

The Effect of Languaging and Teacher Corrective Feedback on the Writing of L2 Learners with Low Proficiency

Sabariah Abd Rahim¹, Yang Xianjian²

^{1,2}Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia, ²Kaili University, China

Corresponding Author Email: sab@ums.edu.my

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i3/23010> DOI:10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i3/23010

Published Online: 25 September 2024

Abstract

Low proficiency Second Language (L2) learners often face significant challenges in mastering the skill of writing. Despite having studied the English language for years, they consistently commit grammatical errors and employ incorrect English language and writing practices. To support low proficiency L2 learners in refining their writing skills, teachers offer Corrective Feedback (CF) to address both grammatical and non-grammatical errors. The effectiveness of the CF can also be improved by incorporating languaging into the teacher CF. Thus, the purpose of the present study is to examine the effect of teacher CF and languaging on the writing of low-proficient L2 learners. The study was done on 25 university students with low L2 proficiency, and the data was collected using a qualitative multiple-case research design. To analyse the data, an error ratio and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test were employed. The finding shows that the provision of languaging on the teacher CF facilitated the low proficiency L2 learners' writing. The study is noteworthy for its application of the mediational tool in the provision and processing of teacher CF and the complementary pedagogical strategy in the pedagogical teaching of writing development for lower proficiency L2 learners.

Keywords: Languaging, Teacher Corrective Feedback, Low Proficiency L2 Learners, L2 Writing

Introduction

Being proficient in writing enables individuals to achieve a diverse array of personal, intellectual, occupational, and recreational objectives. However, writing poses the greatest challenge for individuals with low proficiency, especially L2 learners, and they require supplementary support. For L2 writing teachers, low proficient L2 learners consistently rely on their teacher to rectify their writing due to their limited proficiency in L2. So, teachers are obligated to provide corrective feedback (CF) in the writing classroom as it serves as a valuable tool for assisting students in developing their writing skills (Ene, et al., 2016; Abd Rahim, et al., 2022). In addition, it is the responsibility of teachers to ensure that students are actively engaged with the CF that is provided to them. This may be accomplished by having students deliberate on the teacher CF either verbally or in writing (Lee, 2013). This allows them to comprehend and internalise the feedback that is provided, which can then be utilised in the revision or new piece of writing (Bitchener & Storch, 2016).

Despite getting positive support from L2 writing teachers, a strong advocate for a more natural, input-based approach to language instruction, Truscott (1996), has vehemently opposed the use of teacher CF in writing classes. He asserts that teacher CF will establish an artificial learning environment for L2 learners, which will impact the learners' L2 growth. His primary criticism stemmed from worries over the perceived inefficiency, possible negative consequences, theoretical issues, and practical constraints of providing teacher CF in the L2 learning classroom. Nevertheless, the positive correlation between writing accuracy and teacher CF is becoming increasingly evident. The results, however, have been inconclusive, prompting additional research into the ways in which the efficacy of teacher CF can be enhanced to enable low-proficiency L2 learners to accurately interpret the CF of their teachers. It is recommended that low-proficiency L2 learners must interact with the teacher CF to increase their understanding and retention of the CF for subsequent writings (Lee, 2013; Jerry et al., 2013; Kassim et al., 2014a, 2014b). They must notice and process the teacher CF in order to improve their L2 writing accuracy.

Also, additional pedagogical writing tools or methods should be utilised to emphasise the importance of noticing and comprehending the teacher CF. This will help to increase L2 learners' involvement in noticing and understanding the teacher CF, ultimately leading to improved correctness in L2 learners' writing. The research on teacher CF has not given much attention to this area of how L2 learners perceive and interpret teacher CF (Jonsson, 2012; Kim, 2013). In relation to this, it is important to consider utilizing languaging as a strategic tool to effectively facilitate the provision and processing of teacher CF. Research has indicated that the teacher CF received by L2 learners becomes more efficient when the learners utilise the CF, leading to enhanced writing accuracy. However, in the Malaysian context, research on the languaging of the teacher CF of L2 learners' writing is still in its infancy (Abd Rahim, et al., 2022). Therefore, the findings of this study will contribute to better pedagogical teaching of writing development in Malaysia, notably in the use of the mediational tool in the provision and processing of teacher CF, as well as the complementing pedagogical approach for teacher CF. The study seeks to investigate the languaging effects of the teacher CF of the low proficiency L2 learners' writing. The research topic being addressed is to what extent does the provision of languaging on teacher CF of the writing texts facilitate the low proficiency L2 learners' writing.

Literature Review

Teacher CF and Languaging

Teacher CF is a widely used method of providing feedback for errors found in the L2 learners' writings. Despite receiving criticism from various researchers such as Krashen (1982, 1984), Santa (2006), and Truscott (1996, 1999, 2007), teacher CF is still considered crucial in L2 writing. This is because CF provided by teachers helps L2 learners enhance their writing performance (see Ferris, 2010; Razali et al., 2014; Ganapathy, et al., 2020). Furthermore, teacher CF also has an impact on students' acquisition of L2 knowledge (Hyland, et al., 2006). Studies have demonstrated that teacher CF positively influences the correctness of writing in L2 learners. This has been supported by studies conducted by Forrester (2014), Jerry et al. (2013), and Kassim et al. (2014a, 2014b). Nevertheless, merely offering L2 learners teacher CF is insufficient for enhancing their writing accuracy. If these learners just replicate their teacher CF, they will adopt a passive learning approach, lacking the ability to identify and rectify their own mistakes (Williams, 2003).

In addition, L2 learners must actively interact with the CF given by their teachers to improve their understanding and memory of the language (Lee, 2013). This, in turn, has a good impact on their writing skills (Jerry et al., 2013; Kassim et al., 2014a, 2014b). For them to effectively absorb and remember the corrections given by the teacher for future writing tasks, it is crucial for them to consciously observe and analyse the teacher CF. This is the point which L2 learners must language the teacher CF. In this study, the researchers used comprehensive direct CF for the teacher CF because it covers a wide range of errors by locating and identifying the errors with the errors' coding system used in Ferris et al.'s (2013) study and is suitable for low proficiency L2 learners.

Swain (2006a, 2011) introduced the concept of "languageing" to denote the use of language (languageing) by learners to influence cognitively complex tasks and processes, such as L2 acquisition, through either oral (Oral Languageing) or written form (Written Languageing). According to Swain (2006a), languageing refers to the process of creating significance and forming understanding and expertise via language. It also refers to either writing or speaking to others or writing or speaking to oneself (Swain et al., 2013). According to Moradian et al. (2017), the act of languageing improves the cognitive capacity of L2 learners. It transforms new knowledge or ideas into a tangible linguistic output that can be utilised and improved. Research has demonstrated that the use of language, or languageing, allows L2 learners to independently support themselves in resolving issues related to L2 linguistic forms and structures. This has been proved in studies conducted by Knouzi et al. (2010), Negueruela (2008), Suzuki (2012), Swain et al. (2011), and Watanabe (2014). Languageing considerably improves L2 learners' language knowledge and experience (Al Ajmi, et al., 2014; Swain, et al., 2011). Furthermore, research has demonstrated that the languageing has a substantial impact on the process of language acquisition (e.g., Knouzi et al., 2010; Suzuki, 2012; Swain, 2006a, 2010; Moradian et al., 2017). Thus, incorporating languageing as an additional instructional approach alongside teacher CF should enhance the writing accuracy of L2 learners.

Writing Accuracy

The language generated in writing should adhere to the norms of the L2 (Skehan, 1996), and correct writing entails error-free writing (Arnold, 2008; Khorasan et al., 2015). As L2 learners become more proficient in the language, they write more accurately, as they generate fewer writing errors (Arnold, 2008; Wolfe-Quintero et al., 1998). Nevertheless, writing with precision can be an intimidating endeavour for L2 learners with limited skill. Obtaining teacher CF is essential as it improves the language learning progress and motivation of L2 learners (Hyland et al., 2006). Increasing research supports the notion that there is a favourable correlation between teacher CF and the increase of writing accuracy over a period of time (Bitchener, et al. 2012). With teacher CF, L2 learners can identify the errors present in their writing. However, merely seeing is not sufficient to ensure learners' precise understanding of teacher CF (Kim, 2012).

In order to fully understand teacher CF, L2 learners must engage in the process of languageing the feedback. This involves actively processing and internalising the corrections to effectively incorporate it into future writing tasks. This study requires the use of languageing to the teacher CF obtained. Suzuki (2012) suggested that the languageing offers L2 learners a means to deeply analyse and reflect upon the errors they make in their writing. The act of languageing significantly impacts learners, as it enables them to perform tasks more effectively and

increases their focus, leading to the development of their self-regulatory skills. The study conducted by Suzuki (2009a) examined the impact of languaging in response to teacher CF on improving learners' writing accuracy through revision. The results indicate that the use of languaging resulting from teacher CF has a substantial effect on learners' writing accuracy. Suzuki (2012) also found a comparable outcome when investigating the efficacy of using languaging in response to teacher CF on the writing accuracy of L2 Japanese students during revision tasks. In a further study, Moradian et al. (2017) examined two groups of low-intermediate Iranian EFL students and found that the use of languaging improved the effectiveness of teacher CF, leading to notable improvements in the students' writing accuracy. These findings demonstrate that teacher CF obtained by L2 learners becomes more efficient when they employ languaging.

Sociocultural Theory

Sociocultural Theory (SCT) serves as the study's theoretical foundation. SCT states that social interactions between a beginner (L2 learner) and an expert (L2 instructor) improve the L2 development of learners. An expert provides help to a novice through this interaction, which might take the form of physical support (like using a dictionary) or symbolic support (like using language) (Bitchener et al., 2012). This type of support is referred to as tools and mediation in SCT. Teacher CF is seen as a tangible means of support or a mechanism within the framework of SCT (Bitchener et al., 2016) that teachers (the knowledgeable individuals) offer to address the errors identified in the written work of L2 learners (the inexperienced individuals).

From the perspective of SCT, L2 learners actively engage in the learning process. Hence, they will promptly reply and make use of the provided support, namely the teacher CF, by applying the appropriate forms to rectify the errors identified in their writing. Ultimately, it will result in the learners' L2 development. SCT also emphasises the need for mediation in language acquisition, which can be accomplished with physical or symbolic tool. The physical tool, such as the teacher CF, facilitate the execution of corrections. L2 learners revise the errors in their work based on the corrections provided by their teachers (CF), indicating that the editing of errors has taken place. The symbolic tool, however, facilitates and influences the process of correcting mistakes. Languaging is a symbolic tool utilised by L2 learners to interact with experts (teachers) and coordinate their corrections (Wells, 1999). It serves as a tool for mediation, aiding in the development of ideas that support advanced cognitive processes, such as self-regulation (Bitchener et al., 2016).

Methodology

Method

This study utilised a qualitative multiple-case research design. Qualitative, multiple-case research investigates the problems under study within their own contextual settings (Yin, 2014; Zainal, 2007). The research design also allows for a comprehensive and thorough understanding of the issues at hand by going beyond quantitative statistical results. It enables the examination of a current real-life phenomena through detailed contextual analysis of a limited number of conditions or settings, and their relationships (Zainal, 2007). The study was carried out over a period of five weeks (see Table 1.0). Throughout the duration of the five-week study, the participants were required to fulfil the writing tasks, which entailed completing three distinct in-class writing assignments with varying prompts. The languaging

task application was applied to the teacher CF during Weeks 2 and 4. Table 1.0 shows the study timeline.

Table 1.0

The Study Timeline

Time	Data Collected	Languaging
Week 1	In-class writing task 1	
Week 2	Comprehensive direct CF + languaging	X
Week 3	In-class writing task 2	
Week 4	Comprehensive direct CF + languaging	X
Week 5	In-class writing task 3	

The study utilised prompts that were modified from the textbook employed in the students' course, namely Q: Skills for Success-Reading and Writing 3 (Ward et al., 2015). The participants were instructed to write a five-paragraph essay during each writing session, following the given prompts. Table 1.1 displays the prompts corresponding to each writing task.

Table 1.1

The Writing Tasks' Prompts

Writing Task	Week	Prompt
Essay 1	1	Write a five-paragraph essay about your favourite person.
Essay 2	3	Write a five-paragraph essay describing the unpleasant experience you have faced in life
New Essay	5	Choose the topic below and write a five-paragraph essay on the chosen topic. a. Your favorite person b. The unfavourable encounter you experienced in life

The researchers did a preliminary study on the writing tasks and the languaging task prior to the real in-class writing task essay 1 to assess the practicality of the prompts used in the writing tasks and the instructions for the languaging activity. In the study, the researchers instructed the participants to analyse the teacher CF in order to determine if the languaging task had resulted in improved writing accuracy.

The Participants

25 L2 learners participated in this study. At the time of the study, the learners took the Reading and Writing in English course at one of the local universities in East Malaysia. The participants were selected based on purposive opportunistic sampling because they were actively participated in receiving teacher CF for their writing tasks as they enrolled in the Reading and Writing in English course for that semester. They could serve as the most exemplary sample to illustrate the impact of languaging on the effectiveness of teacher CF on the writing accuracy of L2 students with limited proficiency. The participants obtained MUET Bands 2 and 3. The Malaysian University English Test (MUET) is an assessment of English language competency conducted by the Malaysian Examination Council (MEC) for Malaysian students aspiring to enrol in an undergraduate programme at a local university. During the

MUET examination, students are assessed on their proficiency in four essential skills: speaking, writing, listening, and reading. The cumulative score achieved in the MUET examination will define the students' MUET band, which can range from Band 1 (indicating the lowest level of skill) to Band 6 (indicating the highest level of proficiency). The study included participants who achieved MUET Bands 2 and 3. These participants were characterised as having limited fluency and proficiency in the English language. They struggled to use the language effectively, made frequent grammatical errors, had a limited understanding of the language, and had limited ability to function in English (MUET, 2015). MUET Bands 2 and 3 correspond to CEFR A1 and CEFR A2, respectively, or IELTS Bands 2 (intermittent user) and 3 (very limited user).

The Instrument

Writing tasks were the instrument utilised in this study. The study examined the writing tasks to assess their level of writing accuracy. An error ratio was utilised to quantify the overall accuracy of writing. This assessment tool was employed to examine the efficacy of CF, as documented in the works of Chandler (2003), Karim (2013), Truscott et al. (2008), and van Beuningen et al. (2012). The error ratio, which quantifies the overall accuracy of writing texts, is calculated by dividing the total number of errors by the total amount of words written. The outcome is subsequently multiplied by 100. The 100-word ratio is employed to calculate the percentage of errors in students' essays. It represents the error rates per 100 words. The errors in this study encompass both grammatical and non-grammatical errors. The accuracy rate of errors in the writing tasks was computed and compared based on other research that examined the impact of teacher CF on the grammatical and non-grammatical accuracy of L2 writings (see Karim, 2013; van Beuningen et al., 2011). Table 1.2 displays the coding system for both the grammatical and non-grammatical errors.

Table 1.2

Coding System for the Errors Found in Writing Tasks

Error Code	Description
VT	Verb tense is incorrect
VF	Verb phrase formation is incorrect
WF	Word form (part of speech) is incorrect
ART	Article is missing
PL	Noun plural marker is missing, unnecessary or incorrect
AGR	Subject and verb do not agree in number (singular/plural form)
PREP	Wrong preposition
WO	Word order in a sentence is incorrect
WW	Wrong word (meaning is incorrect for sentence)
WC	Word choice (use of the unsuitable word)
COM	Comma missing or unnecessary
SP	Spelling error
AP	Apostrophe (") missing or unnecessary
SS	Sentence structure error
MW	Missing word(s) in the sentence

REF	Pronoun reference vague or unclear
PRO	Pronoun used is incorrect for the sentence
RO	Run-on sentence (two or more sentences incorrectly joined)
CS	Comma splice (two sentences joined only with a comma)
FRAG	Sentence fragment (incomplete sentence)

The Wilcoxon signed-rank test in SPSS was used to assess the disparities in error ratios among the participants' essays in different writing tasks. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test is a non-parametric statistical test employed to analyse repeated measures data in which participants are evaluated on more than two occasions or situations. The test was administered to measure the notable variations in the error ratio of the participants' writing tasks on different occasions. Specifically, the writing tasks 1, 2, and 3 were conducted at different times: Writing Task 1 (WT1) in Week 1, Writing Task 2 (WT2) in Week 3, and Writing Task 3 (WT3) in Week 5 (see Table 1.1). The variations in the participants' writing error ratio will ascertain whether the implementation of the teacher CF through languaging impacts the participants' writing accuracy in the long run. Furthermore, this study involved analysing the descriptive statistics of the participants' total errors (including the least and maximum number of errors) and the total number of words (including the minimum and maximum number of words) for each writing task using SPSS. These statistics were then compared manually. To streamline the process of counting errors in each category, a coding system was utilised (refer to Table 1.2). This coding system was previously employed in the study conducted by Ferris et al. (2013).

The study also calculated the intra-rater and inter-rater reliability to ensure consistency in executing the evaluation methods used to analyse the participants' writing texts. To assess the consistency of the scoring, a second rater, who was a native English speaker, reevaluated some of the participants' writings following the first scoring and analysis conducted by the first rater. Subsequently, another evaluator would personally assess some of the participants' writings, thereby guaranteeing a high level of inter-rater reliability. The raters possess both a bachelor's degree and a master's degree in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) and have accumulated over five years of experience in teaching English language proficiency.

Results

Table 1.3 displays the mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) of the number of words, total errors, and error ratio among the participants (N=25).

Table 1.3

Mean and SD for the Number of Words, Total Errors and Error Ratio (N=25) of the Participants

	Writing Task 1 (WT1)		Writing Task 2 (WT2)		Writing Task 3 (WT3)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Words	199.48	69.792	201.68	50.586	236.56	82.265
Total Errors	25.60	10.344	25.76	11.054	17.24	9.139
Error Ratio	2.16	0.800	2.12	0.781	2.12	0.781

Table 1.3 illustrates that the participants' WT1 had a mean of 199.48 words produced, with a standard deviation (SD) of 69.792. The total error detected was 25.60, with an SD of 10.344. The error ratio of WT1 was 2.16, with an SD of 0.800. In the WT2 task, the average number of words produced was 201.68 with a standard deviation of 50.586. The total error for this task was 25.76 with a standard deviation of 11.054. The average error ratio of WT2 was 2.12 (SD=0.781), which showed a modest increase compared to the error ratio in WT1. The average word count in WT3 increased from 201.68 (SD=50.586) in WT2 to 236.56 (SD=82.265). The error ratio of WT3, however, remained unchanged at 2.12 (SD=0.781). It is possible that this was because the average word count in WT3, specifically 236.56, was higher than the average word count in WT2. The increase in the quantity of words generated in WT3 may have influenced the error ratio.

Table 1.4 presents the range of total words and errors for each writing task completed by the 25 participants.

Table 1.4

The Minimum and Maximum Number of Words and Total Errors (N=25) for the TG

Writing Task 1 (WT1)			Writing Task 2 (WT2)		Writing Task 3 (WT3)	
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max
Words	110	448	120	330	126	516
Total Errors	9	55	10	56	7	46

Table 1.4 displays the outcomes of the writing tasks completed by the participants. The WT1 had a minimum of 110 words and a maximum of 448 words. In contrast, the WT2 started with a minimum of 120 words and climbed to 126 words in the WT3. The WT2 had a maximum total word count of 330, which is lower than the maximum total word count of 448 in WT1. Nevertheless, the maximum cumulative word count in the WT3 has risen to 516 words. The aggregate number of errors in the participants' writing activities exhibits incongruous outcomes. The total number of errors in the WT2 increased to a minimum of ten errors and a maximum of 56 errors, whereas in the WT1, the minimum number of errors was nine and the highest was 55. The overall error count in the WT3 was reduced to a minimum of seven errors and a maximum of 46 errors.

The Wilcoxon signed-rank test was employed to ascertain whether the inclusion of languaging in the teacher CF has an impact on the writing accuracy of the participants' new writing texts (WT2 and WT3). The Wilcoxon signed-rank test was employed to examine any differences in scores when the same participants are exposed to multiple conditions. To see the differences, the researchers conducted a comparison of the following combinations:

- a. Total Error: WT1to WT2
WT1 to WT3
WT2 to WT3
- b. Total Words: WT1to WT2
WT1 to WT3
WT2 to WT3
- c. Error Ratio: WT1to WT2
WT1 to WT3

WT2 to WT3

The results of the Wilcoxon signed-rank test of the participants are displayed in Table 1.5.

Table 1.5
Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test for the Total Error, Total Words and Error Ratio of the Participants' Writing Tasks

	Total Error WT2 – Total Error WT1	Total Error WT3 – Total Error WT1	Total Error WT3 – Total Error WT2
Z	-0.543	-2.901	-2.784
Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)	0.587	0.004	0.005
	Total Words WT2 – Total Error WT1	Total Words WT3 – Total Error WT1	Total Words WT3 – Total Error WT2
Z	-1.129	-2.328	-1.957
Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)	0.259	0.020	0.050
	Total Error Ratio WT2 – Total Error WT1	Total Error Ratio WT3 – Total Error WT1	Total Error Ratio WT3 – Total Error WT2
Z	-0.135	-3.829	-4.014
Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)	0.893	0.000	0.000

Table 1.5 displays the results of the Wilcoxon signed-rank test conducted on the writing of the participants. The Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were performed using a Bonferroni correction, with a significance threshold set at $p < 0.017$. The median (interquartile range) total errors for WT1, WT2, and WT3 were 23.00 (19 to 30.50), 23.00 (17 to 31.50), and 11.00 (11.00 to 21.50), respectively. There was no statistically significant difference in the total errors seen throughout the running trials of WT1 and WT2 ($Z = -0.543$, $p = 0.587$). Nevertheless, there was a noteworthy decrease in the overall number of errors observed in the WT1 and WT3 ($Z = -2.901$, $p = 0.004$) as well as the WT2 and WT3 ($Z = -2.784$, $p = 0.005$) trials. The total amount of words in writing for this group can be summarised as follows: the median (interquartile range) total words for WT1, WT2, and WT3 were 194 (156 to 220.50), 200 (166 to 231), and 225 (172.50 to 284.50), respectively. However, the participants' WT1 and WT2 trials did not show a significant decrease in the overall number of words ($Z = -1.129$, $p = 0.259$). Furthermore, there was no notable disparity in the overall word count between WT1 and WT3 ($Z = -2.328$, $p = 0.020$) as well as WT2 and WT3 ($Z = -1.957$, $p = 0.050$) during the running trials. The error ratio for the participants' WT1, WT2, and WT3 was calculated as the median (interquartile range) and found to be 13.30 (10.75 to 15.95), 12.70 (9.35 to 14.65), and 6.7 (5.6 to 9.4), respectively. According to the Wilcoxon signed-rank test, there was no statistically significant difference in the error ratio between the participants' WT1 and WT2 ($Z = -0.467$, $p = 0.641$). Nevertheless, there was a notable disparity in the error ratio between WT1 and WT3 ($Z = -3.491$, $p = 0.000$) as well as between WT2 and WT3 ($Z = -3.337$, $p = 0.001$) during the running trials.

According to the data presented in Tables 1.3 and 1.4, it appears that the participants' writing

has demonstrated improvement in terms of both the total number of errors and the ratio of errors. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test revealed a statistically significant enhancement in the total number of errors.

- a. a significant improvement in the number of total errors and the error ratio in the WT3 of the participants' writing when compared to the total number of errors found in the WT1
- b. a significant improvement in the number of total errors and the error ratio in the WT3 of the participants' writing when compared to the total number of errors found in the WT2

Thus, to what extent does the provision of languaging on teacher CF of the writing texts facilitate the low proficiency L2 learners' writing? The findings seem to show that the provision of languaging on teacher CF of the writing texts does facilitate the writing of low proficiency L2 learners positively.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of utilizing languaging as a supplemental pedagogical strategy to teacher corrective feedback (CF) on the writing accuracy of L2 learners with low proficiency. The data collection process involved the use of writing tasks and languaging, with a total of 25 L2 learners participating in the study. The findings revealed that the provision of languaging on the teacher CF of the writing tasks had a positive impact on the writing accuracy of learners with low proficiency. As a result, it facilitated the production of more accurate writing by the low-proficiency learners.

The results of this study are consistent with the findings of previous research on the effect of mediational tools, such as languaging, in the provision and processing of teacher CF. These studies have demonstrated that L2 learners' writing accuracy can be significantly improved through the use of such tools (see Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener et al., 2008; Bitchener et al., 2005; Ellis et al., 2008; Suzuki, 2009a, 2009b, 2012; Moradian et al., 2017). The application of languaging on teacher CF has facilitated the participants' assimilation of the grammar and writing rules of the English language, leading to a significant reduction or complete elimination of errors in their written work.

The study has also highlighted the importance of teacher CF, particularly for low-proficiency L2 learners, despite Truscott's opposition to the implementation of CF in L2 writing classes. Low-proficiency L2 learners require CF from their teachers to resolve language-related issues, whether they are grammatical or non-grammatical. In accordance with Sociocultural Theory (SCT), the social interaction between a novice (low-proficiency L2 learners) and an expert (L2 teacher) facilitates the development of learners' L2 skills. This social interaction also functions as a mediational tool or assistance that an L2 teacher can provide to low-proficiency L2 learners. The study employed languaging as a mediational tool or form of assistance to improve the effectiveness of teacher CF, and the findings suggest that the use of languaging had a notable impact on enhancing the writing accuracy of L2 learners with low proficiency.

Overall, the application of languaging in the provision and processing of teacher CF for low-proficiency L2 learners' writing has a favourable impact on the accuracy of their subsequent

writing. However, the study's conclusions are limited by the small sample size. Future studies should employ larger and more representative samples, as well as additional research instruments, to corroborate the findings and draw more robust conclusions.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the teachers involved in the study and the participants for their willingness to participate in the study.

References

- Abd Rahim, S. & Jaganathan, P. (2022). Linguaging, corrective feedback, and writing accuracy among low proficiency l2 learners. *Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, 4(1), 1-14.
- Al Ajmi, A. A. S. & Holi Ali, H. I. (2014). Collaborative writing group assignments in an EFL/ESL classroom. *English Linguistics Research*, 3(2), 1-17.
- Arnold, E. (2008). Measurements and perceptions of writing development: Omani academic writers of English. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 42-55.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 102-118.
- Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 409-431.
- Bitchener, J. & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group
- Bitchener, J. & Storch, N. (2016). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development*. Multilingual Matters.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-296. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9)
- Ellis, R. Sheen, Y., Murakami, M. & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36, 353-371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001>
- Ene, E. & Kosobucki, V. (2016). Rubrics and corrective feedback in ESL writing: A longitudinal case study of an L2 writer. *Assessing Writing*, 30, 3-20.
- Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 181-201. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490>
- Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 307-329.
- Forrester, B. (2014, September). *Student responses to written corrective feedback*. Paper presented at ASILE Conference 2014, Bali, Indonesia. <http://www.ialf.edu/asile/BintariForrester-studentResponsestoWrittenCorrectiveFeedback.pdf>
- Ganapathy, M., Tan, D. A. L., & Phan, J. (2020). Students' perceptions of teachers' written corrective feedback in the Malaysian ESL classroom. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 17(2), 103-136.
- Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing: an introduction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 1-18). Cambridge University Press.

- Jerry, C., Mohd Jan, J., & Samuel, M. (2013). Improving students' writing: Why is there a need for teacher feedback. *Malaysian Journal of Languages and Linguistics*, 2, 44-55.
- Jonsson, A. (2012). Facilitating productive use of feedback in higher education. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14(1), 63-76. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1469787412467125>
- Karim, K. (2013). *The effects of direct and indirect written corrective feedback (CF) on English-as-a-second-language (ESL) students' revision accuracy and writing skills* [Unpublished PhD Thesis]. University of Victoria.
- Kassim, A. & Ng, L. L. (2014a). Investigating the efficacy of focused and unfocused corrective feedback on the accurate use of prepositions in written work. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 119-130.
- Kassim, A. & Ng, L. L. (2014b). The roles of collaborative dialogue in enhancing written corrective feedback efficacy. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 10(1), 16-30.
- Khorasani, M. R., & Sadzadeh, A. (2015). The effect of direct and peer feedback on accuracy of EFL learners' written performance. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 5(2), 296-308.
- Kim, S. (2012). Measuring linguistic accuracy in an EFL writing class: an electronic communication channel. *Linguistic Research*, 29(3), 665-688.
- Knouzi, I., Swain, M., Lapkin, S. & Brooks, L. (2010). Self-scaffolding mediated by languaging: Microgenetic analysis of high and low performance. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 23-49.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. D. (1984). *Writing, research, theory and applications*. Pergamon Press.
- Lee, I. (2013). Research into practice: Written corrective feedback. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 108-119.
- Moradian, M. R., Miri, M., & Nasab, M. H. (2017). Contribution of written languaging to enhancing the efficiency of written corrective feedback. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 27(2), 406-421. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12138>
- Negueruela, E. (2008). Revolutionary pedagogies: learning that leads (to) second language development. In J.P. Lantolf and ME Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural Theory and the Teaching of Second Languages* (pp. 189-227). Equinox.
- Razali, R. & Jupri, R. (2014). Exploring teacher written corrective feedback and student revisions on ESL students' writing. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 19(5), 63-70.
- Santa, T. (2006). *Dead letters: error in composition, 1873-2004*. Hampton Press.
- Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 38-62.
- Suzuki, W. (2009a). *Languaging, direct correction and second language writing: Japanese university students of English*. [Unpublished PhD Thesis]. University of Toronto.
- Suzuki, W. (2009b). Improving Japanese university students' second language writing accuracy: Effects of languaging. *Annual Review of English Education in Japan*, 20, 81-90.
- Suzuki, W. (2012). Written languaging, direct correction, and second language writing revision. *Language Learning*, 62(4), 1110-1133. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00720.x>

- Swain, M. (2006a). Language, agency and collaboration in advanced second language learning. In H. Byrnes (ed.), *Advanced Language Learning: The Contributions of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95-108). Continuum.
- Swain, M. (2011). Cognitive and affective enhancement among older adult: The role of language. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36(1), 4-19.
- Swain, M., Kinnear, P. & Steinman, L. (2011). *Sociocultural theory in second language education: an introduction through narratives (1st Ed)*. Multilingual Matters.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369.
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "the case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes": a response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 111-122.
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 255-272.
- Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. Y. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 292-305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.05.003>
- Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning*, 62, 1-41.
- Ward, C. S., & Gramer, M. F. (2015). *Q: Skills for success, reading and writing*. Oxford University Press.
- Watanabe, Y. (2014). *Collaborative and independent writing: Japanese university English learners'*
- Williams, J. G. (2003). Providing feedback on ESL students' written assignments. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 9(10), 1-5.
- Wolfe-Quintero, K., Inagaki, S., & Kim, H.Y. (1998). *Second language development in writing: Measures of fluency, accuracy, and complexity* (Tech. Report No. 17). University of Hawaii Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case Study Research: design and methods (5th ed.)*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Zainal, Z. (2007). Case study as a research method. *Jurnal Kemanusiaan*, 9, 1-6.