

# The Correlation between Students' Perceptions on Teacher Feedback and Writing Self- Efficacy

*by* Aridah Aridah

---

**Submission date:** 13-Jan-2022 06:11PM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 1741068288

**File name:** rceptions\_on\_Teacher\_Feedback-Proceeding\_Quality\_Improvement.pdf (413.44K)

**Word count:** 5294

**Character count:** 29543

## The Correlation between Students' Perceptions on Teacher Feedback and Writing Self-Efficacy

Agustina Firdhayanti<sup>1</sup>; Aridah Aridah<sup>2</sup>  
 Mulawarman University – INDONESIA<sup>1</sup>; Mulawarman University—INDONESIA<sup>2</sup>  
 aridah27@yahoo.com

### Abstract

This study aimed to investigate whether there was any significant correlation between students' perceptions on teacher feedbacks and writing self-efficacy. This study applied correlational design. The students of the fifth semester of the English Department who had received feedbacks on their essays participated in completing both teacher feedback perception questionnaire and writing self-efficacy questionnaire. The data were analyzed by using SPSS 21 program. The findings showed that the mean score of students' writing self-efficacy after it was converted into Z score was 50,00094 and classified into a moderate category; the mean score of students' perception on teacher was 50,00307 and classified into a moderate category; and there was no any significant correlation between writing self-efficacy and perceptions on teacher feedback (the p-value was 0,061, which was higher than  $\alpha = 0,05$ ). Furthermore, this value was also corroborated by the result of *r*-value which was 0.316 indicating that the correlation between students' perception on teacher feedback and writing self-efficacy was low. Therefore, it can be said that writing self-efficacy did not have any significant correlation with the students' perceptions on teacher feedback.

### Keywords

Correlation, Perceptions, Teacher Feedback, Writing Self-Efficacy

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Feedback is one of the best ways to improve writing performance. Since writing has significances in improving communicative competence of learning the language in term of conveying information or expressing original ideas, it needs accuracy in many aspects such as vocabulary, grammar, organization and other writing conventions. One of the ways to achieve good writing performance is by having feedback from readers or from teachers if it is a form of academic writing. Feedback is information given by other people related to some aspects of the students' task performance with the intent to qualify the students' cognition, motivation and/or behavior (Kluger and DeNisi, 1996). Feedback is required when students find difficulties in producing a good piece of writing because they do not have enough English exposures. By providing feedback on students' writing piece, it is expected that they are able to revise their own writing which in turn able to write well in the future. This automatically turns out helping them on their writing process as stated by Lizzio & Wilson (2008) that feedback is important in the teaching and learning processes and it gives a significant contribution to the students' experience.

Aside from the pedagogical effect which is created by feedback, there is actually another account that is also affected by it and gives vast contribution toward the students writing performance. It is the self-efficacy. Bandura (1986) states that self-efficacy is the judgments of people about their capabilities to construct and conduct tasks of action required to achieve designated types of performances. It means that self-efficacy is a person's judgment about his/her ability to perform a particular task. It is what a student believes she or he can do or cannot do. The majority of researchers solely used on the effectiveness of the feedback in terms of revisions or changes in writing performance, yet ignored self-efficacy as the part being affected (Ruegg, 2014). Hyland (1998) found that self-efficacy is a key factor in enhancing

motivation, which is important for students to make the effort required to achieve increased performance. This statement is supported by Klassen (2002) who said that self-efficacy beliefs are thought to play a prominent role in the prediction of writing achievement. Self-efficacy affects the way students make an effort in terms of writing viscerally. How they are able to decide the amount of effort they want to employ related to the amount of self-efficacy they have actually affects the performance or the outcome in term of writing. Therefore, providing teacher feedback to students' writing affects their self-efficacy that viscerally also affects the performance or the outcome.

The explanation above shows how feedback associates with self-efficacy. However it does not show what kind of effective feedback that actually affects self-efficacy belief. The diverse opinions on the usefulness of feedback can be possessed by both feedback givers (teacher) and feedback receivers (students), which is a determiner for the potential that feedback has for learning (Carless, 2006). Moreover according to Hyland (2000), students think the assessment of feedback is essential to explore the students' strengths and weaknesses, to increase motivation and to improve future grades. Therefore, students are able to feel them based on the types of feedback given by their teacher which in turn will have the effect toward their self-efficacy. More than one-third of cases of feedback interventions were found to actually diminish performance. This occurs due to the personal reaction of students toward feedback on assignments. Therefore, it can diminish their academic confidence or self-esteem (Young as cited in Lizzio and Wilson, 2008). This evidence shows that the students' perception on teacher feedback affects self-efficacy.

### 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1. Teacher Feedback Perception

Feedback is any information, in the forms of comments, symbols and signs, provided by the external agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding. Therefore,

teacher feedback is the information given by the teacher by providing corrective information related to the aspects of particular performance and understanding (Hattie and Timperley, 2007).

Feedback is actually indispensable in teaching and learning process in order to give the betterment toward students' performance since students still entail the correction to escalate their own cognition of something and how it also acts students to be motivated. This was supported by Kluger and DeNisi (1996) that feedback is information given by an external agent related to several aspects of the students' task performance, indicated to qualify the students' cognitive motivation and/or behavior. Moreover, feedback is also an important aspect of students' learning processes and it is a factor contributing to student learning experience (Lizzio & Wilson, 2008).

Since writing is an indispensable skill to support the other language skills (e.g., listening, speaking, grammar and reading) in terms of developing ideas, reformulating knowledge and discovering personal experiences, teacher feedback is indeed needed to improve their writing performance and to make them comprehend whether they have written clearly, accurately and effectively. This could happen if the teacher provides kinds of feedback which are suitable or effective for them in order to cover their limitation in writing. However, since we do not know what kind of feedback to be categorized as 'effective feedback' for students, the perceptions of the students can be a helpful instrument to identify the effectiveness and the usefulness of one particular type of feedback. Kluger and DeNisi (1996) argue that feedback focused more on the self rather than the task itself, meaning that it focuses more on students' attention on other things than on their learning proceeding and the bad side of it. The feedback perception is the students' reaction at receiving feedback (Lizzio and Wilson, 2008).

There are also some different views about effective feedback. Lipnevich & Smith (2009) suggested that in order to reach the expected result, feedback should comprise detailed, clear and specific comments. Besides, Lizzio and Wilson (2008) also claim that an effective feedback should comprise three dimensions: it should be developmental, encouraging and fair. A developmental factor means that feedback identifies learning goals and strategies. The encouraging factor shows the level of interest or engagement in the assignment. The fairness factor means that the criteria of feedback are transparent and objective. Whereas, Wijsman (2010) only proposed two dimensions which become the basis of indicators of effective feedback, namely developmental and encouraging dimensions.

## 2.2. Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1986) states that self-efficacy is the judgments of people concerning their capabilities to construct and conduct tasks of action in order to achieve designated types of performance. Bandura (1986) also asserts that self-efficacy beliefs are a primary role of personal division and a filter through which people interpret the world and control their behavior. Moreover, self-efficacy reflects how confident students are in terms of performing a specific task. SAMPAINI Having high self-efficacy in one area may not coincide with high self-efficacy in another one. Many students have difficulty in school not because they are incapable of performing successfully, but because they are incapable of believing that they can perform successfully. They have

learned to see themselves as incapable of handling academic skills (Bandura, 1997).

People with low self-efficacy toward a task are more likely to avoid it, whereas those with high self-efficacy are not only more likely to attempt the task, but they will also work harder and persist longer in terms of facing difficulties. Furthermore, self-efficacy affects what activities students select; how much effort they put forth; how persistent they are in term of facing the difficulties and how difficult the goals they set. Students with low self-efficacy do not expect to do well and do not achieve the level which is equal with their abilities since they do not believe they have the skills to do well. That's why they don't try.

Bandura (2006) assumes that people with different perception on their ability (e.g. self-efficacy) are most likely to perform differently despite of having the same level of actual ability. In writing ability, self-efficacy of students has massive contribution whether bringing the successful outcome or not since they have to choose which choices or instructions they want to use that fit their capability. Moreover the successful outcome is also determined in terms of the amount of self-efficacy people have to conduct something as stated by Bandura (1989).

There are three factors that affect self-efficacy according to Bandura (1994). They are mastery experience-a belief that they can do something new if it is similar to something they have already done, vicarious experience-tendency to observe the success and failures of the others (models) who are similar to oneself, verbal persuasion-people are persuaded verbally that they can achieve or master a task, they are more likely to do the task (e.g., feedback), and somatic and emotional state-partial reliance on their somatic and emotional states in terms of judging their capabilities by comprising bodily signs (e.g., anxiety and tension).

## 2.3. Teacher Feedback Perception and Writing Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is such kind of motivational construct which is essential in the students' academic achievement (Wijsman, 2010). Self-efficacy is also a context-specific assessment of people's ability to handle certain assignments at a particular occasion (Bandura, 1986). In other words, students' academic achievement can be affected by self-efficacy belief related to their beliefs in their writing abilities (Schunck and Swatz as cited in Ekholm, Zumburn and Conklin, 2014) since there are some aspects of writing (content, organization, vocabulary, language use, mechanic) that should be known and comprehended to create a qualified writing (Weigle, 2002). This is supported by Klassen (2002) that self-efficacy belief plays a prominent role in the prediction of writing achievement.

Feedback has an important role for both self-efficacy and writing proceeding of students (Duijnhouwer, Prins, and Stokking, 2010). This is proven by Bandura (1994) that verbal persuasion (e.g. feedback) is one of the factors that affects people self-efficacy belief; strategy instruction enhances students' self-efficacy belief (Kluger and DeNisi, 1996) which eventually lead them to give certain amount of effort in doing tasks (e.g. writing). That's the association between feedback and writing self-efficacy.

Moreover, According to Tadlock and Zumburn as cited in Ekholm, Zumburn and Conklin (2014), writing feedback perceptions are defined as an effective responses and openness of students upon receiving feedback about their



writing. How they think the feedback give the effectiveness toward their writing. According to Ekholm et. al. (2014), students with positive feedback perceptions tended to be more self-efficacious writers than students with negative feedback perceptions. Besides, Duijnhouwer, Prins and

Stokking as cited in Wijsman (2010) found the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs before and after feedback was received. Students had decreased self-efficacy after receiving improvement strategies compared to when they wrote their first draft with moderate or low self-efficacy. This happened because they perceive feedback from teacher with low confidence. This confirms their feelings of the incapability. Therefore, this current research was carried out to corroborate the relation between students' perception regarding teacher feedback and self-efficacy belief. Whether their perception about feedback also make them judge their own ability which lead them to have certain amount of self-efficacy creating good writing performance and help students to express what they want to express in term of communicating toward the variety of people at the end of the day. The research questions: (1) How is students' perception on teacher feedback?, (2) How is student writing self-efficacy? And (3) Is there any significant correlation between students' perception on teacher feedback and writing self-efficacy?

### 3. METHODS

The current research was carried out in a foreign language university in Indonesia, East Kalimantan that was Mulawarman University. This research also employed correlational quantitative as its methodology which comprised 36 students as the participants. The participants were chosen based on those who have experienced in making essays and getting the variety of teacher feedback in the third semester. In other words, the fifth semester students of English Department with 36 students who have been taught on how to make an essay and got teacher feedback were considered as the appropriate participants for this research. They had to fill the questionnaire regarding their perception on teacher feedback and writing self-efficacy which eventually were measured to find the significant correlation between variable X (teacher feedback perception) and Y (writing self-efficacy).

Moreover, this research employed questionnaires to measure both variables which were teacher feedback perception and writing self-efficacy questionnaires to investigate the relationship between students' perception on teacher feedback and writing self-efficacy. The first questionnaire, teacher feedback questionnaire, was adapted from Lizzio and Wilson (2008) which comprised 21 statements (positive and negative statements) with Cronbach alpha ( $\alpha = 0.736$ ). The participants should answer on a 7-point scale, which ranged from (1) *not true at all* until (7) *very true*. The middle range was (4) *neutral* since 1 scale was as the indication of the lowest score and otherwise for 7 scale.

According to Lizzio and Wilson (2008), the concept of teacher feedback perception must have three dimensions as the indicators as the basis for measuring it and being called as an effective feedback for students as in developmental dimension, encouraging dimension and fair dimension. Developmental feedback-how students are able to engage

toward the type of feedback given by teacher as the their guidance or strategy for their academic learning and their performance, encouraging feedback-how students are most likely to be able to enhance their motivation, and fair feedback is on how students are most likely to be able to reflect the clarity, legibility and consistency of information. So, this current research employed those three dimensions as the indicators.

The second questionnaire was writing self-efficacy questionnaire which was adapted from Duijnhouwer, Prins and Stokking (2010). They followed the theory Bandura defined. However, Duijnhouwer, Prins and Stokking (2010) defined the term of writing self-efficacy as the judgment of one's capability to write the required text. It comprised 18 statements with Cronbach alpha ( $\alpha = 0.891$ ). Participants should state their opinion on a 7-point scale, which ranged from (1) *not true at all* until (7) *very true*. The middle range was (4) *neutral* since 1 scale was as the indication of the lowest score and otherwise for 7 scale.

After finding the validity and reliability of both questionnaires, they were distributed toward 36 fifth semester students of English Department. Then the raw scores of the data were converted into Z-score to counterbalance the imbalances of range of both questionnaires. Then, the data were tested with a Pearson correlation measurement to find out the correlation between both variables by employing SPSS 21 program.

### 4. FINDINGS

#### 4.1. The Finding of Students' Perception on Teacher Feedback

Result from the descriptive analysis (M, SD) of the sample were presented in Table 1. It could be seen that the mean score of students' perception on teacher feedback was 50,00307 indicating that students' perception on teacher feedback as an effective feedback was moderate for them. Furthermore, table 2 indicated the students' perception on teacher feedback in term of category. It was comprehended that among 36 students, 3 students (8%) had very high criterion which meant teacher feedback was very highly effective for them, 5 students (14%) had high criterion which meant teacher feedback was highly effective for them, 19 students (53%) had moderate criterion which meant teacher feedback was moderately effective for them and 9 students (25%) had low criterion which meant teacher feedback was lowly effective for them. Therefore, it meant that more than 70% of students thought that feedback provided by the teacher was average in term of giving the effectiveness toward them.

Teacher Feedback Perception	
Mean	50,00307
Standard Deviation	10,00256
Maximum	75,48
Minimum	34,04

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Teacher Feedback Perception Questionnaire

Category	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
Very Low	< 33	-	-
Low	33 – 43	9 students	25%
Moderate	44 – 54	19 students	53%
High	55 – 65	5 students	14%
Very High	66 – Above	3 students	8%

**Table 2.** Frequency Distribution for Categorizing Students' Perception on Teacher Feedback

Development	Encouragement	Fairness
50.0020	50.0000	49.9929

**Table 3.** The Mean Scores of Three dimensions

#### 4.2. The Finding of Students' Writing Self-Efficacy

The result of the second hypothesis was shown into the descriptive analyses (M, SD) of the sample which was presented in Table 4. It could be seen that the mean score of students' writing self-efficacy was 50,00094 indicating that their writing self-efficacy was average. This means that their judgment on their capability in writing essay was average. Furthermore, table 5 indicated the students' writing self-efficacy in term of category. It was comprehended that among 36 students, 3 students (8%) had very high criterion which meant that they had very high writing self-efficacy, 7 students (20%) had high criterion which meant that they had high writing self-efficacy, 13 students (36%) had moderate criterion which meant that they had moderate writing self-efficacy, 12 students (33%) had low criterion which meant that they had low writing self-efficacy and 1 student (3%) had very low which meant that he/she had very low writing self-efficacy. Therefore, it meant that more than 60% of students whose moderate writing self-efficacy, their belief toward their ability in term of writing in all aspects (e.g. content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanic) was average.

#### Writing Self-Efficacy

Mean	50,00094
Standard Deviation	9,99782
Maximum	72,23
Minimum	30,56

**Table 4.** Frequency Distribution of Teacher Feedback Perception Questionnaire

Category	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
Very Low	< 32	1 student	3%
Low	32 – 43	12 students	33%
Moderate	44 – 54	13 students	36%
High	55 – 66	7 students	20%
Very High	67 – Above	3 students	8%

**Table 5.** Frequency Distribution for Categorizing Students' Perception on Teacher Feedback

#### 4.3. The Data Analysis of Correlation between Two Variables

As being mentioned in the previous explanation, in order to analyze both variables, investigate if there was any significant correlation or not, Pearson Product Moment was used through SPSS 21 Program. However, before proceeding to analyze it, the hypotheses and decision making process were presented as follows:

$H_0$  = There is no significant correlation between students' perception on teacher feedback and writing self-efficacy.

$H_a$  = There is significant correlation between students' perception on teacher feedback and writing self-efficacy.

Where:

If  $p$  value  $> \alpha$ ;  $H_0$  is accepted

If  $p$  value  $< \alpha$  /  $p$  value =  $\alpha$ ;  $H_0$  is rejected

		Teacher Feedback Perception	Writing self-Efficacy
Teacher Feedback Perception	Pearson Correlation	1	.316
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.061
	N	36	36
Writing self-Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	.316	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.061	
	N	36	36

**Table 6.** The Correlation of Students' Perception on Teacher Feedback and their Writing Self-Efficacy

Based on the calculation by employing software SPSS 21 shown in table 6, the p-value was 0.061 with the r-value of 0.316. It means that the p-value was higher than the level of significance 0.05 ( $p$ -value  $> \alpha$ ). As the consequences, the Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was accepted. It implies that there was no a significant correlation between students' perception on teacher feedback and writing self-efficacy. Aside from seeing the p-value, it was corroborated by the r-value, of 0.316 and it was considered as a low correlation category since according to Gay et. al. (2012) the r-value which is between +0.35 and -0.35, is categorized as a low correlational category.

#### 5. DISCUSSION

This research was carried out to investigate whether students' perception on teacher feedback affected their writing self-efficacy which would eventually lead them to have certain amount of self-efficacy in term of writing.

Based on the result of questionnaire on the students' perception on teacher feedback, it was generally found that students perceived that teacher feedback was moderately effective for them. In terms of the developmental dimension, which got the highest score (50.0020) from the students, it was found that all of the students felt that feedback provided by the teacher help them in developing and revising their writing in all aspects (i.e. content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanic). The perceived that they were able to apply the feedback more widely for future writing assignment, so they would not make the same mistakes for the next essay they write. As stated by Lizzio and Wilson (2008) that feedback is an important aspect of students'



learning processes and it is a factor contributing to student writing experience.

On the other hand, the fairness dimension got the lowest score with the average of 49.9929. This implied that even though the students felt that they can use the feedback effectively for future writing assignment, they felt that the feedback given by the teacher was not fair enough for the students. This unfair teacher feedback was perceived by the students in the aspects of clarity of information and comments that the teacher provided. They felt that the teacher comments and information on their papers were not clear enough to underrated so that it was difficult to make necessary revision. In addition, the students thought that the feedback the teacher provided in the forms of comments and symbols were sometimes hard to understand so that the revision might not meet the teacher's expectation in their writing. This gives implication to the teacher that the information and comments provided on students' paper should be clear and unambiguous.

The dimension of encouragement was the second place on the students' perception with the average score of 50.0. It is the dimension in which the students feel encouraged and motivated by the teacher feedback. The score of the students' perception in this dimension implied that the teacher feedback was useful to encourage and motivate them to make efforts for better achievement in their writing. It was proven by the rate of response they gave in negative feedback statement of the questionnaire which was "Teacher showed my mistakes all the time" accounted for 27.8% to choose *mostly not true* as the response of it. It means that the teacher did not show all of the students' mistakes in all occasions. The teacher let the students find out and correct their mistakes by themselves. This condition might be perceived by the students as the encouragement and motivation to make great efforts for revision in their papers.

In relation to self-efficacy, it was found that students' writing self-efficacy was also moderate. This means that students' belief in their ability in terms of writing in all aspects (e.g. content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanic) was moderate, not high and not low. The score of the students in this aspect informed how they were not too sure to claim that they have a confidence in their ability to write the essay since most of them tended to rate their confident capacity by choosing *neutral* which accounted for 30.5% and *slightly true* with the percentage of 33.3%, compared to *very true* scale which only accounted for 16.7%. this finding is consistent with what Bandura (2006) already stated that people with different perception on their ability (e.g. self-efficacy) are most likely to perform differently despite of having the same level of actual ability. Despite that they had lack of confidence, they still expected to be able to overcome their difficulties they encountered in writing essays. For example, they want to be able to write a well-structured essay and write better essays in all aspects (i.e. content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanic). Most of them (35.1%) selected the *slightly true* toward those statements. Bandura (1994) said that mastery experiences are the most effective way to enhance self-efficacy since people more likely believe they can do something new if it is similar to something they have already done. This current research showed that mastery experience can affect self-efficacy.

After analyzing the relationship between students' perception on teacher feedback and writing self-efficacy, the findings showed that there was no correlation between students' perception on teacher feedback and their writing self-efficacy. Null hypothesis of this study was accepted, meaning that that the perception on teacher feedback of the students did not give any contribution toward the certain amount of self-efficacy they have in term of performing writing task. This was consistent with the first previous research carried out by Wijsman (2010) whose result was the same as this current research that there was no correlation between students' perception on teacher feedback and writing self-efficacy.

Even though the finding of this research was similar to Wijsman (2010), both studies had a difference in terms of the number of indicator used. Unlike this current research, which used three dimensions of perception, Wijsman's study had only had two dimensions as the indicators of effective feedback, they were developmental and encouraging dimensions. This is evident that with or without the fair dimension as the indicator of effective feedback as Lizzio and Wilson claimed, it was most likely not to change the result of the significance of the relationship between students' perception on teacher feedback and writing self-efficacy.

If compared to the study conducted by Ekholm et. al. (2014) in which one of the findings revealed that feedback perception had a positive correlation with writing self-efficacy on how they have reciprocity for each other. It was automatically different with this current research. Ekholm et al. investigated whether feedback perception gave the mediational relationship between writing self-efficacy toward writing self-regulation aptitude. The data analysis showed that showed that writing feedback perceptions partially mediated the relationship between students' writing self-efficacy beliefs and their perceived writing self-regulatory behaviors. This research also employed questionnaires as the instruments for each variable as the current research. However, its questionnaire investigated the students' feedback perception in term of their feeling-whether they liked or felt comfortable with the feedback given by teacher (Tadlock and Zumbrunn in Ekholm 2014) without giving any further explanation what kinds of feedback they like. So, it was solely about students' preference of the feedback they got without perceiving the role of feedback for their writing. This current study on the other hand employed the students' feedback perception questionnaire in term of their opinions-whether the feedback given by the teacher was effective or not. Moreover, it was also divided into three dimensions (i.e. development, encouragement and fairness) on how they perceive the feedback given by teacher will develop, encourage and give the fairness for them. It showed the role of feedback as an effective feedback for students. Therefore, it is proven that certain variables with different indicators were probably able to produce different result of the significant relationship between students' perception on teacher feedback and writing self-efficacy.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

Students were assigned to fill in the teacher feedback perception and writing self-efficacy questionnaire in order to see whether there was correlation between those two variables or not. The findings of this research indicated that students' perception on teacher feedback as the effective

feedback was moderate and so was their writing self-efficacy. However, compared to average scores of both variables, it was found that the average score of writing self-efficacy was lower than that of their perception on the effectiveness of the teacher feedback. The finding also showed that even if teacher feedback was effective for the development of their writing skill, they still did not have enough confidence in writing performance. This was most likely the reason why there was no correlation between students' perception on teacher feedback and their writing self-efficacy since the p-value of this finding was 0.061 which was nearly close to the level of significance ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

Therefore, since the p-value and r-value of this research were 0.061 and 0.316 which means that the correlation was low and therefore, it was not significant at the significance degree of 0.05. It was assumed that there's a little possibility that the students' perception on teacher feedback related to their writing self-efficacy. Thus, it is suggested to investigate the relationship of both variables by incorporating other factors and/or indicators which were (not) included in this research since some studies may have different result due to their different indicators. Moreover, there are some limitations of this research which are most likely to be considered, such as the small numbers of participants with only 36 subjects and the design of this research that just merely gave questionnaires for the things students' got in a fairly long interval of time without giving any further treatment toward them..

## 7. REFERENCES

### 30

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: a social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Regulation of cognitive processes through perceive self-efficacy. *Developmental Psychology*.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V.S Ramachandran (Ed). *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, New York: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy; the exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman Company.
- Bandura, A. (2006). *Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales*.  
<http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/effguide.htm>  
1.
- Cakrawati, T. (2012). The effect of using communicative cartoon movies on the teaching of writing skill at the second grade of smpn 1 arjosari, pacitan, east java.
- Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31, 219-233.
- Duijnhouwer, H. Prins, F. & Stokking, M. (2010a). Progress feedback effects on students' writing mastery goal, self-efficacy beliefs and performance, 16, 53-74.
- Ekholm, E., Zumbrunn, S., & Conklin, S. (2014). The relation of college student self-efficacy between writing and writing self-regulation aptitude: writing feedback perceptions as a mediating variable. *Teaching in Higher Education*.
- Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N. & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. 6-16, 91-391.
- Gay, L., Mills, G., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and applications*. Boston: Boston College.
- Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of feedback, review of educational research, 7 (1),81-112.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 255-286.
- Hyland, K. (2000). Disciplinary discourses: social interactions in academic writing. London: Longman.
- Klassen, R. (2002). Writing in early adolescence: a review of the role of self-efficacy beliefs. *Educational Psychology Review*, 14, 173-203.
- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback intervention on performance: a historical review, a meta analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 254-284. doi: 10.1037//00332909.119.2.254.
- Lipnevich, A. A., & Smith, J. K. (2009). "I really need feedback to learn:" students' perspectives on the effectiveness of the differential feedback messages. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 21, 347-367.
- Lizzio, A., & Wilson, K. (2008). Feedback on assessment: students' perceptions of quality and effectiveness. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33, 263-275.

Ruegg, R. (2014). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on changes in efl students' writing self-efficacy, DOI: 10.1080/09571736.2014.958190.

Weigle, S. (2002). *Assessing writing*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wijsman, L. (2010). The relation between self-efficacy and feedback perception and between feedback and intrinsic motivation.

**31**



# The Correlation between Students' Perceptions on Teacher Feedback and Writing Self- Efficacy

## ORIGINALITY REPORT

18%

SIMILARITY INDEX

17%

INTERNET SOURCES

7%

PUBLICATIONS

%

STUDENT PAPERS

## PRIMARY SOURCES

1	<a href="http://www.slideshare.net">www.slideshare.net</a> Internet Source	3%
2	<a href="http://eprints.umm.ac.id">eprints.umm.ac.id</a> Internet Source	3%
3	<a href="http://www.tandfonline.com">www.tandfonline.com</a> Internet Source	2%
4	<a href="http://srhe.tandfonline.com">srhe.tandfonline.com</a> Internet Source	1%
5	<a href="http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id">digilib.uinsby.ac.id</a> Internet Source	1%
6	<a href="http://clutejournals.com">clutejournals.com</a> Internet Source	1%
7	<a href="http://media.neliti.com">media.neliti.com</a> Internet Source	1%
8	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net">hdl.handle.net</a> Internet Source	1%
9	<a href="http://jurnal.fkip.unila.ac.id">jurnal.fkip.unila.ac.id</a> Internet Source	1%

10	<a href="http://lib.euser.org">lib.euser.org</a> Internet Source	1 %
11	<a href="http://manojshetty.com">manojshetty.com</a> Internet Source	1 %
12	<a href="http://www.coursehero.com">www.coursehero.com</a> Internet Source	1 %
13	<a href="http://pure.tue.nl">pure.tue.nl</a> Internet Source	<1 %
14	<a href="http://core.ac.uk">core.ac.uk</a> Internet Source	<1 %
15	<a href="http://open.metu.edu.tr">open.metu.edu.tr</a> Internet Source	<1 %
16	Sharon Zumbrunn, Sarah Marrs, Caitlin Mewborn. "Toward a better understanding of student perceptions of writing feedback: a mixed methods study", Reading and Writing, 2015 Publication	<1 %
17	<a href="http://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu">cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu</a> Internet Source	<1 %
18	<a href="http://eprints.uny.ac.id">eprints.uny.ac.id</a> Internet Source	<1 %
19	<a href="http://www.iet-c.net">www.iet-c.net</a> Internet Source	<1 %

[eurokd.com](http://eurokd.com)

20

Internet Source

<1 %

---

21

[viurrspace.ca](http://viurrspace.ca)

Internet Source

<1 %

---

22

[www.researchgate.net](http://www.researchgate.net)

Internet Source

<1 %

---

23

Moylett, Helen. "EBOOK: Characteristics of Effective Early Learning: Helping young children become learners for life", EBOOK: Characteristics of Effective Early Learning: Helping young children become learners for life, 2013

Publication

<1 %

---

24

[stars.library.ucf.edu](http://stars.library.ucf.edu)

Internet Source

<1 %

---

25

[thehubedu-production.s3.amazonaws.com](http://thehubedu-production.s3.amazonaws.com)

Internet Source

<1 %

---

26

[www.acarindex.com](http://www.acarindex.com)

Internet Source

<1 %

---

27

Alberth. "Use of Facebook, students' intrinsic motivation to study writing, writing self-efficacy and writing performance", Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 2018

Publication

<1 %

---

28

Rachael Ruegg. "The effect of peer and teacher feedback on changes in EFL students'

<1 %



# writing self-efficacy", The Language Learning Journal, 2014

Publication

---

29

Ting Sun, Chuang Wang. "College students' writing self-efficacy and writing self-regulated learning strategies in learning English as a foreign language", System, 2020

Publication

---

<1 %

30

repository.uin-suska.ac.id

Internet Source

---

<1 %

---

Exclude quotes      On

Exclude matches      Off

Exclude bibliography      On