy when she found that there were fewer "stupid mistakes like spelling and plural forms" in her second verbal report. Doris indicated happiness when she deliberately tried out the new phrase "public health emergency" in her writing and WCF suggested that it was used correctly. She explained her happiness in her second verbal report "when I drafted, I did not want to use 'coronavirus' throughout this passage, so I thought about other words as alternatives. Just to make my passage more diverse at the word level. So now I looked at the WCF, and it indicated it was correct. That's good!".

Surprisingly, five out of six students indicated being excited upon receiving feedback. When the researcher realised this, she asked those students the reasons for this emotion. All five students suggested that since they did not receive any teacher feedback in their first year, they were excited to receive feedback. Eddie's articulation in his second interviewed showed a shared opinion:

> Well, though some WCF suggest my mistakes, I am still glad that we have it. In our first year, we did not receive any feedback, so I did not know what my writing level was.

The feeling of confusion was majorly a result of not understanding the teacher WCF. Moreover, disappointed and neutral seemed to closely relate to the students' own evaluation of their overall

ISSN: 2582-0745
Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

writing performance. If WCF matched their own evaluations, they felt "ok" (Cherry's 1st and 2nd verbal report; Doris' 2nd verbal report; Grace 2nd verbal report) or "not much specific emotions" (Floria, 1st verbal report; Betty, 1st and 2nd verbal report). If there were more WCF points than some students expected, they felt disappointed. For example, Grace felt "ok" for her second writing homework, but expressed "disappointed" for her 1st homework. She stated:

> I felt disappointed when I found that there were more red lines than I expected. Also, even for some simple writing, I made mistakes. For example, spelling and lack of verbs etc.

Being stressed seemed to arise from two circumstances. Firstly, the students had doubts about their teacher's expectations of their revision, and thus did not know what was regarded as an ideal revision. Two students expressed in their second interviews that they sometimes felt stressed and pressured since the teacher did not explain what was her expectations. As Betty indicated:

> I have felt stressed sometimes during and after my revisions. The teacher simply asked us to write a second draft based on WCF…and I am not sure I should just follow her advice, or I need to think of my own revisions. Also, when she (the teacher) underlined some of my sentences, I do not she expects me to correct only grammatical mistakes, or there are other sentence- or even content-level problems.

Secondly, the participating students felt stressed when they made similar mistakes in both of their writing tasks. For example, Grace had subject-verb agreement errors on both her writing tasks. She expressed in her second interview:

> I made the similar mistakes again and again. I know this mistake, but I just did not know how to avoid them. Maybe because I am a careless person? (2nd interview).

However, when the researcher asked whether she had further solutions to her carelessness, she did not provide any specific plans.

The current study also found out that four out of the six students displayed emotional changes from the beginning to the end of their revision processes. It seemed that no matter what their emotions were expressed upon reading the teacher WCF, the majority of the students became more neutral and emotionally stable after revisions. For example, Doris expressed feeling disappointed when she found out some of her mistakes could be avoided with careful review before submission, she stated:

> Well, I am quite disappointed with myself when I see these mistakes…It could have been avoided if I was more careful...So I don't really want to draft a second draft…That's why I have delayed a few days to make appointment with you…But it is quite surprising to find that when I force myself to revise, and when I read my revised draft…it is better than before…my negative feelings just disappear… (1st verbal report)

This finding from Doris was significant since it provided two pieces of evidence. Firstly, the students' emotional experience during revision was dynamic and can change after the revision process. Also, it showed the student's agency in regulating her emotions by delaying the revision.

4.2.2 Behavioral Engagement

The ways in which students engage with WCF can be evidenced through the types of their revision actions and the observable cognitive and metacognitive strategies employed before, during and after revision (Ellis, 2009).

Drawing from the work of Zhang and K. Hyland (2018) and the data from the current study, a total of five types of revision action were identified: accurately follow (AF); initial impetus (II); inaccurate revision (IR); no revision (NR); deletion (Dl). The specific explanations on these

categories were offered in Table 6. Additionally, the revision behaviours among all six students were also given in Table 7.

Table 6: Elaborations on the six types of revision actions

Revision actions	Definition
Accurately follow (AF)	Students' revisions were the same as the direct WCF
Initial impetus (II)	Students made revisions based on the indirect WCF
Inaccurate revision (IR)	Students made inaccurate revisions as responses to the WCF
No revision (NR)	Students made no revisions as responses to the WCF
Deletion (Dl)	Students deleted the words/phrases/sentences that was indicated problematic by the WCF

Table 7: Revision actions among six students

Revision actions	Betty	Cherry	Doris	Eddie	Floria	Grace	Total
AF	6	14	8	11	7	6	52
II	6	5	7	3	3	9	33
IR	0	2	1	3	2	1	9
NR	0	0	1	3	0	2	6
Dl	2	3	0	0	1	0	6
Total	14	24	17	20	13	18	106

Agreeing with precious findings (Zheng & Yu, 2018), for most students, they made accurate revisions based on their teachers' direct and indirect WCF.
The data also disclosed that even for high-proficiency students, they sometimes made inaccurate revisions. For example, 15.38% of Floria's revisions were inaccurate, followed by 15% in Eddie's revisions and 8.3% in Cheery's revisions. A further look at these inaccurate revisions revealed that they were all responses to indirect TWF, especially in the form of underlining. Below is an example from Cheery's first writing task:

Original: …, machines are taking over many human jobs and make our life easier
WCF: underlining
Revised: …, the machines are taking over many human jobs and make our life…

A possible reason would be the type of feedback. Many students explained in their verbal reports and interviews that when the teacher simply underlined some of the words and sentences on their drafts, they felt confused and lacked directions (e.g. Cherry, Doris and Eddie's 1st verbal report).
While previous observations concluded that written feedback was more salient than oral feedback (Li & Vuono, 2019), the data showed that this did not guarantee that all WCF would be corrected. In this study, only half of the students reacted to all their teacher's WCF and the data revealed three reasons. The first reason was related to the student's careless character, evident in students' responses as "I just forgot". The other more underlying reason was revealed by the following discussion with Eddie.
The teacher commented "indention for the first line of each paragraph" on Eddie's first draft of writing task 1, and this feedback received no revision. In his verbal report, he firstly explained that

he forgot this. When the researcher asked him "why he only forgot to correct this feedback", he paused for a few minutes and replied:

> I think maybe deep down in my mind, I just think it is not that big deal. Because when I use some platforms to write a task, it will give this suggestion automatically. So I don't think I need to memorize it. (1st verbal report)

The last reason was relevant to students' beliefs. When the students believed that their original draft was accurate or more appropriate, they decided to keep their original writing. Below is an example from Eddie:

> Original draft with WCF: In conclusion, intelligent machines can't take our places, so our brains will not get lazy in a world run by them.
> (WCF explanation: the teacher underlined "can't take our places" and deleted the word "so")
> Revised draft: In conclusion, intelligent machines can't take our places, so our brains will not get lazy in a world run by them.

Eddie explained his inaction:

> I have checked the dictionary for the word "take place", and it suggested "take the place of someone" can be a synonym of "replace". So, I think my usage of "take our places" is accurate. Maybe it is not that common, but I believe it is accurate.

The data also showed that students chose to delete some errors that received WCF. However, deletion did not always indicate that students tried to avoid that task. Sometimes, it was because they decided to change the content. Below is an example from Betty's writing task 1:

> Original: Once their awareness change, it is hard for them to think as past.
> (WCF: add "s" for the word "change")
> Revised: Once the brain is not used to memorize, people will get lazy easily.

In this example, Betty deleted the WCF "changes" and her revised draft was "is not used to memorize". When asked why she made this revision, she said:

> Well, after reading my (first) draft again, I felt my original content was too abstract. So I deleted the whole sentence, and replaced it with a more concrete example. (1st verbal report)

Then the researcher asked a future question about "why did not think of using a concrete example?", Betty replied that "because this was one of the technique Alice emphasized in her class. She taught us that we needed to include more concrete examples to make our writing more convincing.".

Regarding observable cognitive and metacognitive strategies, all six students mentioned utilizing online dictionaries to help understand teacher WCF. Four out of six students also consulted their friends to confirm whether their revisions were accurate or not. However, only two students mentioned asking their teacher for help. The reason was that they did not want to bother their teacher with such minor problems (Grace, 2nd interview).

In terms of metacognitive strategies, which was less frequently found in prior literature (e.g. Zheng & Yu, 2018), the current study revealed that all students examined their finished draft as the last step of their revisions. All students mentioned that their last step for revision was to read through their revised drafts to identify any other errors. Furthermore, this action was a result from the students' prior teacher instruction and feedback experience. When asked why they read through their revised drafts as a final step, all students responded that it was a requirement by their prior teachers. When they were in high school, their teachers emphasized that they should reread their drafts when they completed the task. Following their teachers' instructions, the students adopted this method and thus became a habit in drafting an English article.

4.2.3 Cognitive Engagement

According the conceptual framework of student engagement, cognitive engagement included the depth of processing (DoP) WCF, students' cognitive strategies and metacognitive strategies. While previous studies differentiated the depth of processing on at the level of noticing or understanding (Zheng & Yu, 2018), the current data suggested that students processed more diverse levels of processing. In sum, four types of DoP were found: failing to notice (FN); deliberately ignoring (DI), incorrect understanding (IU) and correct understanding (AU). Table 8 supplied in-depth elaborations on each category.

Table 8: Explanations on different types of DoP

Depth of Processing	Explanations
Failing to notice	Students failed to notice WCF
Deliberately ignoring	Students noticed the WCF, but decided not to respond to the specific WCF point
Incorrect understanding	Students provided incorrect explanations on the specific WCF points
Correct understanding	Students provided correct explanations on the specific WCF points

All of the six students provided correct explanations on several WCF points, yet not one student stated that they can understand all the feedback points. Students especially highlighted that indirect feedback targeting sentence-level problems was difficult to deal with. For example, the teacher underlined the second part of Grace's sentence "once their awareness changes, it is hard for them to think as past.". When Grace made revisions, she expressed:

> I do not know what she means here. Is it about grammar? Or my expression? Is it about the whole sentence? There's no clue. (1st verbal report)

Therefore, for Grace, even though she noticed the feedback, she failed to provide accurate explanations for this feedback point.

In terms of "failing to notice", the corresponding WCF was about punctuation and structure. For example, the teacher changed "period" to "comma" in Eddie's draft of the second writing task. Yet, Eddie failed to change this and he explained in his verbal report:

> Oh, this…I just forget. I guess I just think it is not a big deal. I think I would not make this mistake next time. So, I haven't paid much attention.

Eddie's comment indicated that when a feedback point was regarded as unimportant or trivial, it was more likely for students to forget. This finding also suggested that student belief could influence how they engaged with WCF. When a feedback point was not taken seriously, it would lead to lower cognitive engagement.

Surprisingly, half of the students chose to deliberately ignore some WCF points. The reason was that they believed the teacher misunderstood their drafts, so that the correct was not suitable for their drafts. Below is an example from Eddie's second writing task:

> Original draft with WCF: In conclusion, intelligent machines can't take our places, ~~so~~ our brains will not get lazy in a world run by them.
> (WCF explanation: the teacher underlined "can't take our places" and deleted the word "so")
> Revised draft: In conclusion, intelligent machines can't take our places, so our brains will not get lazy in a world run by them.

When asked why he did not make corrections, Eddie explained in his verbal report:

> Here, I want to emphasize the casual relationship between these two sentences, so I think the word "so" is necessary. I think the teacher did not get my idea that I want to emphasize (2nd verbal report). So, I keep my original words.

Eddie deliberately ignored the deletion of "so" and provided justified reason. Thus, his inaction in fact reflected a deeper level of cognitive processing since it indicated autonomy. Eddie did not blindly adhere to teacher feedback, but rather gauged its suitability for their drafts.

Cognitive engagement also included the adaptation of cognitive and metacognitive strategies (Oxford, 2011). According to the students' interviews and verbal reports, two types of cognitive strategies were observed, which were reasoning and memorising skills. All students could provide accurate and specific language rules on some of their problematic points. For example, the teacher substituted "were" with "are" in Betty's first draft of writing task one "doctors and nurses from other provinces are eager to be volunteers to help Hubei". Betty argued that:

> Because this action happed in the past, so simple past tense should be applied. This is very easy to understand, I think I am just too careless to notice this (2nd verbal report).

Thus, the participant students showed a higher level of cognitive engagement by providing accurate reasonings.

5. DISCUSSION

The study has disclosed the engagement mechanism among high-proficiency students as they reacted to teacher WCF from the affective, behavioural and affective dimensions.

In terms of the affective dimensions, while all students expressed gratitude towards their teacher for providing WCF, the data also demonstrated that this acknowledgement acted as a factor influencing the extent of student engagement. For instance, upon recognizing the significant time and effort her teacher devoted into delivering WCF, Floria took her revisions more seriously and strived to write a better version of her draft. This finding indicated that WCF has an interpersonal nature. When the students recognized their teachers' workload behind delivering WCF, they felt a sense of obligation to react more seriously and actively to teacher WCF, so that their teacher would not feel her feedback approach as a waste of time and energy. This underscored that student beliefs in their teachers' commitment could foster a more engaged revision process.

The data also suggested that all participant students expected WCF, yet some of them had different opinions regarding the types of WCF they preferred. Also, this preference seemed to relate to what kind of errors students had made. For example, some students expected more direct WCF when they had word choice problems. This disclosed that error type could influence students' affective engagement. This was also evident in Cherry's case that her happiness was a result from her finding that there were fewer mistakes on spelling and plural forms on her drafts.

In terms of affect, which was understood as concrete emotions, the data revealed six emotions, which were happy, excited, confused, stressed, disappointed and neutral. Building on previous studies (Han & Xu, 2021), a newly discovered reason was uncovered for students' happiness. When Doris deliberately tried out new and unfamiliar words on her drafts, she regarded WCF as validation of whether her usage was accurate or not. When WCF confirmed her usage, her emotion became happy. Moreover, what was highlighted from the study was that the students' emotional experience during their responses to WCF was dynamic rather than static. Engaging students with the revision process by multiple drafting can alleviate the negative emotions generated upon receiving feedback. According to Ilgen and Davis (2000, p. 550), corrective feedback "is the

ISSN: 2582-0745
Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

conundrum of feedback". While some studies argued that the corrective feedback generated negative emotions which can in turn motivated actions (Mao & Lee, 2022), the current study proposed that some negative emotions such as disappointment may contribute to a limited level of engagement. Doris' case showed that when she experienced disappointment, she was less willing to start her revision.

However, the study also revealed evidence of emotion regulation actions, which refers to individuals' intentional or unintentional attempts in changing the extent or nature of their emotions (Harley, Pekrun, Taxer, & Gross, 2019). This indicated the while WCF may cause students' negative emotions, the awareness to take actions in regulating emotions could be beneficial. It was impossible to avoid negative emotions, and to deal with this, feedback receivers should be encouraged to use emotional regulation strategies so that their usages of WCF could be more efficient (Sheppes, 2020).

Moreover, the study also concluded influencing factors of student affective engagement, which were prior feedback experience and students' beliefs towards their writing performance (Hill & West, 2020). Excitement expressed by the student participants mainly resulted from their lack of feedback experience. Five students explained that since they received no feedback on their writing drafts during their first year of study, they looked forward to receiving teacher feedback so that they can know their writing levels. According to Han's (2017) study, essay genre or AWE program scores were contextual factors that influenced how students reacted to WCF. This study built on this finding to suggest that the students' prior learning and feedback experience also influenced students' affective engagement. A lack of feedback provision by their prior writing teachers could result in a more intensive and positive emotional responses to WCF.

Regarding behavioural engagement, the current study found that not all WCF received students' attentions and actions, which agreed with previous research (Han, 2019; Li & Vuono, 2019). Nevertheless, the data contributed to the earlier findings that students' beliefs towards the importance of feedback type played a mediating role in student engagement. When a piece of feedback was considered not important, it would probably receive on revision. This agreed with the findings from Saragih, Madya, Siregar & Saragih (2021) that learner engagement was subject to individual factors such as the students' perceptions towards the type of WCF.

Also, the data argued that deletion as a type of revision action did not necessarily indicate lower engagement level. In Betty's example, while she decided to delete one sentence that was corrected by feedback, her intention was to write a more content-appropriate paragraph. Also, her revision action showed that teachers' instructions also acted as an mediating factor of student engagement. What emphasized by the teacher in the class would affect how students planned to revise their writing. This was in contradiction with the findings from Zheng and Yu (2018), who stated that their participating students deleted their original texts because of a lack of understanding. Thus, for their students, deletion was used as an avoidance strategy. This different conclusion was probably because of the students' English proficiency levels. In the current study, the students were highly proficient in both overall English abilities and English writing abilities. Yet, in Zhang and Yu's (2018) study, the students were low-proficiency students. As proved by prior studies, language proficiency levels were found to mediate the students' revision process and also the products of the students' writing (Cheng & Liu, 2022; Wu, 2019). Therefore, it was reasonable to see the same revision operation reflected different levels of student engagement.

Consulting teachers was a less frequently used method could be explained by the Confucius culture in Chinese education (Fwu, Yang, Chen & Chen, 2022); Liu, 2024). From the students'

ISSN: 2582-0745
Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

perspective, the teacher was regarded as authoritative, so they believed that only more serious problems deserved their teachers' attention. For less serious problems, students should solve them by themselves. Adding to previous findings, reviewing the revised draft was found to be a metacognitive strategy employed regularly by all high proficiency students. Additionally, it revealed that contextual factors such as the teachers' instruction could have a long-lasting effect on students' engagement (Yang & Xiaochen, 2022).

The last dimension of student engagement is the cognitive dimension. Compared to prior literature (Fujisawa, Doi & Shintani, 2024), the data indicated the presence of a greater variety of processing levels of WCF than the previous findings, which had only identified the level of noticing and understanding. In sum, four types of DoP were found: failing to notice (FN); deliberately ignoring (DI), incorrect understanding (IU) and correct understanding (AU). In addition, the data revealed reasoning and memorizing skills as two cognitive strategies students employed during revision. This conflicted with the findings from Zheng and Yu (2018), who suggested that students exhibited limited cognitive operations. In their study, their students had the simple target of following the teachers' feedback so that they can make accurate editing.

The major reason for this difference could also be the students' English proficiency levels. The students in Zheng and Yu's study (2018) were low-proficiency students, compared to the current study where all students processed a high level of English proficiency. AS Chandler (2003) has pointed out, for WCF to make sense for the students, they needed to acquire a certain level of linguistic competence. Thus, the discrepancy in the frequency of using reasoning as revision strategies might result from the varying English levels. When students were more proficient in English, they were more accurate in elaborating on why the marked grammatical points or structures were inaccurate (Yang, Zhang & Dixon. 2023).

Students' beliefs also influenced students' cognitive engagement, which reinforced the findings from previous studies (Selwyn, 2016). According to Selwyn (2016), the average undergraduate students' engagement levels were greatly influenced by their beliefs. For the students who believed that the technology-assisted feedback was not useful for their writing, they demonstrated limited levels of engagement. The current study extended the findings to suggest that the various beliefs in the significance of WCF resulted in different engagement actions. If a specific feedback point was considered trivial, the student was less likely to devote his/her cognition into comprehending the feedback and consequently into correcting the errors (Han, 2019). For example, feedback targeting structure and punctuation was more likely to be ignored, especially when the students believed that this kind of feedback was less helpful (see example of Eddie). Furthermore, when the student believed their original drafts were accurate, they engaged in a deeper level of processing of judging the appropriateness of WCF and consequently decided whether to adopt the feedback or not. Eddie's cases of keeping his original usages of "so" indicated this example.

The data indicated that there were both individual and contextual factors that may influence student engagement with feedback. This agreed with Ellis's (2010) argument that learner engagement did not just happen in a vacuum, but was subject to different layers of factors. This also supported some researchers' belief that learner engagement should be understood from a sociocultural perspective, which argues that students are actively involved in their learning and can be influenced by their individual factors as well as different contexts (Goldstein, 2006).

6. CONCLUSION

ISSN: 2582-0745
Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

This study has investigated how high-proficiency students have engaged with teacher WCF in the authentic classroom context at a Chinese university. The study adopted a qualitative approach and collected various sources of data from one English writing teacher and six English-major university year-2 students, aiming to have a deeper understanding of how students reacted to teacher feedback in the cognitive, behavioural and affective dimensions. Data was collected from the students' writing drafts, the corresponding teacher WCF, the students' immediate verbal reports done after the completion of their revised drafts and finally, the student interviews at the beginning and the end of the research period.

The findings demonstrated that it was necessary and significant to explore the revision process of EFL writers, since all six students displayed diverse and meaningful degrees of engagement in all the three dimensions (i.e. cognition, behaviours and affect). The data revealed the complexity of high proficiency students' engagement with WCF. Even being taught by the same teacher, the same teaching syllable and the same teaching procedure, each student had their own preferences and priorities when engaging with WCF. Moreover, the study disclosed that learner engagement should be understood from the sociocultural perspective, which viewed learner engagement as a learning construct that will be influenced by both individual (e.g. personal writing experience and feedback experience and learning beliefs towards the importance of WCF, the teachers and their own writing performances) and contextual factors (e.g. teacher instructions, error types and the explicitness of WCF).

Even though the researcher tried her best to eliminate design and analysis flaws, the study inevitably had some limitations, which could be considered as future inquiries into the relevant topic. Firstly, despite the shorter length of the study, it already discovered that learner engagement was dynamic and changeable. Thus, more studies involving a longer research period could be done to detect any changes or even change patterns regarding learner engagement with WCF. Secondly, this study only focused on high proficiency students. There is possible that the difference English proficiency levels could result in different student engagement actions. Thus, future enquiry could also investigate how students with different proficiency levels engage with WCF.

Lastly, given the small sample size, future research could include a quantitative approach to explore the relationship between several factors. For example, future research could explore the correlation between students' beliefs (e.g. in the teachers' contributions on providing feedback) and students' willingness and engagement levels with teacher feedback.

REFERENCE

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research: LTR*, *12*(3), 409–431. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089924

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

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 191–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001

Cheng, X., & Liu, Y. (2022). Student engagement with teacher written feedback: Insights from low-proficiency and high-proficiency L2 learners. *System*, *109*, 102880.

Christenson, S., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (2012). *Handbook of research on student*

engagement. Springer.

Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., Giardina, M. D., & Cannella, G. S. (Eds.). (2024). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (Sixth edition.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Doughty, C. (2003). Instructed SLA: Constraints, compensation, and enhancement. In Doughty, C. & Long, M. (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 256–310). Oxford: Blackwell.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63*(2), 97–107. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analyzing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 50, 100775.

Ferris, D. R. (2010). SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING RESEARCH AND WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN SLA: Intersections and Practical Applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 181–201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490

Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedb ack for individual L2 writers. *Journal of second language writing*, *22*(3), 307-329.

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 161–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X

Fujisawa, Y., Doi, A., & Shintani, N. (2024). Methods of Research on Depth of Processing for Written Corrective Feedback: A Scoping Review. *Methodology Special Interest Group Report*, *16*, 51-68.

Fwu, B. J., Yang, T. R., Chen, Y. K., & Chen, R. (2022). The impact of teacher feedback on students' decisions to stay on or change course after math failure in a Confucian cultural context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 1046806.

Gao, Y., & Wang, X. (2022). Towards Understanding Teacher Mentoring, Learner WCF Beliefs, and Learner Revision Practices Through Peer Review Feedback: A Sociocultural Perspective. *Journal of Lanugage and Education, 8*(4), 58–72. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2022.15962

Han, Y. (2017). Mediating and being mediated: learner beliefs and learner engagement with written corrective feedback. *System*, *69*, 133-142.

Han, Y. (2019). Written corrective feedback from an ecological perspective: the interaction between the context and individual learners. *System*, *80*, 288-303.

Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2021). Student feedback literacy and engagement with feedback: A case study of Chinese undergraduate students. Teaching in Higher Education, 26(2), 181-196.

Harley J. M., Pekrun R., Taxer J. L., Gross J. J. (2019). Emotion regulation in achievement situations: An integrated model. *Educational Psychologist*, 54, 106–126.

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

Hill, J., & West, H. (2020). Improving the student learning experience through dialogic feed-forward assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 45*(1), 82–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1608908

Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. *Language Teaching Research : LTR*, 24(4), 519–539. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469

Lee, I. (2013). Research into practice: Written corrective feedback. *Language Teaching, 46*, 108–119.

Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and writte corrective feedback in System. *System, 84*, 93–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006

Liu, Q., & Brown, D. (2015). Methodological synthesis of research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 30*, 66–81.

Liu, Y. (2024). *Towards a Contextualised Interpretation of Chinese University Student Engagement with Teacher Written Feedback* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Hong Kong).

Mackey, A., & Oliver, R. (2002). Interactional feedback and children's L2 development. *System (Linköping), 30*(4), 459–477. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00049-0

Mao, Z., & Lee, I. (2022). Researching L2 student engagement with written feedback: Insights from sociocultural theory. *Tesol Quarterly, 56*(2), 788-798.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: a methods sourcebook* (Fourth edition.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Moser, A. (2020). *Written Corrective Feedback: The Role of Learner Engagement: A Practical Approach* (1st Edition). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63994-5

Ng, L. L., & Ishak, S. N. A. (2018). Instructor's Direct and Indirect Feedback: How do they Impact Learners' Written Performance? *Journal of Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature, 24*(3), 95–110. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2403-08

Park, J.-H., & Ahn, S. (2022). L2 Learners' Cognitive and Behavioral Engagement with Written Corrective Feedback. *English Teaching, 77*(3), 133–152. https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.77.3.202209.133

Pearson, W. S. (2024). Affective, behavioural, and cognitive engagement with written feedback on second language writing: a systematic methodological review. *Frontiers in Education (Lausanne), 9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1285954

Sachs, R., Polio, C., 2007. Learners' use of two types of written feedback on an L2 writing task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 29*, 67–100.

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). SAGE.

Saragih, N. A., Madya, S., Siregar, R. A., & Saragih, W. (2021). *Written Corrective Feedback: Students' Perception and Preferences*. International Online Journal of Education and Teaching, 8(2), 676-690.

Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*, 201–234

Sheppes G. (2020). Transcending the "good & bad" and "here & now" in emo tion regulation: Costs and benefits of strategies across regulatory stages. In Gawronski B. (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 61, pp. 185–236). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes, *Language Learning, 46*, 327–69.

Weaver, M. R. (2006). Do students value feedback? Student perceptions of tutors' written responses. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(3), 379–394. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500353061

Wood, R. (2017). *The influence of teacher-student relationships and feedback on students' engagement with learning* (1st ed.). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Wu, Z. (2019). Lower English proficiency means poorer feedback performance? A mixed-methods study. *Assessing Writing*, 41, 14-24.

Yang, L. F., Zhang, L. J., & Dixon, H. R. (2023). Understanding the impact of teacher feedback on EFL students' use of self-regulated writing strategies. Journal of Second Language Writing, 60, 101015.

Yoo, I. (2009) The English definite article: What ESL/EFL grammars say and what corpus findings show. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8*(4), 267–278.

Zhang, Z. V., & Hyland, K. (2022). Fostering student engagement with feedback: An integrated approach. Assessing Writing, 51, 100586.

Zhang, J., & Zhang, L. J. (2024). The effect of feedback on metacognitive strategy use in EFL writing. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 37(5-6), 1198-1223.

Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. *Assessing Writing*, *37*, 13-24.