INTERACTION: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Vol. 13, No 2; September 2026
P-ISSN: 2406-9558; E-ISSN: 2406-9566

EFL Junior High School Students' Engagement with Teacher Written Corrective Feedback and Revision Outcomes

Ken Nita Prabandari
2210631060020@student.unsika.ac.id

Abdul Kodir Al-Baekani
akodir.albaekani@staff.unsika.ac.id

Nia Pujiawati
nia.pujiawati@staff.unsika.ac.id

Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang

ABSTRACT

This study explores how English as a Foreign Language (EFL) junior high school students engage with teacher written corrective feedback (WCF) and what their revision outcomes are. Studies of teacher WCF at the junior high school level in Indonesia remain limited, and few connect students' engagement with the actual results of their revisions. This qualitative case study involved six eighth-grade students at a state junior high school in Karawang, West Java, selected purposively to represent low, medium, and high writing proficiency. Data came from semi-structured interviews and document analysis of the students' first and second recount-text drafts. The findings show that all six students engaged cognitively, behaviorally, and affectively, but the depth of their engagement varied with proficiency. Behavioral engagement was the most dominant dimension because every student produced a revised draft; cognitive engagement was strong at the noticing stage yet uneven at the metacognitive level; and affective responses generally moved from negative to positive. Most revisions were successful, especially those responding to metalinguistic and direct feedback, while the few unsuccessful and misunderstood outcomes involved grammar and marks that only located errors. Teachers are therefore encouraged to introduce feedback codes before revision and to guide lower-proficiency students while they revise.

Keywords: EFL Writing; Teacher Written Corrective Feedback; Learning Engagement; Revision Outcomes;

INTRODUCTION

Writing is considered one of the most complex skills for EFL students because it involves both cognitive processes and linguistic components (Călinescu, 2024; Wardana et al., 2025; Ye & Liu, 2023). Writing in an EFL context is not only about forming ideas. It also requires the selection of appropriate vocabulary, the use of grammar and mechanics, and the proper organization of sentence structure (Filomeno, 2025). Despite its crucial role in academic and professional life, writing

remains a challenge for EFL students in Indonesia, as reflected in recurring errors in grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and text organization (Isma et al., 2023; Wardana et al., 2025). To overcome these challenges, teacher feedback becomes particularly important because it supports long-term improvement of students' writing (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Nugroho et al., 2025). A recent systematic review similarly concludes that feedback and revision are necessary for developing second-language learners' writing skills, because they allow students to monitor and improve their writing over time (Annisa & Gusnawaty, 2024).

One of the most common types of teacher feedback in students' writing is teacher written corrective feedback (WCF) (Kristina & Yumarnamto, 2024). Teacher WCF is considered one of the most effective forms of feedback because it is given in writing, in the form of symbols, marks, or brief comments that show the location and the type of the error, so students can return to it repeatedly (Mao et al., 2024; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Research has identified that various types of teacher WCF, including direct, indirect, and metalinguistic feedback, can improve students' language skills (Shintani & Ellis, 2013; Ferris, 2011). In the Indonesian junior high school context, teacher feedback has been shown to help students address common writing errors such as omission, addition, and misformation (Nurlina, 2025). However, the effectiveness of teacher WCF depends not only on how teachers give feedback, but also on how students respond to and engage with it (Ellis, 2010).

The same difficulty is visible in the school where this study was conducted. According to the English teacher, grammar is the error that appears most often in the students' recount texts, especially verbs that are left in the base form when the sentence refers to past events, followed by mechanical errors such as spelling and capitalization. The recount genre makes this problem easy to see, because a recount retells past experiences in chronological order and therefore relies on consistent past forms, time markers, and action verbs in almost every sentence (Knapp & Watkins, 2005). For eighth-grade students whose English is still developing, keeping the past tense consistent across a whole text is demanding, so their recount drafts usually come back with many grammatical marks. This is the local problem that teacher WCF is expected to address, and it is also the reason why the recount text was chosen as the writing task in this study.

Ellis (2010) proposed a three-dimensional framework for understanding learner engagement with corrective feedback, consisting of cognitive, behavioral, and affective perspectives. This framework was further developed for the WCF context by Han and Hyland (2015), who specified sub-constructs within each dimension. Even highly effective feedback will have little impact if students do not genuinely engage with it. Several previous studies have examined students' engagement with teacher WCF (Cheng & Liu, 2022; Farsani & Aghamohammadi, 2021; Zaeni et al., 2024), yet several gaps remain. First, most of those studies were conducted in higher education or senior high school contexts, so junior high school students have rarely been the focus of research even though they are at an early and critical stage of developing EFL writing skills. Second, most studies focused on the engagement

process without linking it to the outcomes of students' textual revisions, which can be categorized as successful, unsuccessful, and misunderstood (Ruegg, 2015). Third, in the Indonesian EFL context, and especially at the junior high school level, research that connects engagement with revision outcomes is still hard to find. This study addresses those gaps by reading interview data on the three dimensions of engagement together with document analysis of the students' real first and second drafts. Two questions are asked: (1) How do junior high school EFL students engage cognitively, behaviorally, and affectively with teacher written corrective feedback? and (2) What are their textual revision outcomes after receiving that feedback?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher Written Corrective Feedback

Teacher written corrective feedback (WCF) is one of the most commonly used pedagogical practices in second- and foreign-language writing instruction (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Hyland, 2019). Ellis (2009) distinguishes three main types. Direct corrective feedback identifies the error and supplies the correct form, which is easy to process but may lead to shallow cognitive engagement. Indirect corrective feedback only marks the error, for example by underlining or circling it, so students have to find the correct form themselves, which can encourage deeper processing. Metalinguistic corrective feedback adds a cue or an explanation, such as a grammatical code, that points students toward why the form is wrong. Following this distinction, in this study indirect feedback refers to marks that only locate an error without any explanation, such as a circle or an underline, whereas metalinguistic feedback refers to marks accompanied by an explanatory code, such as circling a verb and adding the code "V2" to signal that it should be in the past form. Direct feedback refers to cases in which the teacher writes the correct form above the error. Empirical evidence also suggests that these types work differently. Gebremariam (2024) found that both direct and indirect feedback improved Ethiopian high school students' grammatical accuracy in an immediate posttest, but the effect did not persist in a delayed posttest, which indicates that teacher WCF alone may not be enough to secure long-term accuracy.

Learner Engagement with Teacher WCF

Learning engagement in this study refers to how students respond to teacher WCF during the writing process. Drawing on Ellis (2010) and operationalized through Han and Hyland (2015), engagement is understood as a multidimensional construct. Cognitive engagement includes noticing, understanding, cognitive operations, and metacognitive operations. Behavioral engagement includes revision operations and revision strategies. Affective engagement includes emotional reactions and attitudinal responses. The three dimensions are not independent. They interact dynamically, so that students' feelings about the feedback may shape how deeply

they process it, and that processing in turn shapes the quality of the revisions they actually write (Han & Hyland, 2015).

Previous studies have used this framework in various settings. Farsani and Aghamohammadi (2021) found that cognitive engagement was stronger with teacher feedback than with peer feedback, which suggests that the source of the feedback affects the depth of engagement. Cheng and Liu (2022) compared low- and high-proficiency learners and found that higher-proficiency students engaged more deeply at the cognitive level. In the Indonesian context, Zaeni et al. (2024) studied vocational high school students in Karawang and found that limited English proficiency can prevent students from engaging effectively with teacher WCF, especially on complex errors, while Sa'adah (2021) traced a student's first and final drafts and found that the student took up almost all of the direct and metalinguistic feedback, which improved the quality of the writing. More recently, Linuwih et al. (2024) reported generally positive affective, behavioral, and cognitive engagement among six Indonesian students who received teacher written feedback online. Taken together, these studies were carried out almost entirely in higher education or high school settings, and none of them examined the three dimensions of engagement while at the same time analyzing textual revision outcomes at the junior high school level in Indonesia. That is the gap the present study addresses.

Textual Revision Outcomes and the Recount Genre

Textual revision outcomes refer to the results of students' attempts to revise their writing after receiving teacher WCF (Ruegg, 2015; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Drawing on Ruegg (2015), three outcomes are distinguished. A successful outcome is a revision that matches the intention of the feedback, so the student understands the mark and applies the correct form. An unsuccessful outcome is an attempt that still fails to produce the correct form, so the student acts on the mark but the result remains inaccurate. A misunderstood outcome is a revision that moves in a different direction from the feedback, for instance when the student changes a part of the sentence that the teacher did not mark. These three categories all require an attempt, and they are therefore separated from uptake, which concerns whether the student responds to the mark at all. Items that are left exactly as they were in the first draft are labelled "no attempt" and are reported separately, because they show a gap in uptake rather than a failed revision.

The genre used in this study was the recount text. A recount retells past events in chronological order and usually consists of an orientation, a series of events, and a reorientation or personal comment (Knapp & Watkins, 2005). Its language features are directly relevant to the errors that teacher WCF usually targets: past-tense action verbs, time markers such as first, after that, and then, and consistent use of pronouns and punctuation across the whole text. Because past forms appear in nearly every sentence, a recount draft gives the teacher many opportunities to mark grammatical errors and gives the researcher a clear view of whether students notice, understand, and act upon those marks.

An Integrated Analytical Framework

The three frameworks used in this study work together as one analytical chain. Ellis's (2009) typology explains what kind of input the students received, that is whether the mark supplied the answer, only located the error, or added an explanatory code. Ellis's (2010) three dimensions, operationalized through Han and Hyland's (2015) sub-constructs, explain how the students processed that input cognitively, behaviorally, and affectively. Ruegg's (2015) categories then describe what the processing produced in the second draft. Reading the chain in this order makes it possible to ask not only whether students engaged with the feedback, but also whether a particular type of feedback and a particular depth of engagement led to an accurate revision.

METHOD

Design and Samples

This study employed a qualitative approach with a case study design (Yin, 2014), treating six individual students as separate cases so that a cross-case comparison could be made. The participants were six eighth-grade EFL students at a state junior high school in Karawang, West Java, Indonesia, selected through purposive sampling. Their English proficiency levels were determined on the recommendation of their English teacher, who classified them as low, medium, or high based on their demonstrated ability during regular English lessons and their previous writing scores. Each level was represented by two students, one male and one female, to keep the representation balanced across proficiency and gender.

Six participants were considered sufficient for this design because the aim was depth rather than generalization. A case study looks closely at each participant through more than one source of data (Yin, 2014), and here every student contributed an interview transcript as well as a pair of drafts in which each feedback point was traced individually. Two students per proficiency level also make it possible to compare cases within a level and across levels, which is the minimum needed for the cross-case pattern reported in this article. Because the students' first-semester recount drafts no longer showed the teacher's feedback marks, the six students were asked to write a new recount text and the same English teacher provided feedback following the usual classroom practice. This semi-elicited task is acknowledged as a limitation, since a writing session arranged for research purposes may not fully represent ordinary classroom writing, and the findings are therefore interpreted as a picture of how these students engaged with their teacher's feedback rather than as a description of routine classroom practice.

Before data collection began, permission to conduct the study was obtained from the school, and the English teacher was then asked to take part. Written consent forms were also distributed to the students and to their parents or guardians, as the

participants were minors. Participation was voluntary, the students were told that their drafts and answers would only be used for research, and their identities were anonymized using codes (Student 1 – Student 6, abbreviated as S1 – S6 in the tables).

Instrument and Procedure

This study used two research instruments. The first was a semi-structured interview guide developed from Ellis's (2010) three-dimensional framework and Han and Hyland's (2015) sub-constructs, adapted from Zheng and Yu (2018) and validated by two lecturers with expertise in EFL writing. The guide consisted of 17 open-ended questions covering what the students noticed, how they revised, and how they felt about the feedback. It was written in English and translated into Indonesian so that all participants could answer comfortably, and every session was audio-recorded and transcribed. The second instrument was the students' writing documents, namely their first drafts with the teacher's visible WCF marks and their corresponding second drafts. Each feedback point in the first draft was identified, traced to the second draft, and categorized using Ruegg's (2015) framework.

The data were collected in four steps. First, all six students wrote a recount text as their first draft in one sitting, using the same prompt about an unforgettable personal experience. Because the drafts they had written earlier in the semester no longer carried the teacher's marks, this writing session was arranged in a free period rather than during the regular English lesson, and no minimum length was set, so the students wrote as much as they normally would in class. Second, the teacher read the drafts and provided written corrective feedback in the usual manner, using circles and underlining for errors the students were expected to find themselves, grammatical codes such as V2, +ed, +V-ing, and A for capitalization to signal the type of error, and the correct form written above the word to give the answer directly. Third, the marked drafts were returned to the students, who wrote their second draft immediately after the drafts had been checked, in the same session; they revised individually but were allowed to use a dictionary or to ask a friend or the teacher, as they normally would in class. Fourth, the researcher analyzed the paired drafts and then interviewed each student individually in Indonesian, each interview lasting about 10–20 minutes.

Data Analysis

The interview transcripts and the document analysis results were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles et al. (2014), following the stages of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. For the interview data, statements were first assigned to one of the three dimensions and then coded with the sub-constructs of Han and Hyland (2015), so that a statement about recognizing a mark was coded as noticing, a statement explaining a rule as understanding, a statement about rereading or checking as a metacognitive operation, a statement about the order or the help used while revising as a revision strategy, and a statement

about feelings or attitudes as affective engagement. For the document data, a table was built for each participant listing every feedback point, the form of the mark, the change in the second draft, and the resulting outcome category.

Several steps were taken to strengthen trustworthiness. The coding of the drafts was carried out twice by the researcher at different times and the results were compared to check consistency; the ambiguous cases, especially the difference between an unsuccessful and a misunderstood revision, were then discussed with the supervisors until an agreement was reached; and the interpretation of the interviews was returned to the students through member checking so that they could confirm or correct what they meant. Consistent with the qualitative design, the outcomes were read as dominant patterns across the six cases rather than as frequency counts or statistical comparisons.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on the interviews and the analysis of the student documents, all participants engaged with the teacher WCF in their recount text writing across the cognitive, behavioral, and affective dimensions, but the depth of that engagement varied with their English proficiency. Table 1 summarizes the six cases side by side before each dimension is discussed in turn.

Table 1.
Cross-Case Summary of Students' Engagement and Revision Outcomes

Student	Level	Cognitive	Behavioral	Affective	Feedback received	Outcomes
S1	High	Noticed all marks; explained the rules; rechecked the draft	Revised easy items first; reread from the beginning	Calm and confident	Metalinguistic and direct	All items successful
S2	High	Noticed and understood; explained the past-tense rule; monitored own work	Revised systematically and checked the result	Surprised, then glad	Metalinguistic and direct	All items successful
S3	Low	Noticed the marks; understood only part of the rules	Revised from top to bottom; used a dictionary	Down at first, relieved after	Indirect and metalinguistic	Mostly successful; one unsuccessful
S4	Medium	Noticed coded items quickly, circled items slowly	Revised item by item; asked a friend	Fine; preferred direct correction	Metalinguistic and direct	Mostly successful; one unsuccessful
S5	Medium	Noticed and reasoned, but did not recheck the draft	Revised without a plan; dictionary and peer help	Relaxed; liked finding answers	Indirect and metalinguistic	One misunderstood; two no attempt

Student	Level	Cognitive	Behavioral	Affective	Feedback received	Outcomes
S6	Low	Noticed coded and underlined items; confused by circles	Revised all marked items by asking a friend	Nervous, then happy	Direct and metalinguistic	All attempted items successful

Table 1 shows the pattern that the following sections describe in detail: the two high-proficiency students reached the deepest cognitive level and revised everything successfully, while the students who worked mainly at the behavioral level still revised but left a few items inaccurate or untouched.

Students' Cognitive Engagement

At the noticing stage, the students were generally able to recognize the teacher's marks, although the form of the mark affected how easily they interpreted it.

Student 1: "It was punctuation and capital letters, and there were also some spelling and verb mistakes."

Student 4: "Tenses, mostly. When there was a code, I understood it right away, but when it was only circled, I did not get it immediately."

Student 6: "I was a bit confused at first. The circled ones were the confusing part, but when something was underlined, I knew right away that the spelling was wrong."

These statements show that the students mostly noticed grammatical errors, especially verbs and tenses, together with mechanical errors such as spelling and punctuation. Coded and underlined feedback was easier to notice, while items that were only circled tended to confuse them. In terms of understanding, the students differed in how far they could explain the reason behind a correction.

Student 2: "I think this part is about the past, so it should not use 'are'. It has to be changed into the past tense, right?"

Student 3: "Honestly, I do not really get all of it, maybe because I do not study enough. The grammar part is the hardest because there are so many rules, and I have not memorized them all."

Higher-proficiency students such as Student 2 could explain the grammatical reason behind the correction, whereas lower-proficiency students such as Student 3 understood it only in part. The students also performed cognitive operations, reasoning about why an error had occurred, and metacognitive operations, monitoring their own revisions.

Student 5: "I thought about how to fix it, and also why I got it wrong, because I am used to writing Verb 1."

Student 1: "Yes, I read it again to make sure. Usually, punctuation is the one I miss the most, so I fix it again."

The cognitive sub-constructs worked almost like a ladder. Every student reached noticing, most reached understanding and cognitive operations, but only Student 1 and Student 2 consistently reached the metacognitive stage of planning and rechecking their revisions. This uneven pattern is in line with Cheng and Liu (2022), who found that engagement with feedback is mediated by proficiency and is nonlinear rather than growing evenly. The difference is that Cheng and Liu (2022) studied university learners and stopped at the engagement process, whereas the present study found the same uneven pattern in much younger learners and linked it directly to the accuracy of their second drafts, as summarized in Table 1.

Students' Behavioral Engagement

All six students responded to the teacher WCF through concrete revision actions, covering both revision operations and revision strategies.

Student 1: "I looked at where the mistakes were, read it from the beginning, and then fixed them. I fixed the easy ones first, then the difficult ones."

Student 3: "I just did it in order, from top to bottom. I still tried even when I was not sure it was right."

Student 5: "I did not really have a plan. I just used a dictionary and asked a friend."

A common pattern emerged in which the students used a dictionary first, then asked a friend, and finally asked the teacher when they were still stuck. Behavioral engagement was the most dominant dimension because every student actually produced a revised draft instead of ignoring the feedback. This is in line with Tsao (2024) and Shen and Chong (2022), who reported that revision, a behavioral form of engagement, was the most prevalent way learners engaged with teacher WCF. The difference is that those studies used large-scale surveys or syntheses of older learners, while this study traced real drafts at the junior high school level. Notably, Student 6, whose proficiency was the lowest, still revised all their marked errors correctly by actively asking a friend, which shows that strong behavioral engagement can compensate for weaker cognitive understanding (Zhang & Hyland, 2022).

It is worth asking why the behavioral dimension was the strongest among these young learners. The interviews suggest that revising was, for them, first of all an assignment to be completed: a mark on the paper was read as an instruction to change something, and the students acted on it even when they could not explain

the rule behind it, as Student 3 admitted when saying that they kept trying although they were unsure. At this age the students also have a limited store of explicit grammatical knowledge, so the fastest route available to them is to follow the mark and, where the mark is not clear enough, to borrow understanding from a dictionary, a friend, or the teacher. Behavioral engagement is thus not necessarily a sign of deep processing; it can also be a strategy for coping with feedback that is understood only partially. This is an important qualification for junior high school writing pedagogy, because a fully revised draft may hide the fact that the student still does not know why the original form was wrong.

Students' Affective Engagement

Most students showed a range of emotional responses and attitudes toward the teacher WCF, which generally moved from negative to positive over the revision process.

Student 2: "When I saw the corrections, I thought, 'Oh, it turns out there are a lot of mistakes.' But actually, I felt fine, even glad, because it means I am not good enough yet, so I have to be better."

Student 3: "I felt a little down because there were still so many mistakes, and I was also shocked… After revising, I felt relieved because I understood it a bit more."

Student 6: "I felt nervous and afraid of being wrong. After I finished revising, I felt happy and relieved because it was done."

Although some students first felt anxious or down, almost all reported relief and satisfaction after revising. All of them saw the teacher WCF as useful, but their preferences were divided almost evenly: Students 1, 3, and 5 preferred coded or circled feedback because it pushed them to find the answer themselves, while Students 2, 4, and 6 preferred direct feedback because it gave them certainty. This preference did not map cleanly onto proficiency or confidence, which partly resonates with Fitriyah et al. (2024). The link between positive feelings and willingness to revise is also in line with Tsao (2024), who found that affective engagement can predict behavioral engagement. Seen together, the three dimensions did not work separately but influenced one another (Shen & Chong, 2022; Cheng et al., 2023), with the behavioral dimension acting as the bridge that turned the students' noticing and feelings into an actual revised text.

Students' Textual Revision Outcomes

The document analysis grouped the attempted revisions into successful, unsuccessful, and misunderstood outcomes, and reported unchanged items separately as no attempt. The three outcome categories are applied here as follows: an unsuccessful outcome is an attempt at the marked item that still produces an incorrect form; a misunderstood outcome is a change made in the wrong place, so

that a part which was already correct is altered; and a no-attempt case is an item left exactly as it was in the first draft, which shows a gap in uptake rather than a failed revision. Successful outcomes were the most common, appearing in almost all of the drafts, especially when the teacher gave a code or a clear mark. In the tables below, the teacher's codes are written in square brackets next to the word they marked, for example get [V2], because in the handwritten drafts the marks were written above the words.

Table 2.
Successful Revision Outcomes

Participant	Draft 1 (with teacher WCF)	Draft 2 (Revision)	Revision Analysis
S1	First, in the morning, we had breakfast and **V2** get ready.	First, in the morning, we had breakfast and got ready.	Verb form. The base verb "get", coded with V2, was correctly changed into the past form "got".
S1	**A** after that, we left immediately using our car.	After that, we left immediately using our car.	Capitalization and punctuation. The sentence-initial letter was capitalized.
S2	**Was** Next day my friend are confident with her result.	Next day, my friend was confident with her result.	A comma should follow the time signal. Verb "be" tense. "are" was correctly changed into the past form "was".
S3	During school holiday, **V2** I go to Dufan with my family. We go there by my uncle**'s** car.	During school holidays, I went to Dufan with my family. We went there by my uncle's car.	Verb form. The repeated base verb "go" (V2) was correctly changed into "went" in both clauses.
S4	**V2** One week ago, I'm go **to** out for meet with my best friend.	One week ago, I went out to meet my best friend.	Verb form and word choice. "I'm go" became "I went" and the preposition "for" became "to".
S4	**My best friend and I** Me and my best friend **were** is planning to go shopping at the mall.	My best friend and I were planning to go shopping at the mall.	Subject pronoun and verb tense. "Me" is an object pronoun and cannot act as the subject, so "Me and my best friend" was changed into "My best friend and I",

			using the subject pronoun "I" and placing the other person first. The verb "is" was also corrected into the past form "were".
S5	**V2** We swim together and see many fish.	We swam together and saw many fish.	Verb form. "swim" (V2) and "see" were correctly changed into the past form "swam" and "saw".
S6	**Was** I am really tired but it is a great day.	I was really tired, but it was a great day.	Verb "be" tense and punctuation. "am" and "is", both coded to be changed, were correctly changed into the past form "was", and a comma was added before "but".

As shown in Table 2, the students revised a variety of errors, including verb forms and tenses, subject-verb agreement, subject pronouns, word choice, capitalization, and punctuation. Two cases deserve a closer look. In the first S1 example the base verb get, marked with the code V2, was changed into the past form got, which shows that a code naming the type of error was enough for the student to produce the right form without further help. In the second S4 example the teacher wrote the correct phrase above the line, and the student not only replaced the object pronoun Me with the subject pronoun I but also reordered the phrase into My best friend and I and corrected the verb is into were, so one direct mark led to two accurate changes in a single sentence. Most successful revisions in the data followed this pattern: they happened with metalinguistic and direct feedback, because the code or the supplied answer told the student exactly what kind of change was needed. This is consistent with Sa'adah (2021) and Zaeni et al. (2024).

Table 3.
Unsuccessful Revision Outcomes

Participant	Draft 1 (with teacher WCF)	Draft 2 (Revision)	Analysis
S3	After eat we finally **+ed** play again.	**+V-ing** After eated, we finally played again.	Verb form. "play" became "played" successfully, but "eat" should have become "eating" because the preposition 'after' is followed by a gerund (after + V-ing), not the simple past. The

Participant	Draft 1 (with teacher WCF)	Draft 2 (Revision)	Analysis
			student over-generalized the past –ed rule and produced the non-existent form “eated”.
S4	**V2** I feel happy, but my money is gone.	I felt happy, but **was** my money were gone.	Subject-verb agreement. “feel” became “felt” correctly, but “is gone” should be “was gone”. The student wrote “were gone”, which does not agree with the uncountable noun “money”.

Table 3 shows two unsuccessful outcomes, both grammatical. Student 3 changed play into played correctly, but wrote eated for eat. The mark told the student to add an ending, and the student added the most familiar one, the past -ed, without noticing that after is followed by a gerund, so the result was a form that does not exist in English. Student 4 changed feel into felt correctly, but rewrote is gone as were gone, which does not agree with the uncountable noun money. In both cases the students noticed the mark and attempted the revision, yet they lacked the grammatical knowledge to select the right form, which is in line with Cheng and Liu (2022), who found that lower-proficiency learners struggle most with feedback on local errors such as grammar. The two cases also show that an attempt is not the same as an accurate revision, and that a mark which only signals the type of error may push the student toward over-generalizing a rule already known.

Table 4.
Misunderstood Revision Outcome

Participant	Draft 1 (with teacher WCF)	Draft 2 (Revision)	Analysis
S5	**V2** Tthen we eat some snackes and talked together on the sand.	Tthen, we ate some snackes and talked together **on** and the sand.	Misinterpretation of feedback scope. "eat" was correctly changed into "ate", but the student also changed the already-correct word "on" into "and", turning a correct part into a new error.

Table 4 presents the only clear misunderstood outcome in the data. Student 5 changed eat into ate as the code required, but also replaced the preposition on, which was already correct and had not been marked, with and. The revision therefore moved in a direction the teacher had not intended and created a new error where none existed. This illustrates the risk of marks that only locate an error: when students are not sure how far the mark reaches, they may extend the correction to neighbouring words. The same student also left two marked items unchanged, which are reported as no attempt in Table 5.

Table 5.
No Attempt (Uptake)

Participant	Draft 1 (with teacher WCF)	Draft 2 (Revision)	Analysis
S5	**V2** **T**~~t~~hen we eat some snackes and talked together on the sand.	**T**~~t~~hen, we ate some snackes and talked together **on** and the sand.	The word “then" was marked for capitalization but left unchanged, so it counts as "no attempt" with no revision outcome. The misspelled "snackes" was also marked but left unchanged, so it is another "no attempt" case rather than a revision outcome.

Table 5 records the two items that Student 5 left untouched: the misspelled word Tthen, which had been marked for capitalization, and the misspelled snackes. Neither counts as a revision outcome, because no attempt was made; they are reported separately as a gap in uptake. It is telling that both marks were of the kind that only locate an error. In the interview the same student described revising without a plan and relying on a dictionary and a friend, which suggests that unclear marks are the first ones to be skipped when a student has no strategy for checking the whole draft.

Overall, the revisions were predominantly successful, with only a small number of unsuccessful and misunderstood outcomes and two items with no attempt. Reading the two research questions together, there was a close relationship between the depth of engagement and the accuracy of the revision: the students who engaged up to the metacognitive level, Student 1 and Student 2, produced almost fully correct second drafts, while the lower-proficiency students who engaged mainly at the behavioral level still revised but left a few errors inaccurate or untouched.

The role of feedback explicitness deserves particular attention. In this study, direct and metalinguistic marks led to accurate revisions far more often than marks that only located an error, and the explanation appears to lie in what each type of mark asks the student to do. A direct correction and a code such as V2 both reduce the problem to a single decision, because the type of error, and sometimes the answer itself, is already given; a circle or an underline, by contrast, asks the student to diagnose the error first and only then to repair it. That diagnosis requires the explicit grammatical knowledge that lower-proficiency eighth-graders are still building, which is why the same students who revised coded items accurately produced eated, were gone, or shifted the correction onto a neighbouring word. In terms of engagement, marks that only locate an error do invite deeper processing, as Ellis (2009) suggests, but for young learners that invitation is only productive when the learner has the resources to accept it. Where the resources are missing, the deeper

processing turns into guessing, and the extra cognitive demand is spent on finding the error rather than on learning the rule. This qualifies the common assumption that less explicit feedback automatically produces deeper learning, and it suggests that explicitness should be matched to proficiency rather than applied uniformly.

Pedagogically, three implications follow for junior high school writing classes. First, feedback codes should be introduced and practised before students are asked to revise, so that a mark such as +ed or A is read as a type of error rather than as a vague signal that something is wrong. Second, marks that only locate an error are still useful, but for lower-proficiency writers they work better with a short note on the kind of error, or with a brief feedback conference in which the teacher asks the student to say what the mark means before revising. Third, since behavioral engagement was the strongest dimension, teachers can build on it with a simple guided revision checklist that asks students to reread the draft, check every mark, and explain one correction in their own words, so that revising becomes a moment of learning rather than copying.

CONCLUSION

This study examined how six eighth-grade students engaged with teacher WCF in recount text writing and what their revision outcomes were. For the first research question, the students engaged in all three dimensions, but the depth varied with proficiency. Cognitively, everyone noticed the marks, yet only the two high-proficiency students reached the metacognitive stage of rechecking their work. Behaviorally, engagement was the strongest dimension, as all six produced a revised draft using strategies such as rereading, consulting a dictionary, and asking a friend or the teacher. Affectively, their feelings moved from anxiety to relief, and all of them regarded the feedback as useful. For the second research question, the revision outcomes were predominantly successful, especially with metalinguistic and direct feedback; the few unsuccessful outcomes involved verb forms and agreement, one misunderstood outcome occurred when a student altered an unmarked word, and two marked items were left unattempted. Depth of engagement and accuracy of revision were therefore closely related.

The findings carry three practical implications for teachers of young EFL writers. Feedback codes should be taught and practised before a revision task; marks that only locate an error should be accompanied by a short explanation or a brief feedback conference, particularly for lower-proficiency students; and a guided revision checklist can turn the students' already strong willingness to revise into genuine learning by asking them to explain their own corrections. This study has clear limitations. It involved only six students in one school, used a single text genre, and relied on a semi-elicited writing task arranged for research purposes, so the results describe these six cases rather than junior high school students in general. The proficiency levels were also based on the teacher's judgement and previous writing scores rather than on a standardized test. Future research could involve more participants and more than one school, use other genres such as narrative or

procedure texts, and follow students over a longer period to see whether the link between engagement depth and revision success is stable. Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches would also make it possible to test that link in larger groups.

REFERENCES

Annisa, A., & Gusnawaty, G. (2024). Feedback and revisions in developing writing skills in second language learners: A systematic review. *Kajian Pendidikan, Seni, Budaya, Sosial dan Lingkungan*, *1*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.58881/kpsbsl.v1i1.7

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.

Călinescu, A. (2024). Mechanics of ESL/EFL writing performance at the tertiary level. *Journal of Effective Teaching Methods*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.59652/jetm.v2i1.102

Cheng, X., & Liu, Y. (2022). Student engagement with teacher written feedback: Insights from low-proficiency and high-proficiency L2 learners. *System*, *109*, 102880. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102880

Cheng, X., Liu, Y., & Wang, C. (2023). Understanding student engagement with teacher and peer feedback in L2 writing. *System*, *116*, 103176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103176

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, *1*(1), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054

Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 335–349. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990544

Farsani, M. A., & Aghamohammadi, N. (2021). Exploring students' engagement with peer- and teacher written feedback in an EFL writing course: A multiple case study of Iranian graduate learners. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *45*(4), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v45n4-1

Ferris, D. R. (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing (2nd ed.)*. University of Michigan Press.

Filomeno, P. S. (2025). Grammatical and mechanical error analysis in writing compositions among Grade 7 learners in a public school. *Asia Pacific Journal of Advanced Education and Technology*, *4*(2), 14–21. https://doi.org/10.54476/apjaet/19539.

Fitriyah, I., Ningrum, A. S. B., & Gozali, I. (2024). An investigation of written corrective feedback in EFL writing assessment: How teachers' feedback practices meet students' expectations. *International Journal of Language Testing*, *14*(1), 166–183. https://doi.org/10.22034/IJLT.2023.411616.1275

Gebremariam, H. T. (2024). Exploring the effects of written corrective feedback types on grammatical accuracy in L2 writing: Evidence from Ethiopian high school students. *SAGE Open*, *14*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241274331

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

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, *39*(2), 83–101. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399

Isma, A., Rasmin, L. O., & Samsudin, S. (2023). Decoding the challenges: A study of English writing errors among EFL students. *GLENS: Global English Insights Journal*, *1*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.61220/glens.v1i1.2023a1

Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, text, grammar: Technologies for teaching and assessing writing*. University of New South Wales Press.

Kristina, M., & Yumarnamto, M. (2024). Written corrective feedback (WCF) preferences in a writing class. *Beyond Words*, *12*(2), 157–177. https://doi.org/10.33508/bw.v12i2.7350

Linuwih, E. R., Setiawan, S., & Munir, A. (2024). Student engagement with teacher written feedback in online EFL writing context. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *14*(7), 2117–2126. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1407.26

Mao, Z., Lee, I., & Li, S. (2024). Written corrective feedback in second language writing: A synthesis of naturalistic classroom studies. *Language Teaching*, *57*(4), 449–477. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000393

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd ed.)*. SAGE Publications.

Nugroho, D. S. P., Sukmaningrum, R., & Setyorini, A. (2025). Teacher feedback technique in students' English writing: A study of descriptive texts among X-grade students at SMA N 15 Semarang. *English Teaching Journal and Research*, *5*(1), 29–44. https://doi.org/10.55148/etjar.v5i1.1380

Nurlina, S. L. (2025). The implementation of teacher feedback to improve students' writing skills in junior high school. *DUTIES: Education and Humanities International Journal*, *1*(1), 34–44. https://doi.org/10.70152/duties.v1i1.173

Ruegg, R. (2015). Differences in the uptake of peer and teacher feedback. *RELC Journal*, *46*(2), 131–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214562799

Sa'adah, L. (2021). Written corrective feedback provided by the teacher on student's descriptive writing for fostering student's writing quality. *RETAIN: Research on English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, *9*(3), 84–92.

Shen, R., & Chong, S. W. (2022). Learner engagement with written corrective feedback in ESL and EFL contexts: A qualitative research synthesis using a perception-based framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *48*(3), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2072468

Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*(3), 286–306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.011

Tsao, J.-J. (2024). Unveiling the links between EFL learners' perceived L2 writing classroom goal structures, engagement with teacher written corrective feedback, and self-reported writing proficiency through structural equation modeling. *SAGE Open*, *14*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241299161

Wardana, I. K., Joni, D. A. A. W., & Arsana, A. A. P. (2025). Factors affecting teacher feedback on writing achievement, self-efficacy, and self-regulation among junior high school EFL students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *14*(3), 596–611. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v14i3.73964

Ye, W., & Liu, J. (2023). Exploring and modeling the reading-writing connection in EFL integrated writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1161272

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods (5th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.

Zaeni, B. V., Wachyudi, K., & Saefullah, H. (2024). EFL students' engagement with teacher's written corrective feedback: A case study at a vocational high school. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, *4*(1), 6863–6873. https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i1.8672

Zhang, Z. (V.), & Hyland, K. (2022). Fostering student engagement with feedback: An integrated approach. *Assessing Writing*, *51*, 100586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100586

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.03.001