



Faculty members' strategies to foster students' learning engagement in writing class

Nurmalinda Maharani Farizka^{1*}, Bambang Yudi Cahyono²

^{1,2} English Department, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

* Email: nurmalindamaharani@gmail.com (corresponding author)

Article history: Received: 3 January 2021

Available online: 30 March 2021

Accepted: 29 March 2021

Published regularly: March 2021

Abstract

Fostering students' learning engagement plays a crucial role in higher education institutions. It is essential to assist students' learning best, satisfaction, and preferred faculty members' teaching strategies. The purpose of this study was to find out the faculty members' strategies by mapping out the students' perceptions of their experiences in writing classes with highly-engaging environments. Thirty participants from undergraduate students of English Language Teaching (ELT) at five state universities in Malang, Indonesia were selected purposively. All participants identified themselves as active students as they already had sophisticated results in the writing classes. Hence, the researchers employed a Likert scale questionnaire and semi-structured interview guide in collecting the data. The study revealed that the learning management system, materials, discussion, and feedback sections were rated highly as the most common activities during the teaching and learning of writing skills. Almost all of the participants mentioned confidently that those fundamental activities that boosted their participation resulted in positive learning engagement. Specifically, the researchers found that the faculty members' indirect learning strategy that specified only on the social learning strategies can foster students' engagement well. In highlight, this study offers teaching reflections by spotlighting various engagement strategies implemented in the writing class circumstances.

Keywords: learning strategies; learning engagement; writing class

To cite this article: Farizka, N. M., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2021). Faculty members' strategies to foster students' learning engagement in writing class. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 11(1), 175-196. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v11i1.2478>

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v11i1.2478>



Copyright © 2021 THE AUTHOR(S). This article is distributed under a *Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International* license.

Introduction

In recent years, higher education institutions have shown a persistent establishment with fostering students' learning engagement by introducing substantial innovative strategies that offer new ways of transferring new knowledge. As cited in "student engagement literature review" by Trowler (2018), student engagement and self-involvement in learning has become the most recent focus of attention among those who contribute to improving the quality of teaching and learning at higher educational levels. The fundamental rationale behind those statements, Martin and Bolliger's (2018) research study exclusively discovered that student engagement helps to reduce a sense of vulnerability, boost interest in learning, increase student satisfaction levels, and enhance student performance that reflects on the student academic and writing performance. In other words, it informs and offers a consequential glimpse of the importance of engagement strategies at the university educational levels (Delfino, 2019; Parsons et al., 2014).

In the process of teaching writing, it is essential for faculty members to foster students' engagement regarding a fundamental issue that writing class in general might determine students' apathy and passiveness. It happens since the process of writing itself only focuses on how to write an essay well without involving students' active participation in a meaningful context (Akbari et al., 2016; Lin & Huang, 2018; Richards & Renandya, 2002). Besides, Brown and Heekyeong (2015) tried to point out that one of the principles for teaching writing skills is that all the processes-oriented to writing should emphasize the use of interactive engagement and focus on the student-centered processes as well. Consequently, faculty members are required to create meaningful environments where students feel stimulated, encouraged, and motivated to improve their writing performance as the result of the learning engagement.

In order to create meaningful environments, faculty members need language learning strategies as specific actions to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations (Oxford, 1990). According to Oxford (1990), language learning strategies are divided into two categories: direct and indirect strategies. Direct strategies are divided into (a) memory strategies for remembering and retrieving new information, (b) cognitive strategies for understanding and producing language, and (c) compensation strategies for using language despite the knowledge gap. Likewise, indirect strategies are separated into (a) metacognitive strategies for planning and coordinating the learning process, (b) effective strategies for regulating emotion while learning, and (c) social strategies for learning with others.

Besides, to assist students' involvement, faculty members need to comprehend the theoretical basis of learning engagement. It derives from Bloom's (1959) idea in which the learning engagement refers to three major dimensions: behavioral engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement. According to Bloom (1959), those three indicators are able to help faculty members observe the encouragement of their students' learning engagement. It is also justified as the indicators of how students can interpret their active participation and affection concerning the process of learning. In particular, behavioral engagement refers to students who are behaviorally engaged with behavioral norms, such as attendance and involvement. Besides, emotional engagement refers to students who engage emotionally that would be experienced in affective reactions such as interest or enjoyment. Then, cognitive engagement refers to the cognitively engaged students that would seek to go beyond the requirements and would relish the challenge.

Many studies showed the emergence of the importance of language learning engagement in writing class circumstances. A survey study at a university in the South of England by Masika and Jones (2016) revealed that student belonging and engagement for university students were substantial to construct their positive feelings during learning. By investigating the students' perceptions, both of the researchers reported that many students who were facilitated and assisted exclusively with the right track of accomplishment would intentionally improve their positive learning involvement. Some of the justifications were able to develop a sense of belonging, gaining strong confidence, and constructing their self-reflection. The result was in line with Abas' (2015) research study that noticing some right assistance and strategy can boost the quality of students' academic performance. He noted that the

educators' main role in fostering learning through students' engagement was also delivering substantial effect to influence the students' motivation to learn something new. The studies suggested further researchers continue the prior studies since the discoveries did not cover all of the three dimensions of language learning strategies.

Because of many positive results, many researchers would be on the alert to do some further studies. Engaging students with many valuable exposures during learning can maximize students' academic performance (Lee, 2014; Pourmousavi & Mohamadi Zenouzagh, 2020; Wei & Cao, 2020; Yu & Hu, 2017). According to their research studies, establishing valuable feedback was a fundamental step to facilitate the students with the right assistance in writing classes. Providing feedback is one of the ways to foster students' learning engagement in writing classes (Rouhi et al., 2020; Vahedi et al., 2019; Zheng & Yu, 2018). By having some feedback sections with the students, they were able to consult and share their ideas that affected their positive learning engagement by feeling motivated in correcting their ideas, errors and showing their preferences to convince their ideas to the faculty members. Feedback can build a good relationship between faculty members and students (Wonglorsaichon et al., 2014; Zhang & Hyland, 2018). The discoveries uncovered other activities except for feedback sections. They recommended further studies will be finding out more activities that might be obtained by considering participants' perceptions and preferences.

Recently, faculty members' roles and strategies were assigned as the main fundamental circumstances in the writing class environment since they can improve students' motivation (Lee & Yu, 2017; Martin, 2012; Yin, 2018; Yu, 2019). Subsequently, many researchers have tried and worked on faculty member strategies and students' learning engagement in writing class-sections. One of the justifications is a study by Martin and Bolliger (2018) on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. This survey-based research study examined students' perceptions of various engagement strategies offered by the educators. The result revealed and noted down that structured-discussions by including guiding questions and/or prompts to deepen their understanding of the content was rated as one of the very important engagement aspects that a faculty member should use. This is because the detailed activities can boost their motivation in the writing class circumstances. As mentioned in a limitation section, the findings only happened in online classroom settings. It might open some further studies to investigate in a real writing class circumstances to differ the findings.

Moreover, previous research studies conducted by Baranova et al. (2019), Bond et al. (2020), and Tai et al. (2019) made a clear justification of the learning engagement in the process of writing. All the researchers focused on investigating students' learning engagement by using a variety of material sources through e-learning circumstances. In highlight, after conducting the evaluation, they reported that students were interested in the process of writing and felt more confident and experienced after the e-learning course ended. Clearly, the researchers approved a substantial idea that after being stimulated with many assistance sources, students' learning engagement played an influential role as resulted in highly-satisfied outcomes which impacted students' writing performance as well as achievement. Providing some supporting materials for students can help them feel stimulated as their behavioral engagement is improved significantly (Fredricks et al., 2004). The discoveries suggested further researchers find other importance of a variety of material sources and the example of the materials.

Franklin and Harrington (2019) discovered the importance of combinations between a faculty member and students' roles in today's classroom. Both researchers stressed that in the 21st century, a faculty member had to plan lessons to maximize engagement and promote autonomy where students may choose excellence and mastery as their educational outcomes. In brief, the research result can be summarized into short information in that successful faculty members and students' classroom collaborations were able to create an interesting as well as a meaningful atmosphere to foster students' enthusiasm and motivation in the process of writing. This is in line with Payne's (2014) research finding that students' motivation and connectedness can be easily built when they had many collaborative exposures in the process of learning. As written in a limitation part, the studies did not involve students' preferences to describe the characteristics of the faculty members' strategies to foster their motivation in learning.

Lee (2014) and Rajabalee et al. (2019) conducted studies investigating students' learning engagement and the impact on their academic performance in the process of learning. Students' behavioral engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement can exclusively influence their ability to master something if they were given and stimulated with the right assistance. The result revealed a significant positive correlation between students' learning engagement and their academic performance. The researchers noted that building a good relationship between the faculty members or instructors and the students will lead to highly-engaging circumstances in the process of

teaching and learning. The studies suggested further researchers find out students' perceptions within the same major since the discoveries did not rely on the same major.

The substantial review of some studies above encouraged the researchers to investigate the faculty members' strategies to foster students' learning engagement in writing class. This is due to some reasons that some limitations exclusively found in the previous researchers' findings, and this needs further discovery and clear significance as well. To sum up, within all the previous researchers' findings, there are some differences in research contexts between the prior studies mentioned and the present study. In contrast with this study that involves undergraduate students at state universities in Malang, the researchers focus more only on the English education major. Hence, the previous studies did not employ English education majors, but they involved ESP class in Petersburg, Polytechnic University, first-year Business Management students, and others involved students' graduate programs at more than five universities across the United States.

Hence, unlike the previous studies that only focused on one/specific dimension of learning engagement theory, this survey-based study focuses on Bloom's three dimensions as the fundamental theory to assert students' learning engagement. Additionally, the review of some previous studies established faculty members' strategies without involving a specific assumption or ideas to be proved or justified. Some of them reported the learning strategies by showing some common activities involved in the process of learning. On the other hand, this study stresses Oxford's (1990) learning strategies as the primary theory to be considered and justified. Therefore, in collecting and investigating some detailed information, the present study determined and reported faculty members' strategies through Oxford's (1990) fundamental strategies.

From the research gaps mentioned above, exploring faculty member strategies to foster students' learning engagement in writing class is essential. It will employ a new theory of learning strategies by mapping out the whole population of some students' perceptions about writing classes with highly-engaging environments. Based on the background mentioned, the present study aimed to answer this research question, "What are the common characteristics of faculty members' strategies to foster undergraduate students' learning engagement in writing class?" Therefore, the result of the present study

would be beneficial for reflecting faculty members' awareness of the concept of learning engagement in writing class circumstances.

Method

Research design

The study used a survey research design to find out the common characteristics of faculty members' strategies to foster undergraduate students' learning engagement in writing classes by exploring the students' perceptions of their experience in writing classes with highly-engaging environments. This study involved some representative students from different universities as the participants. This is in line with Latief's (2019) statement that survey research design involves a precise sample to be selected from a population. It is used to identify trends in opinions, attitudes, and characteristics of a large group of people (Creswell, 2012).

Participants

The researchers employed a purposive sampling method that involved thirty students from undergraduate students of English Language Teaching (ELT) at five state universities in Malang, Indonesia. The demographic information of the research participants is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The demographic information of the research participants

Items	Variable	Sub-variable(s)	Percentage (%)
1	Gender	Female	53.3
		Male	46.7
2	Semester	4	100
3	Affiliation	Universitas Negeri Malang	23.3
		Universitas Brawijaya	16.7
		Universitas Islam Malang	16.7
		Universitas Maulana Malik Ibrahim	23.3
		Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang	20
4	Writing course name	Argumentative writing	30
		Advance writing	36.7
		Writing 4	33.3
5	Writing score result	A	76.7
		A-	23.3

Specifically, the participants were selected based on their writing ability by having "very good to excellent" writing scores as they had already passed all of the writing courses. In highlight, more than half of the participants were

female (53.3%), while the rest (46.7%) were male students. All participants identified themselves as active students, having sophisticated results in the writing classes with highly-engaging environments.

There were five procedures for finding out the research participants. They were as follows: first, the researchers gained access to the sample by asking for permission from the participants in each university chosen in Malang, East Java, Indonesia. Second, the researchers waited for the participants' willingness and availability to accept it or reject it. Third, if the participants allowed the researchers to distribute the form via Google Forms, the researchers selected the participants regarding the criteria mentioned. Forth, the researcher allowed the participants to answer the items. Fifth, the researcher collected the answers and interpreted the result of the forms.

Data collection

The researchers collected the data through a questionnaire and an interview guide. The questionnaire was employed to collect some information on the level of students' learning engagement and the factors affecting their learning engagement through faculty members' strategies used in the writing class. The questionnaire was adapted from the previous studies by Baranova et al. (2019), Franklin and Harrington (2019), and Martin and Bolliger (2018). It consisted of 15 Likert scale items that contained some activities that might be implemented by the faculty members in the process of writing section (see Table 2). Afterward, the Likert scale had 5 scoring criteria: never (1), rarely (2), every once in a while (3), sometimes (4), and almost always (5).

To maintain and authenticate the questionnaire's correctness, the researchers collaborated with an expert in the validation process before the distribution of the questionnaire. The validator is a faculty member who experts on the writing skills and language learning strategies from the Graduate Program in English Language Teaching (ELT) of Universitas Negeri Malang.

Besides, the interview guide consisted of 10 questions as a follow-up activity after filling out the questionnaire (see Appendix 1). It made something clear about some information collected that potentially can be investigated more in-depth by the researchers. The process of interviewing the participants was done by doing a phone interview. The researchers randomly choose some of the participants to be interviewed as they had already filled the forms completely. Hence, all participants could clarify their perceptions, describe the writing classroom circumstances, tell the faculty members' strategies to foster

students' learning engagement, and give some further recommendations for the coming up writing classes.

Table 2. Breakdown of the 15 Likert scale items

Items	Activities	Scale range					Category
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Students are permitted to suggest the activities in a course outline that is accessible in the writing course.						
2	Students are able to ask, suggest and interact with faculty members during their presentations.						
3	Students are advised to search and choose the appropriate materials (e.g. chapters, articles, books) based on their interests and preferences.						
4	Students are able to show their choices and preferences in selecting the references of writing in the process of writing production.						
5	Students are given a rubric for considering their choices of references based on their interests.						
6	Students are permitted to convince their ideas through alternative online resources to dig and explore topics in more depth.						
7	Students are guided to work meaningfully by using 'chosen' references to complete their writing.						
8	The faculty member creates an online writing forum for students (ex; WhatsApp group) to discuss the writing difficulties.						
9	Students are asked to do a group discussion instead of only individual writing activity before they start to produce their writing.						
10	Discussions are organized with leading questions and/or prompts to enhance their interpretation of the topic.						
11	Students do peer-review or group-review classmates' work.						
12	Students are required to give feedback on students' writing products based on their interests.						
13	The feedback session is organized with guiding questions and/or prompts to enhance their interpretation of the topic.						
14	The faculty member provides feedback using						

	various modalities (e.g., text, recommended resources).
15	The faculty member reacts to students' achievement relates to the writing production (e.g., giving sign/emoticon to show the compliment).

Data analysis

The data collected were analyzed through five procedures. First, the researchers processed the data manually by looking at the scale range and the graphic percentage that has been facilitated and provided by the Google Forms platform features. The researchers counted each Means (M) of the items in the questionnaire. Second, the researchers categorized the data collection based on their categories of the scale range accumulation (see Table 3).

Table 3. Scale range accumulation

Means (M)	Categories
0-1.0	Never
1.1-2.0	Rarely
2.1-3.0	Every once in a while
3.1-4.0	Sometimes
4.1-5.0	Almost always

Third, the researchers decided the proper activities categorized "almost always" and "sometimes" as preferred activities. It indicated the highest points of the scale range accumulation to represent students' positive learning engagement in writing classes. Forth, the researchers contacted the participants to interview them as a follow-up activity. It aimed to know the rationale behind the selection and check the proper activities chosen whether they were rated as "highly engaged" or not to represent the participants' level of positive learning engagement. Fifth, the researchers transcribed and describing the participants' utterances.

Findings

To find out the common characteristics of faculty members' strategies to foster undergraduate students' learning engagement in writing class, the researchers defined some substantial activities mentioned by the participants. The rationale behind its proceeding, discovering some activities that encouraged students' positive engagement, made it easier for the researchers to analyze the faculty members' strategies. Consequently, the researchers only interpreted and

stressed the ten activities rated highly as the most common activities in the process of teaching and learning writing. The ten proper activities mentioned by the participants were classified into four main categories: learning management system, materials, discussion, and feedback sections.

Learning management system

In determining the best activities to be carried out during one semester, faculty members' way to offer some negotiations and discussions that involved all students in a class can establish students' learning engagement (see Table 4).

Table 4. Learning management system section

Items	Activities	Means (M)	Category
1	Students are able to ask, suggest and interact with faculty members during their presentations.	4.7	Almost always
2	Students are advised to search and choose the appropriate materials (e.g., chapters, articles, books) based on their interests and preferences.	4.8	Almost always

As shown in Table 4, students mentioned that the two activities were important as they rated highly engaged to represent the level of their positive engagement in learning management systems. The terms of association can foster their learning engagement in the process of writing. In each meeting, the faculty members' decision to give students options on whether they can continue or ask for some reviews of the previous meeting lessons can affect students' motivation to learn. Students would be very happy and enjoy the process of learning since they are always invited to share their difficulties, express their common interest, or state some weak points which needed to be reviewed or revised by the faculty members. As a result of interpreting the association in the learning management system, a participant said:

...our writing projects are consistent with good writing principles; grammar, originality, being more scientific, etc. (P1)

Another participant said:

He usually tries to discuss material that we don't understand. We love that discussion. (P3)

It made clear that the students resulted in excellent results at the end of the writing classes sections. Faculty members' way of associating themselves with their students affected the students' ability to learn best. It was known from their utterances where their writing ability was significantly improved when

they should apply their knowledge in a writing task or a writing project. They could write it well based on the writing principles that the faculty members had explained.

Materials

Before students had a writing activity section, faculty members would be responsible for guiding and giving some directions to be followed by students. It was done by equalizing the chosen materials from the faculty members and the students themselves. In other words, they received knowledge from the faculty members' presentations and were given a chance to search for some references that may lead them to explore their self-interest and attention to their preparation in the writing production processes (see Table 5).

Table 5. Materials section

Items	Activities	Means (M)	Category
3	Students are able to show their choices and preferences in selecting the references of writing in the process of writing production.	4.5	Almost always
4	Students are permitted to support their ideas through alternative online resources to dig and explore topics in more depth.	4.7	Almost always
5	Students are guided to work meaningfully by using 'chosen' references to complete their writing.	4.7	Almost always

In this case, the participants rated highly engaged to represent the level of their learning engagement regarding the three activities mentioned. The choices of materials were selected as very important by the students as they described the process of learning would be so much meaningful and useful. Students had so much fun in representing their preferences in selecting references, using optional online resources, and completing their writing based on their self-interests. Some of the students mentioned and shared their best supporting materials that were allowed by the faculty members. They were as follows:

Everyday Arguments: A Guide to Writing and Reading Effective Arguments by Katherine Mayberry and *A Guide to Argumentative Research Writing and Thinking: Overcoming Challenges* by Arnold Wentzel. Those are books I used to support my writing skills. (P7)

I usually take more materials from articles on the Internet. (P4)

YouTube and any kinds of writing textbooks. (P2)

It assumed that the students tended to actively participate in writing classes where they could bring their preferences in the process of selecting materials. They felt happy when the faculty members did not obligate them to use a specific material only from the faculty members. They loved to enrich themselves with some preferred materials chosen by themselves as their supporting materials to improve their writing ability.

Discussion

Students enjoyed the faculty members' creativity in giving constructive learning circumstances to improve students' writing performance and achievement by creating a valuable discussion section that allowed them to ask, suggest and interact with their friends (see Table 6).

Table 6. Discussion section

Items	Activities	Means (M)	Category
6	Students are asked to do a group discussion instead of only individual writing activity before they start to produce their writing	3.8	Sometimes
7	Discussions are organized with leading questions and/or prompts to enhance their interpretation of the topic.	3.9	Sometimes

As shown in Table 6, they confirmed the two activities in the discussion section were important as they rated highly engaged to represent their positive engagement level. It noted that they also might be helped by the faculty members' suggestions if they needed some help. Students thought that the discussion section enabled them to be active since they experienced the discovery and cooperative learning. In interacting with friends, they went out of their way to learn and actively search for additional knowledge together. As a result, a participant said:

We correct our writing errors with friends, and then we also provide and give feedback for our friends. (P1)

Another participant also said:

Peer review, discussion. Give assignment, then the faculty member gives feedback to our essay. I like his confirmation. (P5)

Grouping the students into peer and group discussion was essential in the process of shaping their writing ability. From the two participants' statements, the students could learn from one another as they got a precious chance to add

their existing knowledge with something new that they got from friends. Afterward, they also received another knowledge from the faculty members' confirmation by inviting the whole class discussion.

Feedback

Feedback activity was categorized as a primary section that highly-affected students' learning engagement. They rated this section as the most fundamental activity that gave a big impact to show their engagement level that was rated positively highly engaged. Specifically, faculty members' responsibility in allowing the students to correct, suggest, and discuss the confusion with other friends could achieve the students' self-expectation, self-reflection, learning goals, and positive motivation in writing accomplishment (see Table 7).

Table 7. Feedback section

Items	Activities	Means (M)	Category
8	Students do peer-review or group-review classmates' work.	5	Almost always
9	Students are required to give feedback on students' writing products based on their interests.	4.7	Almost always
10	The feedback session is organized with guiding questions and/or prompts to enhance their interpretation of the topic.	3.7	Sometimes

Subsequently, some students also described that this substantial section could establish their belief and motivation to learn best how to write better again and again. They felt worthy in creating other written works since the faculty members also relieved and simplified the process of correction or feedback as a basis for students' potential writing skill improvement. The faculty members provided them with clear guidance to be done by them in an orderly manner. Some of them mentioned:

They give us advice, then pointed our mistakes and often brought up the mistakes again in later discussion, not in a malicious way, in order to remind us again not to make a mistake. (P8)

After our friend checks our journal, the faculty member collects the journal and checks it one by one. He corrects the wrong words or tenses used, and then he gives the score for the journal. From the score, we could know about our progress. (P9)

We can ask him in further about the mistakes we made if we don't understand. (P10)

The chosen participants made a clear statement that the feedback section was essential for their writing skill improvement. They simplified their thoughts into faculty members' willingness to correct every single work written by students could help them improve their writing skills as they could achieve their learning goals well.

Discussion

In accordance with the information-collected, the faculty members' strategies that were rated effectively to foster students' learning engagement were closely similar to the indirect strategy that specifies only the social learning strategies. The evidence might be seen from how the faculty members built meaningful interactions with the students in designing, assigning, and creating writing classroom circumstances. They were very active and responsive to engage students' participation in the meaningful context, which may cover students' self-interest in deciding the learning management system, materials, discussion, and feedback section. This is in line with Oxford's (1990) idea in which social learning strategies facilitate learning with others and help learners understand the culture of the language they are learning by having interactions.

Another justification came from some students' comments concerning the item "do you think those kinds of activities the faculty members implement can engage your learning engagement?" almost all male and female participants agreed confidently. Specifically, they thought that the social learning strategies made them feel secure in the process of writing. Consequently, almost all of the students showed that their learning engagements were rated highly engaged. They also pointed out that those ten activities substantially impacted their writing progression and achievement. Besides, by interpreting and analyzing the result of the interview, the researchers sorted two fundamental factors that successfully affected students' learning engagement through faculty members' social learning strategies used in the writing class circumstances.

The first factor came from the faculty members' ways to increase students' interests and preferences in the pre and while writing sections. This was evident from the listed activities that most participants' preferred answers indicated the faculty members' creativity in facilitating the students' interests and preferences. They were done by allowing the students to use other supporting materials, share with friends by having a group discussion,

emphasize the feedback from friends and faculty members, and then evaluate themselves by doing a self-reflection section. The finding is in line with the characteristics of the social learning strategies in which the students felt easy due to the process of learning by having an interaction that is combined with students' interests (Oxford, 1990).

The second factor came from the faculty members' ways to facilitate students with many exposures in the post-writing sections. The participants' answers made a piece of comprehensible information that the faculty members always did a consultation section after their students accomplished their writing works. The faculty members asked the result of students' discussion, checked the writing progresses, collected the students' works, reminded the errors, and then guided what they should do afterward. The finding is in line with the characteristics of the social learning strategies in which the students felt more-directed in the learning processes that were resulted from meaningful stimulation (Oxford, 1990).

Hence, the researchers classified and categorized the answers based on each engagement type to show how the social learning strategies affect students' behavioral engagement, cognitive engagement, and emotional engagement. First, students' behavioral engagement came from their involvement in the process of sharing the ideas or interest with faculty members, having group discussions with friends, and emphasizing their self-involvement and attendance in a meaningful learning context, as shown in Martin and Bolliger's (2018) research findings. Unconsciously, the students were engaged behaviorally through faculty members' learning activities to engage and involve their active participation in every meeting to make the process of learning more meaningful.

The result of this study also confirms the findings mentioned by Lee and Yu (2017), Martin (2012), Yin (2018), and Yu (2019) that involving students' perceptions and preferences can lead to other substantial activities that can also motivate students' behavioral engagement. By elaborating the ideas through asking and receiving some constructive conceptions to be discussed together, it can influence the students' persistence and attention well. Specifically, it can be known when the participants chose ten out of fifteen proper activities to represent their main choices that were successfully foster their positive learning engagement. They preferred some activities that considered their awareness and involved their self-interest. They delighted in some interactions and

elaborations that the faculty members used in the teaching and learning processes.

Second, students' cognitive engagement came from their responsibilities to accomplish their writing works by finishing them well. They were cognitively engaged when listening, asking, and interacting with faculty members during faculty members' presentations, noticing the errors, learning the materials, and receiving feedback, then revising it. It affected their readiness to produce the best writing accomplishment for their final projects at the end of the semester. The result of this study supports Baranova et al. (2019), Bond et al. (2020), Tai et al. (2019), and Zheng and Yu (2018) research findings that after being stimulated with meaningful activities and many assistance sources, the students' learning engagement played an influential role as resulted in highly-satisfied outcomes. The students can achieve their writing achievement by elaborating their sufficient ability with the faculty members' way of clarifying some difficulties and providing some supporting materials for the students.

Third, students' emotional engagement came from their feelings of interest and enjoyment in the process of learning. It resulted from the students' personal feelings that most of them were motivated to do the weekly tasks and assignments since their faculty members created meaningful learning circumstances that may foster their exciting interests. They might bring their preferences (e.g., references, materials, and books) that needed to be discussed further with friends and faculty members through a class discussion. As shown in the research findings of Franklin and Harrington (2019), Lee (2014), and Rajabalee et al. (2019), successful faculty members and students' classroom collaborations were able to create a meaningful learning atmosphere to foster students' enthusiasm and motivation in the process of writing.

In addition, the present study discoveries can enrich some previous research findings reviewed concerning some activities to foster students' learning engagement (Lee, 2017; Pourmousavi & Mohamadi Zenouzagh, 2020; Rouhi et al., 2020; Vahedi et al., 2019; Wei & Cao, 2020; Yu & Hu, 2017). This study reveals the emergence of four substantial categories that need to be implemented and considered by faculty members in writing class circumstances. They are the learning management system, materials, discussion, and feedback sections. Besides, all of the participants also stressed the faculty members' way in each stage of writing: pre-writing, while-writing, and post-writing activity can determine the level of students' engagement. It

made clear that the faculty members' learning strategies can foster students' learning engagement and achieve their writing achievement.

Conclusion

This study confirms the importance of faculty member strategies to foster students' learning engagement in writing class by acknowledging the learning management systems, materials, discussion, and feedback sections. The result of this study reinforces and supports the substantial belief that institutions need to design and promote engaging learning experiences for undergraduate students in writing class circumstances. Some perceptions, answers, and feedback that were highly rated and recommended by thirty participants were beneficial as a teaching reflection and further development of the teaching and learning writing skills. The results suggest that engagement leads to the students' writing achievement, skills improvement, and better performance as their real expectation in learning English. Besides, the results from this study would be beneficial for (1) faculty members who are searching for innovative engagement strategies to incorporate the meaningful circumstances of their writing classes, (2) instructional designers who aid in the design and development of writing skills courses, and (3) administrators who are trying to figure out ways to maximize students' participation and engagement in the writing class circumstances. However, there was a particular limitation found in the study. The sample size was relatively small and taken from a restricted number of students. Subsequently, further research studies could focus more on examining faculty members' perceptions and preferences of engagement strategies and then compare them with the students' perceptions and preferences.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge undergraduate students of English Language Teaching (ELT) at five state universities in Malang, Indonesia for their willingness and availability to be the research participants of this study.

Funding

This work was supported by the Universitas Negeri Malang (2021).

ORCID

Nurmalinda Maharani Farizka <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2320-2954>

Bambang Yudi Cahyono <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5210-5208>

References

- Abas, Z. W. (2015). Fostering learning in the 21 st century through student engagement. *International Journal for Educational Media and Technology*, 9(1), 3–15. Retrieved from http://jaems.jp/contents/icomelj/vol9/1_Invited_Zoraini.pdf
- Abubakar, A. M., Abubakar, Y., & Itse, J. D. (2017). Students' engagement in relationship to academic performance. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 8(1), 5-9. Retrieved from https://www.jesoc.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/JESOC8_201.pdf
- Akbari, E., Naderi, A., Simons, R. J., & Pilot, A. (2016). Student engagement and foreign language learning through online social networks. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 1(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0006-7>
- Baranova, T., Khalyapina, L., Kobicheva, A., & Tokareva, E. (2019). Evaluation of students' engagement in integrated learning model in a blended environment. *Education Sciences*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9020138>
- Bloom, B. S. (1959). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals*. D McKay & Co.
- Bond, M., & Bedenlier, S. (2019). Facilitating student engagement through educational technology: towards a conceptual framework. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*, 2019(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.5334/jime.528>
- Bond, M., Buntins, K., Bedenlier, S., Zawacki-Richter, O., & Kerres, M. (2020). Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: a systematic evidence map. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0176-8>
- Brown, H. D., & Heekyeong, L. (2015). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Delfino, A. P. (2019). Student engagement and academic performance of students of Partido State University. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 15(1), 22–41. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v15i3.05>
- Franklin, H., & Harrington, I. (2019). A review into effective classroom management and strategies for student engagement: teacher and student roles in today's classrooms. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 7(12), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v7i12.4491>

- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Heaton, J. B. (1988). *Writing English language test*. Longman.
- Kim, H. J., Hong, A. J., & Song, H. D. (2019). The roles of academic engagement and digital readiness in students' achievements in university e-learning environments. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0152-3>
- Latief, M. A. (2019). *Research methods on language learning: an introduction*. UM Press.
- Lee, H. (2017). The effects of university English writing classes focusing on self and peer review on learner autonomy. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 14*(3), 464–481. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2017.14.3.6.464>
- Lee, I., & Yu, S. (2017). Hong Kong secondary students' motivation in EFL writing: a survey study. *TESOL Quarterly, 52*(2), 176–187. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.364>
- Lee, J. S. (2014). The relationship between student engagement and academic performance: is it a myth or reality? *Journal of Educational Research, 107*(3), 177–185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2013.807491>
- Lin, S. H., & Huang, Y. C. (2018). Assessing college student engagement: development and validation of the student course engagement scale. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 36*(7), 694–708. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282917697618>
- Martin, A. (2012). Motivation and engagement: conceptual, operational, and empirical clarity. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 303–314). Springer US.
- Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2018). Engagement matters: student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. *Online Learning Journal, 22*(1), 205–222. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v22i1.1092>
- Masika, R., & Jones, J. (2016). Building student belonging and engagement: Insights into higher education students' experiences of participating and learning together. *Teaching in Higher Education, 21*(2), 138–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2015.1122585>
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. Newbury House.
- Parsons, S., Nuland, L., & Parsons, A. (2014). The ABCs of student engagement. *Phi Delta Kappan: The Professional Journal for Educators*, May Edition.

- Retrieved from <https://kappanonline.org/abcs-student-engagement-parsons-nuland/>
- Payne, L. (2019). Student engagement: three models for its investigation. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 43(5), 641–657. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2017.1391186>
- Pourmousavi, Z., & Mohamadi Zenouzagh, Z. (2020). A comparative study of the effect of teacher's group and individual feedback on Iranian EFL learners' learning of speech acts in apology letter writing. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00088-w>
- Rajabalee, B. Y., Santally, M. I., & Rennie, F. (2020). A study of the relationship between students' engagement and their academic performances in an eLearning environment. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 17(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2042753019882567>
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: an anthology of current practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rouhi, A., Dibah, M., & Mohebbi, H. (2020). Assessing the effect of giving and receiving written corrective feedback on improving L2 writing accuracy: does giving and receiving feedback have fair mutual benefit? *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00093-z>
- Tai, J. H. M., Bellingham, R., Lang, J., & Dawson, P. (2019). Student perspectives of engagement in learning in contemporary and digital contexts. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 38(5), 1075–1089. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1598338>
- Trowler, V. (2018). *Student engagement literature review*. The Higher Education Academy, The University of Lancaster.
- Vahedi, E. N., Saedi, M., & Tamjid, N. H. (2019). Exploring Iranian EFL teachers' perception and practice of corrective feedback in light of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Language Horizons*, 2(2), 31-50. <https://doi.org/10.22051/LGHOR.2019.25599.1111>
- Wonglorsaichon, B., Wongwanich, S., & Wiratchai, N. (2014). The influence of students' school engagement on learning achievement: a structural equation modeling analysis. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 1748–1755. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.467>
- Wei, W., & Cao, Y. (2020). Written corrective feedback strategies employed by university English lecturers: a teacher cognition perspective. *SAGE Journals*, July September, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020934886>

- Yin, H. (2018). What motivates Chinese undergraduates to engage in learning? insights from a psychological approach to student engagement research. *Higher Education, 76*(5), 827–847. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0239-0>
- Yu, S. (2019). Evaluating student motivation and engagement in the Chinese EFL writing context. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 62*(September), 129-141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.06.002>
- Yu, S., & Hu, G. (2017). Understanding university students' peer feedback practices in EFL writing: insights from a case study. *Assessing Writing, 33*(July), 25-35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2017.03.004>
- Zhang, Z., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing, 36*(April), 90-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004>
- Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: a case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. *Assessing Writing, 37*(January), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.03.001>

Appendix

Interview guide

1. Can you tell me how your faculty member set the learning management system in your class?
2. What is the impact of interpreting the association in the learning management system?
3. Do you think it can engage your positive learning engagement? In what way he engages your positive engagement.
4. Do you have any recommendations about your supporting materials to support your writing performance?
5. What kind of supporting materials/additional materials given by the faculty member to support your writing performance?
6. Do you think it can engage your positive learning engagement? In what way he engages your positive engagement.
7. Does the faculty member monitor students' progression in the process of discussion and writing production?
8. What kind of treatment that the lecturer used at the end of your writing result?
9. What kind of feedback is used by the faculty member in writing class?
10. Do you think it can engage your positive learning engagement? In what way he engages your positive engagement.