

## **Chapter V**

### **Conclusion and Limitations and Future Research**

#### **5.1. Conclusion**

To find out if WCF could be applied effectively, the researcher conducted a study to investigate students' feedback uptake and engagement with teacher written corrective feedback. In addition, the researcher analyzed the relationship between the two variables. The researcher conducted the study at his home university, with second-semester students taking the course "Recount and Narrative Writing" being the subjects. The researcher collected the data by gathering the students' first drafts and second drafts of their written works. Later, he continued with administering a questionnaire measuring the students' engagement with the teacher feedback. Lastly, the researcher proceeded to carry out several interview sessions with three students, whose responses were noteworthy.

It was found that most of the students had high levels of uptake, ranging from 80% to 100%. Only four students had less than 80% uptake, with only one of whom had 50% uptake. Moreover, the students had average to high levels of engagement with the feedback. On top of that, the researcher found that learners' engagement had a relatively strong relationship with feedback uptake. In contrast, it was found that a minority of students had a mismatch between their engagement and uptake, suggesting that learners' engagement is not a sole factor that contributes to feedback uptake. Finally, the findings suggest that even though teacher WCF is largely effective, there may be a minority of students who requires additional support to affirm deeper engagement, which could subsequently promote improved feedback uptake.

## **5.2. Limitations and Future Research**

Due to the researcher's limited time and authority, the study was conducted at a private university in the researcher's hometown, with only 25 students as the participants. For further research, it may be advantageous to have more students as the participants to be able to generalize the result to a bigger population. Additionally, the study was also not a longitudinal analysis, which could hinder the exploration of potential changes in feedback uptake and learners' engagement over time. Hence, as a direction for future studies, it might yield more comprehensive data if the study was done over a period of extended time.

In like manner, this research did not deeply examine what type of feedback (e.g., direct and indirect) would be most effective among students. Furthermore, this study did not delve into the contextual factors that contribute to feedback uptake. In later studies, it would greatly enhance the results if the study included the investigation of the type of feedback and the contextual factors facilitating feedback uptake. By doing so, future research could present a more in-depth understanding of how written corrective feedback truly functions in varied learning environments, which as a result, may provide more pedagogical strategies to optimize its effectiveness.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, P. H. (2019). Major writing challenges experienced by EFL learners in Soran University. *Journal of University of Human Development*, 5(3), 120–126. <https://doi.org/10.21928/juhd.v5n3y2019.pp120-126>
- Alharbi, M. A., & Alqefari, A. N. (2022). Students' uptake and perspectives on teacher and peer feedback on written assignments. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives*, 18(2), 107-118.
- Al-Tamimi, N. O. M. (2018). An investigation of academic writing errors among tertiary level students at Hadhramout University: A perception study. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 5(2), 214– 227.
- Bargiela, M. M. (2003). Teacher feedback and learners' uptake. *Linguagem em (Dis)curso*, 4(1), 81 - 96.
- Birch, S., & Ladd, G. (1997). The teacher–child relationship and children's early school adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35, 61–79.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. (2012). Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing. *Routledge*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.04.010>
- Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development* (Vol. 96). Multilingual Matters. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1558/wap.32514>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Weate, P. (2016). Using thematic analysis in sport and exercise research. In *Routledge handbook of qualitative research in sport and exercise* (pp. 213-227). Routledge.

- Chandler J. (2003) The efficacy of various different kinds of feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3): 267–96.
- Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (1991). Competence, autonomy, and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-system processes. In M. Gunnar & L. A. Sroufe (Eds.), *Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology* (Vol. 23). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods approaches, vol. 1 (1).
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications.
- Di Loreto, S., & McDonough, K. (2013). The relationship between instructor feedback and ESL student anxiety. *TESL Canada Journal*, 20-20.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT journal*, 63(2), 97-107.
- Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 32(2), 335-349. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990544>
- Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., McCollum, R. M., & Wolfersberger, M. (2010). Contextualizing corrective feedback in second language writing pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 14, 445–463.
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81–104). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. (2013). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203813003>

- Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal of second language writing*, 22(3), 307-329. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.009>
- 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.
- Finn, J. D. (1993). *School engagement and students at risk*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Finn, J. D., Pannozzo, G. M., & Voelkl, K. E. (1995). Disruptive and inattentive withdrawn behavior and achievement among fourth graders. *Elementary School Journal*, 95, 421-454.
- Finn, J. D., & Rock, D. A. (1997). Academic success among students at risk for school failure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 221-234.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence. *Sage Journals*. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, (16), 40-53.
- Handley, K., Price, M., & Millar, J. (2011). Beyond 'doing time': Investigating the concept of student engagement with feedback. *Oxford Review of Education*, 37(4), 543-560.
- Han, Y. (2017). Mediating and being mediated: learner beliefs and learner engagement with written corrective feedback. *System*, 69, 133-142.
- 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.

- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Heift, T. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in CALL. *ReCALL*, 16(2), 416 - 431.
- Henderickson, J. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching. Recent theory, research and practice. *Modern Language Journal* 62, 387–398.
- Hirose, K., & Sasaki, M. (1994). Explanatory variables for Japanese students' expository writing in English: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(3), 203-229.
- Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, 31, 217–230.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language teaching*, 39(2), 83-101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Kasper, L. F. (1997). Assessing the metacognitive growth of ESL student writers. *Tesl-Ej*, 3(1), 1-20.
- Kepner, C. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of writing skills. *Modern Language Journal* 75, 305–313.
- Koltovskaia, S. (2020). Student engagement with automated written corrective feedback (AWCF) provided by Grammarly: A multiple case study. *Assessing Writing*, 44, 100450.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242431410\\_Principles\\_and\\_Practice\\_in\\_Second\\_Language\\_Acquisition](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242431410_Principles_and_Practice_in_Second_Language_Acquisition)
- Krause, K. L., & Coates, H. (2008). Students' engagement in first-year university. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 493-505.

- Kuh, G. D. (2007). How to help students achieve. *Chronicle of higher education*, 53(41).
- Lalande, J.F. (1982). Reducing composition errors. An experiment. *Modern Language Journal* 66, 140-149.
- Lee, V. E., & Smith, J. B. (1995). Effects of high school restructuring and size on early gains in achievement and engagement. *Sociology of Education*, 68, 241–270.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals* 24, 203–218.
- Lira-Gonzales, M. L., Nassaji, H., & Chao Chao, K. W. (2021). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in a French as a foreign language classroom. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 7(2).
- Loewen S (2004) Uptake in incidental focus on form in meaning focused ESL lessons. *Language Learning* 54(1): 153–88.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37 - 66.
- Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 471 - 497.
- Menon, S., & Clyne, R. K. (2022). Uptake of formative feedback: perspective from a transnational education cohort. *Essays in Biochemistry*, 66(1), 75-81.
- Mujtaba, S. M., Parkash, R., & Nawaz, M. W. (2020). Do indirect coded corrective feedback and teachers short affective comments improve the writing performance and learners uptake?. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 36(1), 34-47.
- Newmann, F., Wehlage, G. G., & Lamborn, S. D. (1992). The significance and sources of student engagement. In F. Newmann (Ed.), *Student engagement and*

- achievement in American secondary schools* (pp. 11–39). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ortega, L. (2003). Syntactic complexity measures and their relationship to L2 proficiency: A research synthesis of college-level L2 writing. *Applied linguistics*, 24(4), 492-518.
- Park, J. H., & Ahn, S. (2022). L2 learners' cognitive and behavioral engagement with written corrective feedback. *English Teaching*, 77(3), 133-152.
- Pawlak, M. (2014). *Error correction in the foreign language classroom*. New York: Springer.
- Price, M., Handley, K., & Millar, J. (2011). Feedback: Focusing attention on engagement. *Studies in higher education*, 36(8), 879-896.
- 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, 277–303.
- Radecki, P.M., Swales, J.M. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System* 16 (3), 355–365.
- Rodriguez, I. (2022). Students' uptake of written feedback in an Egyptian university language program.
- Ruegg, R. (2015). Differences in the uptake of peer and teacher feedback. *RELJ Journal*, 46(2), 131-145.
- Sachs, R., & Polio, C. (2007). Learners' use of two types of written feedback on a L2 writing revision task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 29, 67–100.
- Sasmita, Y. V., & Setyowati, L. (2021). Problems faced by EFL students in learning to write. *Linguista: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pembelajarannya*, 5(1), 11-25.
- Scrivener, J. (2011). *Learning Teaching: The Essential Guide to English Language Teaching* (3rd ed). Oxford: Macmillan books for teachers.



- Semke, H.D. (1984). The effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals* 17, 195–202.
- Sheen Y (2004) Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research* 8(3): 263–300.
- Skinner, E. A., & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effect of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85, 571–581.
- Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: Developments, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11-23). Cambridge University Press.
- Stipek, D. (2002). Good instruction is motivating. In A. Wigfield & J. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners’ processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing: Case studies. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 303–334.
- Takahashi, J. (2022). *Exploring Written Corrective Feedback Engagement from a Sociocognitive Perspective: A Case Study of Learners of Japanese as a Foreign Language*. Indiana University.
- Tashakkori, A., and C. Teddlie. (1998). *Mixed Methodology: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (Vol. 46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tarigan, H. G. (1987). Membaca sebagai suatu keterampilan berbahasa. Angkasa.
- Thi, N. K., Nikolov, M., & Simon, K. (2023). Higher-proficiency students’ engagement with and uptake of teacher and Grammarly feedback in an EFL writing course. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 17(3), 690–705. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2022.2122476>

- Tian, L., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Learner engagement with automated feedback, peer feedback and teacher feedback in an online EFL writing context. *System*, 91, 102247.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language learning*, 46(2), 327-369. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for “The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes”: A response to Ferris. *Journal of second language writing*, 8(2), 111-122.
- Vattøy, K. D., Gamlem, S. M., & Rogne, W. M. (2020). Examining students’ feedback engagement and assessment experiences: a mixed study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(11), 2325–2337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1723523>
- Wehlage, G. G., Rutter, R. A., Smith, G. A., Lesko, N. L., & Fernandez, R. R. (1989). *Reducing the risk: Schools as communities of support*. Philadelphia: Farmer Press.
- Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Parker, M., & Rowntree, J. (2017). Supporting learners' agentic engagement with feedback: A systematic review and a taxonomy of recipience processes. *Educational psychologist*, 52(1), 17-37.
- Yu, S., Zhang, Y., Zheng, Y., Yuan, K., & Zhang, L. (2019). Understanding student engagement with peer feedback on master’s theses: a Macau study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(1), 50-65.
- Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 209-222.
- Zhang, Z., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing* 36, 90–102.

- Zhang, Z. (2022). Promoting student engagement with feedback: insights from collaborative pedagogy and teacher feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(4), 540-555.
- Zhang, Z. V. (2020). Engaging with automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback on L2 writing: Student perceptions and revisions. *Assessing Writing*, 43, 100439.
- 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.
- Ziaei, S., & Dabaghi, A. (2023). Effects of Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learner's Uptake and Attention. *Applied Linguistics Inquiry*, 1(1), 129-141.