

Exploring Affective Engagement with Automated and Peer Feedback in L2 Writing: Evidence from Chinese Undergraduates

Zhuo Chen^{1*}, Pauline Swee Choo Goh², Pei Lin Tay³

School of Education, Faculty of Social Sciences & Leisure Management, Taylor's University, Subang
Jaya, Selangor 47500, Malaysia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100300156>

Received: 09 March 2026; Accepted: 14 March 2026; Published: 30 March 2026

ABSTRACT

Feedback is increasingly perceived as an interactive process instead of a one-way transmission of information. In this context, affective engagement, or how students respond emotionally to feedback, has become a critical factor shaping the effectiveness of feedback. While automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback and peer feedback are widely used in university English writing classrooms, limited research has examined students' emotional experiences and attitudinal responses across different feedback types. Using a qualitative case study design, this study investigates the affective engagement of four undergraduate English majors completing a writing task involving AWE feedback and peer feedback in a Chinese university writing course. Drawing on students' drafts, feedback comments, reflective journals, and retrospective interview data, this study explores students' emotional experiences and attitudinal stances toward both types of feedback. The findings indicate that AWE feedback elicits a combination of trust and mild anxiety, whereas peer feedback generates greater emotional variability. Learner beliefs, as well as feedback accuracy and features, significantly shape students' affective engagement. The findings highlight affective engagement as a key psychological mechanism in feedback processing and suggest that effective feedback practices should attend not only to informational quality but also to learners' emotional responses.

Keywords: Affective engagement; AWE feedback; Peer feedback; L2 writing

INTRODUCTION

Learner-centered approaches to L2 writing instruction have shifted pedagogical attention from teacher written corrective feedback to learners' writing processes and engagement with feedback (Cheng et al., 2023). Research has shown that feedback effectiveness depends not only on feedback quality, but also on learners' engagement during feedback use (Yamazaki & Hiver, 2024). Learner engagement with feedback is commonly conceptualized as a multidimensional construct comprising behavioral, cognitive, and affective components (Ellis, 2010).

Among these dimensions, affective engagement, which refers to learners' emotional responses and attitudinal stances toward feedback, has received comparatively limited attention in L2 writing research (Han & Gao, 2021), despite evidence that emotions mediate feedback acceptance, strategy use, and revision decisions (Zhang, 2022). As a result, learners' emotional experiences during feedback engagement remain insufficiently understood.

In contemporary L2 writing classrooms, feedback is increasingly provided through various types, particularly automated writing evaluation (AWE) systems and peer feedback. AWE systems offer rapid and standardized

feedback but may evoke emotional distance due to limited interpersonal interaction, whereas peer feedback emphasizes social interaction and collaboration but may also generate anxiety or distrust (Jin et al., 2024; Zhai & Ma, 2022). Although prior studies have compared these feedback sources in terms of effectiveness, learners' affective engagement across AWE and peer feedback within authentic classroom contexts remains underexplored.

From a socio-cultural perspective, emotions are viewed as contextually situated experiences arising from learners' interactions with learning environments (Han & Xu, 2021). Accordingly, affective engagement provides a critical lens for understanding how learners evaluate and respond to different feedback types. Against this backdrop, the present qualitative case study examines undergraduate EFL learners' affective engagement with AWE and peer feedback in a Chinese university writing course. By analyzing students' writing drafts, journals and interviews, this study explores the characteristics and influencing factors of learners' emotional responses to these two feedback types. The study is guided by the following two research questions:

- (1) How do students demonstrate affective engagement with AWE and peer feedback, and what similarities and differences emerge?
- (2) What factors shape students' affective engagement with AWE and peer feedback?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Engagement, originally conceptualized to explain students' participation and persistence in educational contexts, has been extended to L2 writing feedback research to capture learners' multidimensional responses during feedback use (Wang et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2024). Ellis (2010) conceptualized feedback engagement as comprising behavioral, cognitive, and affective dimensions, a framework later refined and widely adopted in L2 writing research (Zhang & Hyland, 2018). While this model has been instrumental in examining revision behaviors and cognitive processing, recent studies suggest that affective engagement plays a mediating role in shaping learners' cognitive regulation and behavioral responses to feedback (Ene & Yao, 2021), thus warranting closer analytical attention.

Affective engagement in L2 writing feedback is commonly defined as learners' emotional responses and evaluative attitudes toward feedback, encompassing emotions such as anxiety, trust, frustration, and motivation, as well as value judgments regarding feedback types and content (Chen et al., 2023; Shi, 2021; Tian & Zhou, 2020). Empirical evidence indicates that these emotional experiences substantially influence learners' willingness to attend to, interpret, and adopt feedback (Chen & Hu, 2025). Consequently, research attention has gradually shifted from feedback effectiveness to learners' feedback experiences, highlighting the dynamic interplay between emotion, cognition, and behavior in feedback engagement (Mao & Lee, 2024). As feedback types diversify in contemporary writing classrooms, learners increasingly engage with feedback not only from teachers but also from AWE systems and peers.

AWE systems such as Pigai and Grammarly have been widely adopted in university writing instruction due to their immediacy and provision of structured feedback on linguistic features and, to a lesser extent, textual organization (Fu et al., 2024; Fan & Ma, 2022). Although learners often recognize the objectivity and efficiency of AWE feedback, studies report reduced emotional resonance, superficial processing, and feelings of detachment due to its mechanistic and non-interpersonal nature (Ranalli, 2021; Chen & Huang, 2025). Learners' trust in the system, perceived control, and feedback comprehensibility have been shown to shape emotional responses and feedback uptake (Liu & Yu, 2022). These findings suggest that affective engagement with AWE is complex and potentially fragile, yet it remains insufficiently examined beyond outcome-based measures.

In contrast, peer feedback is inherently social and interactional, emphasizing collaboration and mutual

negotiation of meaning (Cheng et al., 2023; Wu & Schunn, 2023). While peer feedback can foster writing awareness, self-regulation, and confidence (Qian & Li, 2025; Zhang & Gao, 2024), its interpersonal nature often elicits emotionally charged responses, including anxiety, resistance, and ambivalence (Bharuthram & van Heerden, 2023). In East Asian EFL contexts, collectivist values and face concerns further complicate learners' emotional experiences during peer feedback, requiring learners to engage in simultaneous cognitive processing and emotional regulation (Hu & Lam, 2010; Xue et al., 2023). Despite these insights, affective engagement in peer feedback has primarily been examined in isolation, limiting a comparative understanding across feedback types.

Although interest in affective engagement has grown, existing research largely focuses on single feedback types or relies on questionnaire-based and experimental designs, offering limited insight into learners' situated emotional experiences during authentic feedback engagement (Shi, 2021; Xu & Zhang, 2025). Empirical research remains scarce regarding how learners' emotional responses, trust, and acceptance mechanisms differ when various feedback types, such as AWE and peer feedback, are encountered within the same writing task.

To address these gaps, the present study adopts a qualitative case study approach in a Chinese undergraduate EFL writing context. By integrating learners' writing drafts, reflective journals, and retrospective interviews, the study provides a fine-grained analysis of learners' affective engagement with AWE and peer feedback, shedding light on emotional dynamics and regulatory mechanisms across feedback types.

METHOD

The study was conducted in a process-oriented English writing course for second-year English majors. Four students were selected through purposive criterion sampling based on comparable English proficiency (as evidenced by their course performance in the previous final examination), their demonstrated engagement with feedback, and their willingness to participate in interviews and reflective journals. All participants were from the same class and completed the same writing task with identical feedback sequences (AWE feedback followed by peer feedback). This sampling strategy ensured a shared instructional context, improved comparability, and allowed in-depth exploration of individual differences in feedback engagement.

Data were collected over a 16-week undergraduate English writing course. One writing task was selected for analysis. Students wrote a 250-word essay and completed two rounds of revision. In the first round, students submitted their drafts to the Pigai AWE system, which provides feedback primarily on language accuracy, lexical usage, and sentence-level errors. Students were provided with feedback in the form of highlighted errors and brief explanations, which they reviewed independently during the revision process. During the second round, revised drafts were submitted to the university's online learning platform for peer feedback. Students had prior experience with peer feedback activities. The students then revised their drafts in response to peer comments. All writing drafts, feedback, and revision activities were completed outside class hours. Multiple data sources were collected to capture students' affective engagement. These included students' drafts and revised texts across feedback stages, AWE and peer feedback records, reflective journals completed after each feedback round, and retrospective interviews conducted after the two rounds of revision. Interviews lasted 30-40 minutes, were conducted in participants' native language, and were audio-recorded with consent. During interviews, students were prompted with their drafts and feedback records to elicit reflections on emotional responses and revision decisions.

Students' writing texts, feedback records, reflective journals, and retrospective interview data were analyzed to examine affective engagement with AWE and peer feedback. Analysis was guided by the three-dimensional feedback engagement model (behavioral, cognitive, affective), with a focus here on affective engagement

subdivided into emotional responses and attitudinal stances (Zhang & Hyland, 2018; Ene & Yao, 2021). Textual analysis of initial and revised drafts was conducted to identify whether and how feedback items were incorporated. Reflective journals were analyzed using content analysis to code students’ emotional and attitudinal expressions. Interview transcripts were analyzed thematically to identify affective reactions and attitudes toward feedback. Coding followed an open-axial-selective process to categorize data into emotional responses and attitudinal stances, with codes constantly refined through constant comparison across data sources. The initial coding framework was based on prior literature on learners’ affective engagement, but was further refined through iterative analysis of emerging patterns in the data. The coding process involved multiple reviews of the data, with careful comparison between coded segments and original texts to ensure consistency and accuracy. Table 1 provides an example of how raw data were transformed into codes and categories through the coding process. The coding framework and selected data extracts were reviewed and refined by peers to enhance analytical rigor. To strengthen the credibility of the analysis and identify recurring thematic patterns of affective engagement with AWE and peer feedback, data from multiple sources were triangulated, enabling cross-validation of students’ emotional reactions, revision behaviors, and underlying reasoning.

Table 1. Example of Coding Process

Data extract	Initial code	Category	Theme
“I felt quite pleased, as my peer not only addressed linguistic errors but also offered concrete suggestions...” (Student A)	Feeling pleased with specific and useful feedback	Positive emotional reaction to detailed peer feedback	Emotional reactions to peer feedback
“The AWE system proved remarkably efficient.” (Student B)	Perceived efficiency of AWE feedback	Positive evaluation of AWE feedback effectiveness	Attitudinal responses to AWE feedback

RESULTS

To examine how students responded to AWE and peer feedback, this study analyzed their emotional reactions and attitudinal stances during interviews, using these two dimensions as indicators of affective engagement to reveal its characteristics and underlying mechanisms. It was found that both types of feedback elicit diverse emotional and attitudinal responses in students, with learner beliefs, feedback accuracy, and feedback features emerging as significant factors influencing affective engagement.

Emotional Reactions

In the context of AWE feedback, students generally displayed a composite emotional response characterized by rational acceptance, active utilization, and critical evaluation. While the high density and prompt nature of AWE feedback initially caused some emotional stress, students generally recognized its value in identifying language issues and encouraging self-reflection. During the coding process, patterns of emotional regulation emerged, indicating a shift from initial anxiety to evaluative judgment. For example, Student C noted that:

“AWE feedback provided a substantial amount of suggestions. While it initially seemed overwhelming and a bit tiresome to read through, I soon realized that many of the areas were in need of further attention. Upon making the necessary changes, I felt the text was much clearer.”

Similarly, Student D commented in the interview: *“Seeing so many annotated suggestions initially felt overwhelming, but the specific guidance helped pinpoint exactly what needed to be revised.”* Additionally, Student B also developed a critical perspective during AWE feedback: *“The system provided very quick feedback and the suggestions are useful, however, some of the comments seem excessively rigid to me. Before making any revisions, I would reevaluate those points.”* Overall, the high density and efficiency of AWE feedback were associated with initial emotional stress, while also encouraging more reflective and critical engagement with feedback. The observed shift from anxiety to acceptance, followed by evaluative judgment, suggests that students gradually employed emotional regulation strategies when engaging with AWE feedback. The observations collectively support the theme of compound emotional responses to AWE feedback, highlighting a pattern of initial stress followed by reflective engagement and emotional regulation.

In contrast, peer feedback elicited more differentiated and context-dependent emotional responses, forming a distinct theme of context-sensitive emotional reactions to peer feedback. Students generally exhibited positive emotions when feedback is detailed, specific, and demonstrated the peer’s involvement. For instance, Student A stated in the interview: *“I felt quite pleased, as my peer not only addressed linguistic errors but also offered concrete suggestions for content improvement.”* Similarly, Student C commented in the reflective journal: *“I was pleasantly surprised by the thoroughness of my peer’s feedback. Despite this, I am uncertain about the accuracy of some suggestions and will verify them online.”*

Alternatively, when feedback was too brief or lacked sufficient involvement, students displayed noticeable disappointment and dissatisfaction. Student B stated frankly in the interview: *“I spent considerable time providing feedback to my peers, but the feedback I received was only a few sentences. I was somewhat disappointed.”* Consistent with previous findings (Ene & Yao, 2021; Han, 2017; Zhang & Hyland, 2022), Student B’s disappointment can be understood in relation to feedback features and learners’ expectations in non-teacher feedback contexts.

When peer feedback was perceived as brief and insufficiently specific, it elicited negative emotional reactions such as disappointment, which in turn reduced its perceived value. In these instances, negative emotional responses were coded, highlighting how peer feedback can evoke both satisfaction and frustration, depending on the specificity of the feedback and the perception of reciprocity.

Overall, two analytically derived themes were observed in students’ responses to different feedback types: compound emotional reactions to AWE feedback and context-sensitive emotional reactions to peer feedback. By integrating coding categories and patterns across multiple participants, these thematic patterns provide a more comprehensive analytic synthesis than simply describing individual responses.

Due to its high density and perceived accuracy, AWE feedback tends to evoke compound emotions, including initial pressure followed by recognition and acceptance (Fu et al., 2024). Comparatively, peer feedback elicited a range of emotions depending on the context, fluctuating between satisfaction and frustration depending on the specificity and reciprocity of comments received (Qian & Li, 2025). The following table provides a thematic summary of students’ emotional reactions to the two types of feedback (see Table 2).

Table 2. Thematic Summary of Students’ Emotional Reactions to AWE and Peer Feedback

Feedback Type	Theme	Supporting Quote
AWE	Compound emotional reactions (e.g., anxiety, satisfaction, pleasure)	“While it initially seemed overwhelming and a bit tiresome to read through...” (Student C) “The system provided very quick feedback and

		the suggestions are useful...” (Student B)
Peer	Context-sensitive emotional reactions (e.g., pleasure, frustration, disappointment)	“I felt quite pleased, as my peer not only addressed linguistic errors...” (Student A) “...I was somewhat disappointed.” (Student B)

Attitudinal Responses

Regarding attitudinal reactions, students generally adopted a positive and trusting attitude toward AWE feedback. A cross-case analysis revealed a consistent pattern of technology-based trust, in which students evaluated AWE feedback primarily based on its perceived accuracy, efficiency, and systematization, rather than on interpersonal factors. A total of three students praised the linguistic diagnostic capabilities of the AWE system, describing its feedback as “clear”, “accurate”, and “instant” Student C emphasized in the reflective journal: *“I find the vocabulary and sentence suggestions provided in AWE feedback quite precise”*. Similarly, Student B expressed surprise at the efficiency of AWE feedback, stating that: *“The AWE system proved remarkably efficient”*. According to these attitudes, students regarded AWE as a credible source of feedback, which facilitated their willingness to accept and implement its recommendations. Despite experiencing some emotional pressure from AWE feedback, students generally demonstrated rational acceptance and trust, a pattern also observed in previous studies on technological feedback use (Fu et al., 2024).

In contrast, students’ attitudes toward peer feedback differed markedly. Rather than reflecting a uniform evaluative perspective, peer feedback resulted in a conditional trust pattern, in which student acceptance was determined by the perceived quality and depth of feedback received. Students displayed stronger agreement and acceptance tendencies when peer feedback was specific, well-reasoned, and appropriately phrased. As noted by Student A in the reflective journal: *“Peer feedback was instrumental in highlighting errors and perspectives that might have otherwise gone unnoticed.”*

Similarly, Student C stated in the interview: *“If I had overlooked an aspect raised by peers during initial drafting, this highlighted my oversight and reminded me to pay better attention.”* In these responses, high-quality peer feedback was not only accepted but also cognitively valued as a complementary perspective for revision. However, trust diminished significantly when peer feedback appeared vague or perfunctory. For instance, several students (including Students B and D) questioned the value and credibility of feedback because of its brevity, lack of reciprocity, or superficial nature.

Student D commented in the journal, *“Peer suggestions were too sparse; I am unsure how to revise”*. Student B stated bluntly in the interview, *“I am somewhat disappointed; peer feedback felt rather perfunctory.”* Peer feedback credibility is closely linked to perceived effort, reciprocity, and usefulness, which explains this shift from acceptance to skepticism. These responses suggest a tension between students’ expectations of peer feedback and their actual engagement with it, particularly when feedback was perceived as insufficient or uninformative.

In general, there were distinct attitudinal tendencies among the students toward the two types of feedback. Based on these findings, two attitudinal orientations were identified: AWE feedback generated stable, system-based trust based on perceived efficiency and accuracy, while peer feedback generated fluctuating trust influenced by feedback quality and interpersonal commitment.

AWE feedback was generally perceived as efficient and systematic, fostering rational acceptance, whereas peer feedback was evaluated variably depending on its specificity, justification, and interpersonal tone. A thematic summary of attitudinal responses toward AWE and peer feedback is provided in Table 3.

Table 3. Thematic Summary of Students’ Attitudinal Responses to AWE and Peer Feedback

Feedback Type	Theme	Supporting Quote
AWE	Technology-based trust (e.g., positive, trust)	<p>“AWE system proved remarkably efficient” (Student B)</p> <p>“I find the vocabulary and sentence suggestions provided in AWE feedback quite precise” (Student C)</p>
Peer	Conditional trust (e.g., respectful, negative)	<p>“Peer feedback was instrumental in highlighting errors and perspectives that might have otherwise gone unnoticed.” (Student A)</p> <p>“Peer suggestions were too sparse; I am unsure how to revise” (Student D)</p>

Factors Influencing Students’ Affective Engagement

There is no coincidence in the variation in students’ affective engagement; rather, multiple individual and contextual factors are at work (Saeli & Cheng, 2019; Zhang & Hyland, 2022). Based on the analysis of writing texts, feedback, interviews and reflective journals, this study identified three key factors that influence students’ affective engagement with AWE and peer feedback: learner beliefs, feedback accuracy, and feedback features. In addition to determining the intensity of students’ emotional reactions, these factors also affect their attitude toward feedback and their subsequent engagement with it.

Students’ learning beliefs about feedback are essential to their affective engagement (Han & Gao, 2021). A student who perceives feedback as a learning resource is more likely to adopt feedback with openness and willingness, whereas a student who doubts its credibility or value is more likely to exhibit emotional defensiveness or reject feedback cognitively (Shi, 2021). For example, Students A and C demonstrated relatively open feedback beliefs in the interviews, believing that feedback “*aids in identifying and addressing problems*”. While their emotional responses were relatively stable throughout the task, they engaged actively by incorporating AWE and peer feedback. Conversely, Students B and D expressed skepticism regarding feedback’s usefulness during interviews, especially regarding the subjectivity of peer feedback, stating that “*our levels are similar; so it has limited reference value*”. Such skepticism toward feedback credibility was accompanied by anxiety and distrust, as well as reduced proactive affective engagement, a pattern also noted in prior research on feedback beliefs (Han & Gao, 2021).

Whether feedback is accurate and reasonable directly affects students’ affective experiences and their assessment of trust (Ene & Yao, 2021). In the case of AWE feedback, system-generated linguistic feedback is regarded as objective and reliable by the most users (Fu et al., 2024). As Student A noted, “*I tend to trust the suggestions of AWE feedback as they are accurate*”. However, when feedback contains misjudgments or differs from student expectations, it can cause emotional distress. Student D, for example, indicated that some suggestions made by the AWE system were “*too mechanical and context-inappropriate*”, which led to the neglect of such feedback. Peer feedback presents a more complex accuracy issue. For example, according to Student C: “*I sometimes feel that the errors pointed out by my peer are not actually errors, which makes me hesitate about revising*”. When peer feedback was perceived as uncertain or insufficiently clear, students reported fluctuating levels of trust and emotional responses during the revision process.

Students’ affective responses are also influenced by the structure and presentation of feedback (Fan & Xu, 2020). Research indicates that learners’ perceived value and emotional motivation are significantly enhanced by feedback that includes problem identification, improvement suggestions, and positive evaluations (Chen et al.,

2023). In this study, students preferred feedback that was specific, well-reasoned, and balanced affirmation with suggestions. For instance, Student A remarked: *‘Peer feedback both identified issues and commended my strengths, motivating me to improve’*. In contrast, overly brief or perfunctory feedback often provoked emotional resistance. According to Student B, *“this time’s comments were too general and seemed careless, which made me feel disappointed”*.

Students’ emotional responses varied depending on the feedback source and the manner of delivery. Peer feedback that was delivered tactfully and sincerely elicited more positive affective responses, whereas blunt or ambiguous comments were interpreted as superficial or dismissive, reducing students’ engagement. Learners demonstrated distinct affective patterns across feedback types. In the AWE context, students generally exhibited coexisting trust and mild anxiety, acknowledging the system’s technological reliability while feeling pressured by the dense error detection. In the peer feedback context, students displayed alternating satisfaction and disappointment, reflecting sensitivity to interpersonal quality, reciprocity, and feedback accuracy. Across both contexts, students’ reactions were influenced by the clarity, tone, and perceived reliability of the feedback.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION

This study investigated undergraduate EFL learners’ affective engagement with AWE and peer feedback in an authentic writing course. Findings indicate that affective engagement is dynamic and context-dependent, with students’ emotions and attitudinal responses closely intertwined. During AWE feedback, students experienced a composite affective pattern of mild stress followed by positive acceptance. Although initial tension arose from the system’s intensive and precise feedback, the clarity and actionability of AWE suggestions fostered trust and proactive adoption, illustrating the coexistence of negative affect and positive attitudes (Zhai & Ma, 2022). In contrast, peer feedback elicited more variable affective responses. Detailed and sincere peer comments generated positive emotions such as surprise and satisfaction, whereas vague or perfunctory feedback triggered negative emotions including disappointment and resistance (Li & Reynolds, 2023; Wei & Liu, 2024).

Learners’ affective engagement was shaped by multiple interacting factors. First, feedback beliefs influenced trust and acceptance: AWE was generally perceived as more objective and reliable, whereas trust in peer feedback depended on peers’ competence and level of engagement, creating a hierarchy of trust among feedback types (Fan & Xu, 2020). Second, the accuracy and features of feedback directly affected affective responses (Mao & Lee, 2024). Systematic and clear AWE feedback enhanced perceived security and trust, whereas peer feedback could produce affective shifts depending on its specificity, balance, and tone (Chen & Hu, 2025). Constructive, detailed comments promoted positive engagement, while ambiguous or superficial feedback elicited resistance (Wu & Schunn, 2023). Overall, feedback beliefs, feedback accuracy, and feedback features jointly shaped learners’ affective engagement, supporting the SCT view that emotions are formed through learners’ interpretations within specific contexts rather than as isolated psychological states (Xu & Zhang, 2025).

Finally, the findings highlight that affective engagement is not merely a passive emotional reaction but a socially and cognitively mediated process. Students’ perceptions of feedback quality and reliability, combined with their beliefs and prior experiences, dynamically influenced emotional responses, attitudinal orientations, and subsequent engagement behaviors. These insights underscore the need to consider both informational and interpersonal dimensions of feedback in fostering meaningful learner engagement.

The present study highlights the previously under-explored role of affective engagement in feedback processing, emphasizing that affect constitutes a core mechanism through which learners comprehend, evaluate, and internalize feedback, rather than merely a subordinate factor in feedback acceptance. Affect not only modulates feedback adoption but also drives learners’ construction of feedback meaning (Xu & Zhang, 2025). In practice,

these findings suggest several pedagogical strategies. For AWE feedback, instructors might guide learners to process system suggestions in stages to reduce cognitive and affective load and enhance self-efficacy. For peer feedback, training should focus on improving specificity, clarity, and politeness to foster mutual trust and positive affective engagement. Furthermore, encouraging students to maintain reflective journals and record post-feedback emotions can cultivate metacognitive awareness, strengthen feedback resilience, and support sustained engagement in writing.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Students' affective engagement in a university English writing classroom, as well as the influencing factors in both AWE and peer feedback contexts, were examined in this study. Results indicate that students experience mild stress coupled with trust during AWE feedback, whereas peer feedback causes greater emotional fluctuations. Their experiences are significantly influenced by feedback quality, feedback features, and differences in learning beliefs. It appears that affective engagement is not simply an incidental response during feedback processing, but rather an important psychological mechanism shaping understanding, judgment, and feedback adoption. According to research, learner beliefs, feedback accuracy, and feedback features all play a significant role in shaping emotional experiences and attitudinal orientations, further emphasizing the importance of affective engagement within the feedback process. In addition to enriching the affective perspective of feedback studies, these findings suggest that educators should balance the constructive and emotional regulation functions of feedback design when introducing non-teacher feedback in order to develop positive feedback beliefs among students and foster trust-based student-teacher relationships.

Considering the limited sample size and research duration, the findings of this study reflect primarily case-specific characteristics and require further validation across broader samples and diverse task contexts. Future research may adopt multimodal approaches (such as affective lexical analysis) in order to capture real-time affective shifts during feedback reception.

Ethical Considerations

All participants were provided with a detailed explanation of the research purposes, data usage, and confidentiality principles prior to the start of the study. The consent of all participants was obtained, and they were assured that their responses would be kept confidential and anonymous. Data collected from the participants will only be used for research purposes and they may withdraw at any time without any consequences. It has been reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee at Taylor's University.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares there are no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability

Due to confidentiality and privacy agreements with participants, the data supporting the findings of this study are not publicly available. The dataset includes interview transcripts, students' writing assignments, and reflective journals, which may contain identifiable information.

REFERENCE

1. Bharuthram, S., & van Heerden, M. (2023). The affective effect: Exploring undergraduate students'

- emotions in giving and receiving peer feedback. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 60(3), 379-389. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00455-4>
2. Chen, H., & Hu, G. (2025). Investigating relationships among students' affective, behavioral and cognitive engagement with peer feedback on EFL writing. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 84, 101430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101430>
 3. Chen, J., & Huang, K. (2025). 'It is useful, but we feel confused and frustrated': exploring learner engagement with AWE feedback in collaborative academic writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2025.2508805>
 4. Chen, W., Liu, D., & Lin, C. (2023). Collaborative peer feedback in L2 writing: Affective, behavioral, cognitive, and social engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1078141. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1078141>
 5. Cheng, X., Liu, Y., & Wang, C. (2023). Understanding student engagement with teacher and peer feedback in L2 writing. *System*, 119, 103176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103176>
 6. Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 32(2), 335-349. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990544>
 7. Ene, E., & Yao, J. (2021). How Does That Make You Feel: Students' Affective Engagement with Feedback. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 25, 66-83. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2021.25.04>
 8. Fan, N., & Ma, Y. (2022). The Effects of Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) Feedback on Students' English Writing Quality: A Systematic Literature Review. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 28, 53-73. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2022.28.03>
 9. Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 50, 100775. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100775>
 10. Fu, Q. K., Zou, D., Xie, H., & Cheng, G. (2024). A review of AWE feedback: Types, learning outcomes, and implications. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(1-2), 179-221. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2033787>
 11. Han, Y. (2017). Mediating and being mediated: Learner beliefs and learner engagement with written corrective feedback. *System*, 69, 133-142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.07.003>
 12. Han, Y., & Gao, X. (2021). Research on learner engagement with written (corrective) feedback: Insights and issues. In J. Philp & R. E. Papi (Eds.), *Student engagement in the language classroom* (pp. 56-74). *Multilingual Matters*.
 13. Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2021). Student feedback literacy and engagement with feedback: A case study of Chinese undergraduate students. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 26(2), 181-196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1648410>
 14. Hu, G., & Lam, S. T. E. (2010). Issues of cultural appropriateness and pedagogical efficacy: Exploring peer review in a second language writing class. *Instructional science*, 38(4), 371-394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9086-1>
 15. Jin, X., Jiang, Q., Xiong, W., Feng, Y., & Zhao, W. (2024). Effects of student engagement in peer feedback on writing performance in higher education. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 32(1), 128-143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2081209>
 16. Li, M., & Reynolds, B. L. (2023). Academic emotions in giving genre-based peer feedback: an emotional intelligence perspective. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 14(4), 993-1026. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0134>
 17. Liu, S., & Yu, G. (2022). L2 learners' engagement with automated feedback: An eye-tracking study. *Language Learning & Technology*, 26(2), 78-105. <https://doi.org/10.64152/10125/73480>
 18. Mao, Z., & Lee, I. (2024). Student engagement with written feedback: Critical issues and way forward. *RELC Journal*, 55(3), 810-818. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221150811>
 19. Qian, J., & Li, D. (2025). Toward a better understanding of student engagement with peer feedback: A longitudinal study. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 63(1), 709-734.

- <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2023-0108>
20. Ranalli, J. (2021). L2 student engagement with automated feedback on writing: Potential for learning and issues of trust. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52, 100816. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100816>
 21. Saeli, H., & Cheng, A. (2019). Student writers' affective engagement with grammar-centred written corrective feedback: The impact of (mis) aligned practices and perceptions. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22(2), 109-132. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1065058ar>
 22. Shi, Y. (2021). Exploring learner engagement with multiple sources of feedback on L2 writing across genres. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 758867. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.758867>
 23. Tian, L., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Learner engagement with automated feedback, peer feedback and teacher feedback in an online EFL writing context. *System*, 91, 102247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102247>
 24. Wang, Y., Cao, Y., Gong, S., Wang, Z., Li, N., & Ai, L. (2022). Interaction and learning engagement in online learning: The mediating roles of online learning self-efficacy and academic emotions. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 94, 102128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2022.102128>
 25. Wei, Y., & Liu, D. (2024). Incorporating peer feedback in academic writing: a systematic review of benefits and challenges. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1506725. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1506725>
 26. Wu, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2023). Passive, active, and constructive engagement with peer feedback: A revised model of learning from peer feedback. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 73, 102160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2023.102160>
 27. Xu, J., & Zhang, S. (2025). Understanding the dynamics of EFL learner affective engagement with receiving peer feedback: A case study from the sociocultural perspective. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 120, 102662. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2025.102662>
 28. Xue, S., Yang, Y., Du, J., & Liu, F. (2023). Multi-layered e-feedback anxiety: An action research study among Chinese learners using peer feedback activities in an academic writing course. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1062517. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1062517>
 29. Yamazaki, J. S., & Hiver, P. (2024). Learners' behavioral engagement and performance on linguistically difficult L2 reading tasks: The effects of effort feedback, self-efficacy, and attributions. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688241304871>
 30. Zhai, N., & Ma, X. (2022). Automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback: A systematic investigation of college students' acceptance. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(9), 2817-2842. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1897019>
 31. Zhang, Z. (2022). Promoting student engagement with feedback: insights from collaborative pedagogy and teacher feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(4), 540-555. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1933900>
 32. Zhang, Y., & Gao, Y. (2024). Exploring the dynamics of student engagement with receiving peer feedback in L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 60, 100842. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100842>
 33. Zhang, Z. V., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 36, 90-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004>
 34. 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>
 35. Zhu, X., Yao, Y., & Lu, Q. (2024). The relationships between the growth mindset, writing feedback literacy, and feedback engagement of undergraduate students in L1 Chinese writing learning. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 80, 101320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2023.101320>