

A Comparison Differences in Students' Perceptions Toward Using Teacher's Feedback

Andi Syahputra^{1*}

¹ Tadris Bahasa Inggris, STAIN Teungku Dirundeng Meulaboh, Aceh, Indonesia
e-mail: andjphd36@gmail.com¹

Abstract

This study aims to compare their perceptions between gender and their age toward using the teachers' feedback in their classroom. This study applied a quantitative method with survey method, which allowed the data to be quantified and analyzed using statistical analysis. In collecting the data, the Questionnaire Feedback, Identification, School Trajectories that measure their perceptions about Effective Teachers' Feedback (EFT) and Ineffective Teachers' Feedback (IEFT) have been used. The samples are 125 students, who are 53 boys and 72 girls, also 17 and 18 years old. The data are analyzed by descriptive statistics. The findings showed that there were statistically significant differences perceptions among students across their genders ($p \leq 0.001$) on EFT perceived. Furthermore, there is a significant difference between 17 years old students and 18 years old students ($p \geq 0.05$) on EFT perceived. As the result, the students' gender and their age have main effect, with girls perceiving are more effective than boys, which leads them to report receiving more feedback from their teachers when compared to boys, and 18 years old students' percept more than 17 years old students on teachers' feedback toward their reading achievement.

Keywords: Students' Perceptions, Teacher's Feedback

1. Introduction

There are many languages around the world. English is believed to be one of the international languages commonly used in the world. Also, it is officially used in any the united nation meeting. Therefore, it is essential that the language is taught in across the education levels. Indeed, it has been included in one of the National examination subjects in Indonesia. Similarly, to learning other foreign languages, reading is one of four skills that need to be mastered in English by students. Reading has been defined mainly as a complex process between the reader and the text (Madani., 2016). In addition, reading is the activity of word recognition, phonemic decoding, and text comprehension. Meaning is constructed through a process which includes dynamic interactions between the reader background knowledge, the information in the text, and the reading situation context (Andi, 2014). Besides that, the reading is a process in which seeing, understanding and comprehending the words, sentences, punctuation and other elements in a written text are needed (Esra C., & Sabri, 2018). Of particular are there are five crucial reading specified, there are reading comprehension strategies, vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness, and reading fluency (Akyol, H., & Boyaci-Altinay, 2019).

In other words, the efficient reading skills will serve as toolkits to read the world that could help one to be better student or worker (Zuhana et al., 2014). In academic and working environments setting, students and the readers are constantly need to synthesize, evaluate, interpret and use the information in text selectively. Thus, it is an important thing for them, for instance how to have good analytical skills to evaluate an analyze the information contained in the text they encounter daily (Zuhana et al., 2014).

A part of reading, teacher's feedback on students is important. Feedback is a strategy to improve students' knowledge in their reading skill. It also increases learning achievement for the teachers as well as the students. In some researches, feedback is some procedures of instructional response to inform a student which is right or wrong, it also plays an essential role in many procedures of learning (Edmunds, Milton, & Wills, 2015; Freedberg, Glass, Filoteo, Hazeltine, & Maddox, 2017, p. 12). For instance, dawdling feedback, giving reward to feedback

*Corresponding author.

affect to learning, and comparing the effectiveness of positive and negative feedback to learning (Freedberg et al., 2017; Galea, Mallia, Rothwell, & Diedrichsen, 2015).

Positive feedback may take the form of praise markers such as “OK,” “fine,” “good,” and “excellent” and/or all preceding terms + “job” or “work” such as “excellent work” or “nice job”. Negative feedback or corrective feedback as any teacher behavior that minimally attempts to inform the learner of the fact of error (Fakhrul A., Sofyan A.G., 2019). There are six types of negative feedback or corrective feedback including: 1) explicit correction in which teacher provides the correct form and clearly shows that what the student had said was incorrect answer; 2) recasts is the teacher’s reformulation of all or part of the students’ utterance in true form; 3) Elicitation is when the teacher directly elicits a reformulation from students by asking questions; 4) metalinguistics clues is the feedback in comments form, information form, or questions form related to the well-formed utterance of the students; 5) clarification requests in when the teacher uses phrases, for examples “pardon?” or “I don’t understand” to ask for a clarification from the students; 6) repetition is when the teacher repeats the students’ ill-formed utterance (Asnawi., Zulfikar., 2017).

Similarly, the researchers had argued that the effective feedback should provide two ways, verification and elaboration. The verification way can be implemented in several comments to confirm whether an answer is right or wrong, for example “true” or “false”. Besides that, direct verification can be given by assigning or checking mark an answer to indicate the truth or error. Moreover, elaboration way has more variation than the verification way, such as describing a topic or main idea, explaining a response, discussing a particular error, providing an example already answered, and preparing a key answer or a guide (Sumarno, Setyosari, P., 2017, p. 443).

Also, feedback is a statement on students’ learning achievement in doing test or exercise to improve their incomplete learning (Safak, P, Yilmaz, H. C., Demiryurek, P., & Dogus, 2016, p. 109). The students will receive an evaluation or comment on what they have done. This evaluation will give special satisfaction for students. In evaluation, the feedback should be given immediately by teachers which indicate to the students’ correctness of their response. A good feedback gives students information they need so they can understand where they are in their learning and what to do next—the cognitive factor. Once they feel they understand what to do and why, most students develop a feeling that they have control over their own learning—the motivational factor. Good feedback contains information that a student can use, which means that the student has to be able to hear and understand it. Students can’t hear something that’s beyond their comprehension; nor can they hear something if they are not listening or are feeling like it would be useless to listen. Because students’ feelings of control and self-efficacy are involved, even well-intentioned feedback can be very destructive (Sen, 2017). In addition, it is the information provided by a teacher towards the students regarding their performance or their achievement during teaching-learning processes (Asnawi., Zulfikar., 2017, p. 279).

Further, ideally, both self-assessment (internal feedback) and teacher feedback (external feedback) should help students control their learning. New concepts and skills will require more teacher regulation, including teacher feedback that describes performance and also suggests strategies for improvement. The teachers’ strategies that they suggest and model will become part of the students’ repertoire for practicing that skill. The teachers’ criteria that they describe in their feedback will become part of the students’ own criteria for viewing that kind of work. Gradually more and more self-assessment should occur: as concepts become more familiar, students come up with their own learning strategies, and less teacher’s feedback is needed. Many teachers asserted that they had implemented and given abundant feedback to their students (Carvalho et al., 2015, p. 2336; Hattie, 2009). However, Carvalho et.al. cited Valente et al. (2009) research result, the teachers frequently used the type of person-centered feedback to the students’ performance and their achievement, such as accused, judged, and punished. This type is not effective in increasing students’ learning (Carvalho et al., 2015; Valente, M.O., Conboy, J., & Carvalho, 2009).

Teacher’s feedback used to decrease the differences between students’ comprehension, their performance, and teachers’ development and their actual performance

(Hattie, 2009). In some research findings had presented feedback was one of the most powerful technique and affected on students' achievement (Hattie, 2009), as well as an essential value of pedagogical process, because it has relationship between teachers' implementation and students' needs (Bailey & Garner, 2010; Sumarno, Setyosari, P., 2017).

On the other hand, based on the content of feedback and the form of feedback (the two broad categories of errors) are concerned, Chandler (2003, p. 276) argues that the three patterns that are response by the teachers in their classroom. These are: (1) the regular response (firstly, giving feedback on content and then feedback on form in a later draft) (2) the reverse pattern (3) another are mixed in which form and content feedback (Al-Jarrah, R., & Al-Ahmad, 2012). Additionally, Feedback is any expressions or information which provide a notify on the result of a learning achievement or a certain behavior (Leh, Ling Ying; Bin Ibrahim, 2019, p. 97; Sumarno, Setyosari, P., 2017, p. 444). According to Wasding (2013) explained that feedback is useful to examine the success or the failure of learners' achievement result. By providing feedback to students, they will be aware that their achievement is acceptable or not. In language learning, feedback focuses almost all aspects of language elements and language skills. For instance: positive feedback, negative feedback, the forms of verbal, non-verbal feedback expressions, and neutral feedback. Feedback covers both oral feedback and written feedback (Wasding, 2013).

The purpose of feedback is to enable students to acquire information. The teachers should create the best decisions on what knowledge information they need to impart in a moment timely (Krish, 2006). The teacher's feedback should help students not only on how to acquire knowledge but also how to acquire it well (Safak, P, Yilmaz, H. C., Demiryurek, P., & Dogus, 2016). In language learning, the term feedback refers to the information given to learners that can be used to revise language skills, particularly in reading skill too (Phuong, T.T., & Huan, 2018). Feedback also refers to any indication to the learners that their target language used is incorrect, which includes various responses that the learners receive (Lightbown, P., & Spada, 2001, p. 171).

In contrast, some English teachers did not give their feedback on their students' reading achievement either spoken or written. Consequently, the students who get bad achievement result will face difficulties in understanding a reading text comprehensively. It is based on the preliminary research conducted by the researcher. This finding is supported: 1) Carvalho et al. (2014) who also had used the Questionnaire Feedback, Identification, School Trajectories (QFIST) as their instrument on "teachers' feedback: exploring differences in students' perceptions, found that no differences were found in the perceived feedback regarding a main effect of the type of education program attended, neither for the combined effect of type of education program attended and the student gender. However, results revealed a student gender main effect, with girls perceiving more effective feedback than boys (Carvalho et al., 2014); 2) Hattie (2011), in his research, he claimed that a teacher should continually give feedback to the students because it is more effective influences on students' achievement (Hattie, 2011); 3) Hong Li and Qingying Lin (2007) obtained similar result by investigating teachers' feedback in a Chinese college context in the College of Bioengineering and the College of Material Science and Engineering in Chongqing University, PR China: the positive impact of teachers' feedback is on the accuracy of the target achievement when the students were asked to revise their achievements (Hong, L., & Qingying, 2007); 4) Silver and Lee (2007) viewed that the teacher's feedback as a crucial variable in the process approach as it helps to pinpoint students' strengths and weaknesses, and helps them to be better motivated (Silver, R., & Lee, 2007); 5) Hyland and Hyland (2006) found that the teacher's feedback is considered as a useful tool that can be used to promote students' revision (Hyland, K., & Hyland, 2006).

However, some studies revealed conflicting results where teacher's feedback could have a positive, negative, or even a debilitating effect on achievement, for instance they examined the immediate influence of possible combinations of positive and negative feedback (consistent and inconsistent) on task performance and goal-setting (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Shute, 2008). In another result, Kluger and DeNisi (Cited in Carvalho et al., 2014) revealed that in fact a third of the findings of their research about the effectiveness of feedback on learning were negative (Carvalho et al., 2014, p. 170). There also some various research

findings shown that the characteristics of effective feedback had a negative effect and is not effective on learning, for examples in Wiggins, 2012; Thurlings, Vermeulen, Bastiaens & Stijnen, 2013.

Some literatures had been believed that feedback is important, but there are some notes under which feedback can supports learning. The following are: First, feedback requires to be formative feedback. Shute (2008) outlines the importance of formative feedback defining it as “information communicated to the learner that is intended to modify the learner’s thinking or behavior for the purpose of improving learning” (Shute, 2008, p. 1). It should be attended to by the students, and implemented on to improve performance (Carless, 2007). Second, feedback needs timely (Gibbs, G., & Simpson, 2004). It should be given back to the student not long after they have written the assignment. Third, feedback should focus on the error. In a recent article, Dana Ferris (2006) shows that error correction feedback is effective (D Ferris, 2006). Fourth, make sure the feedback is linked to an assessment that is linked to criteria and specific outcomes (Gibbs, G., & Simpson, 2004). Therefore, it is advised to use rubrics and an established set of criteria. Moreover, teachers’ feedback is one of the effective strategies to revise students’ achievement in doing their reading test which could be direct or indirect (Lee, 2003). For examples, in dialog methods and mini-conferences during teaching and learning process, or write the comments on the students’ answer paper. Feedback is also information given to a person to scaffold learning experiences and evaluate performance successively toward the goal (Sprouls., 2011).

Another point is the general literature on feedback notes that teachers employ different ways to comment on students’ work. These include written feedback (Hartshorn et al., 2010; Junqueira, L., & Payant, 2015), oral feedback (Wasding, 2013), audio feedback (Wood et al., 2011), peer feedback (O’Donnell, 2014), teacher-student conferences (Patthey-Chavez, G.G., & Ferris, 1997), and computer-based feedback (Yoke et al., 2013) among others. In the literature, teacher written feedback is defined also as any comments, questions, or error corrections that are written on students’ assignments (Mack, 2009). It can take a variety of forms: praises, suggestions, questions, error corrections, criticisms, etc.

However, the students appear to prefer feedback on local errors and value teachers’ feedback on them (Asnawi., Zulfikar., 2017, p. 279). Ellis (2009) suggested focusing on marked features that learners appear to struggle with (Ellis, 2009). Ferris (2015) argued that feedback on local errors should be directed at rule-governed, “treatable” grammatical errors (Dana Ferris, 2015). Where focused or unfocused feedback is concerned, the general opinion favors focused feedback (Ellis, 2009). In spite of that, Brookhart (2012) claimed that without teacher’s feedback, students can become unmotivated and lose the sense of how they are doing and which aspects of their working they should pay more attention to (Brookhart, 2012). Today, many researchers argued that the feedback is a motivator in active learning in students’ classes, but there is confusion to distinguish between praise and feedback related to learning content (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). As Deci, Koester, and Ryan (Cited in Sumarno et al., 2017) revealed that while the teachers give the feedback directly, the students’ intrinsic motivation is significantly decreased and they are unwilling to encourage themselves of self-organize. Also, the teacher’s feedback as extrinsic rewards often encourages students to put more emphasis on incentives, which leads to higher competition intensity rather than high engagement in learning (Sumarno, Setyosari, P., 2017, pp. 445–446).

The students are observers or the agents of feedback in learning process, each them have different teacher’s feedback interpretation in their class. This study aims to compare their perceptions between gender and their age toward using the teachers’ feedback in their classroom. this study used the Questionnaire Feedback, Identification, School Trajectories (QFIST; Carvalho et al., 2014) that measure their perceptions about Effective Teachers’ Feedback (EFT) and Ineffective Teachers’ Feedback (IEFT)

2. Method

This study applied a quantitative method with survey method, which allowed the data to be quantified and analyzed using statistical analysis. Survey data were analyzed by descriptive statistical methods to answer research questions. Descriptive statistics including

frequencies, percentages, means, calculating the value of t-test were used to summarize the distribution of the data and the researcher used Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) program version 20.

The study was conducted at SMAN 1 Meulaboh in West Aceh district, Indonesia. The school was chosen using purposive sampling technique. The researcher chose the school for some reasons; Firstly, it might be represented other schools which have the same curriculum implementation and which have students from the different social economic background. Secondly, the school was located in the urban areas that enable the researcher to reach it easily. Thirdly, the researcher had good access to the site because he had ever served there from 2013 to 2015. The population of this study consisted of students studying in the 12th grade. The researcher randomly selected 125 students in 12th grade, who are between 17 and 18 years old. Regarding to Mean = 17.53 (SD = .501), there were 53 (42,4%) boys and 72 (57,6%) girls.

The researcher did his research on the last year students of senior high school. The researcher believed that the students studying in this grade will be able to do a self-reflection on their learning before continuing their studies at the university level.

This study used the questionnaire as an instrument. The questionnaire was a closed-ended questionnaire. In this study used the QFIST (Questionnaire Feedback, Identification, School Trajectories) that measure their perceptions about Effective Teachers' Feedback (EFT) and Ineffective Teachers' Feedback (IEFT). The questionnaire distributed to the students consisting of 10 questions in a four-point Likert scale (1 = never; 2 = occasionally; 3 = frequently; 4 = always). The questions provided seven items of evaluating Effective Teachers' Feedback (EFT) perceived: 1) the teacher explains the aims of the learning firstly; 2) the teacher presents the reading text topic lucidly; 3) the teacher writes some directions to support the students to do the assignment; 4) in improving students' achievement, the teacher allows the students' chances; 5) the teacher asks the students to discuss and explains their achievements to each other's; 6) after finishing a task, the teacher clarifies the incorrect answer and recommends the correct answer on their achievement directly; 7) to increase on the quality of students' achievement, the teacher proposes some questions related to the assignment. The other following three items evaluate Ineffective Teachers' Feedback (IEFT) perceived: 1) the teacher requires more suggestion on students' achievement; 2) the teacher's comments becomes less important for the students; 3) the teacher order the students to do their task to be a good achievement but the teacher does not explain how to get it.

The validity of the questionnaire was administered to different participants and responses checked to see if the questions were interpreted the same or differently by different participants. After assessing their feasibility and identifying any problems that could be encountered during data collection, the researcher modified the questionnaire. The academic advisors and experts in this field of study checked the validity of the questionnaire. Reliability of the study tool was verified according to the internal consistency method using Cronbach's Alpha method by applying it to a prospective sample of participants, from the population and outside the sample, the overall reliability of the instrument reached, and this indicates that the tool is valid and reliable enough to meet the objectives of the current study. Cronbach's Alpha is an appropriate method to determine the coefficient of internal consistency when items are not scored dichotomously.

3. Result and Discussion

Results

Based on the students' perception in EFT questions of the questionnaire, there was a significant difference between boys ($N=53$, $M=20.12$, $SD=3.21$) and girl ($N=72$, $M=22.32$, $SD=3.57$) $t=3.59$, $p\leq 0.001$.

Table 1. Mean differences for EFT perceived between boys and girls

Gender of students	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Boy	53	20,13	3,211	,441
Girl	72	22,32	3,568	,420

Table 2. T-test for EFT perceived between boys and girls

Dependent variables		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
Score_EFT	Equal variances assumed	,995	,320	-3,533	123
	Equal variances not assumed			-3,590	118,053

Furthermore, the students' perception in IEFT questions of the questionnaire, there is no significant difference between boys ($N=53$, $M=7.77$, $SD=2.08$) and girls ($N=72$, $M=7.50$, $SD=2.19$) at $p \geq 0.05$.

Table 3. Mean differences for IEFT perceived between boys and girls

Gender of students	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Boy	53	7,77	2,081	,286
Girl	72	7,50	2,195	,259

Table 4. T-test for IEFT perceived between boys and girls

Dependent variables		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
Score_IEFT	Equal variances assumed	,107	,744	,704	123
	Equal variances not assumed			,710	115,357

On the other hand, as for the EFT perceived, there is a significant difference between 17 years old ($N=59$, $M=20.15$, $SD=3.17$) and 18 years ($N=66$, $M=22.50$, $SD=3.58$) $t=-3.86$, $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 5. Mean differences for EFT perceived between 17 and 18 years old

Students' Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
17	59	20,15	3,167	,412
18	66	22,50	3,579	,441

Table 6. T-test for EFT perceived between 17 and 18 years old

Dependent variables		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
Score_EFT	Equal variances assumed	1,060	,305	-3,864	123
	Equal variances not assumed			-3,891	122,989

Otherwise, in IEFT perceived there is no significant difference between 17 years ($N=59$, $M=7.85$, $SD=2.02$) and 18 years ($N=66$, $M=7.41$, $SD=2.24$) at $p \geq 0.05$.

Table 7. Mean differences for IEFT perceived between 17 and 18 years old

Students' Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
17	59	7,85	2,024	,264
18	66	7,41	2,239	,276

Table 8. T-test for IEFT perceived between 17 and 18 years old

Dependent variables		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
Score_IEFT	Equal variances assumed	1,302	,256	1,143	123
	Equal variances not assumed			1,150	122,982

Discussions

The students had particular perceptions related to teacher's feedback that they do when their teacher assessed their work or they did not value the feedback, specifically on comparison differences between their gender and their age. The result has indicated that there were statistically significant differences perceptions among students across their genders. The girls have more perceptions of EFT perceived compared to the boys ($p \leq 0.001$). On the other hand, when compared students' percept on IEFT, the result proved that there was no significant difference between boys and girls ($p \geq 0.05$). Based on students' gender, there were differences perception on the effective and ineffective teachers' feedback. Girls perceiving are more effective than boys, which leads them to report receiving more feedback from their teachers when compared to boys. This result seems similar to [Havnes, et al. \(2012\)](#), they found that gender differences over perceptions of feedback. Girls were more critical than boys concerning the quality of the feedback received ([Havnes et al., 2012](#)). Also, [Carvalho et al. \(2014\)](#) found that girl reported greater frequency and more attentive of effective feedback when compared to boys ([Carvalho et al., 2014](#)). Further, an additional important point the current study highlights is that in which girls proved to be better able to manage and control their attention ([Else-Quest et al., 2006](#)).

On the other hand, there is a significant difference between 17 years old students and 18 years old students ($p \geq 0.05$) on EFT perceived. The result shows that 18 years old students' percept more than 17 years old students on teachers' feedback toward their reading achievement. In IEFT perceived there is no significant difference between 17 years old students and 18 years old student ($p \geq 0.05$). These findings were supported by Hattie and Timperley, they reported that 26% of the adolescent students in his sample preferred to be praised loudly and publicly when they achieved on an academic task, 64% preferred to be praised quietly and privately, and only 10% preferred teachers to say nothing at all. Thus, each student can perceive their teacher's feedback in different ways, it means that the individual and situational characteristics (either based on gender or age) can have essential impact on how the students perceive it ([Carvalho et al., 2015](#); [Havnes et al., 2012](#); [Rakoczy, Harks, Klieme, Blum, & Hochweber, 2013](#)). Moreover, the students' perceptions clearly indicated that they satisfied when the teacher corrected their work or assignment through the feedback

4. Conclusions and Suggestions

In conclusion, the findings are there were differences perception on the effective and ineffective teachers' feedback on students' gender. Girls perceiving are more effective than boys, which leads them to report receiving more feedback from their teachers when compared to boys. Further, considering the students' age, 18 years old students' percept more than 17 years old students on teachers' feedback toward their reading achievement. Thus, further

research should focus on how these feedback perceptions relate to learning and how learners' personal characteristics affect their feedback perceptions. Besides that, to understand the feedback contribution in learning, it is important to the future research the impact of feedback on high learning achievement and be attributed to the students' characteristics.

References

- Akyol, H., & Boyaci-Altinay, Y. (2019). Reading Difficulty and its Remediation: A Case Study. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 8(4), 1269–1286. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.8.4.1269>.
- Al-Jarrah, R., & Al-Ahmad, S. (2012). An Optimality-theoretic Account of Corrective Feedback in Process Writing. *Asian EFL Journal*, 14(3), 10–40. <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/main-editions-new/an-optimality-theoretic-account-of-corrective-feedback-in-process-writing/>.
- Andi, S. (2014). Improving Students' Reading Comprehension through Survey, Question, Read, Recite, and Review (SQ3R) Technique. *English Education Journal*, 5(2), 1–18. <http://jurnal.stkipkusumanegara.ac.id/index.php/semnara2020/article/view/808>.
- Asnawi., Zulfikar., & I. (2017). Students' Perception of Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Classes. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, 8(3), 275–291. <http://www.jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id/EEJ/article/view/8918>.
- Bailey, R., & Garner, M. (2010). Is the feedback in higher education assessment worth the paper it is written on? Teachers' reflections on their practices. *Teaching in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562511003620019>.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2012). Preventing Feedback Fizzle. *Educational Leadership*.
- Carless, D. (2007). Conceptualizing Pre-emptive Formative Assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 14(2), 171–184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695940701478412>.
- Carvalho, C., Conboy, J., Santos, J., Fonseca, J., Tavares, D., Martins, D., ... Gama, A. P. (2015). An Integrated Measure of Student Perceptions of Feedback, Engagement and School Identification. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.896>.
- Carvalho et al. (2014). Teachers' Feedback: Exploring Differences in Students' Perceptions. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 159, 169–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.351>.
- Edmunds, C. E. R., Milton, F., & Wills, A. J. (2015). Feedback can be superior to observational training for both rule-based and information-integration category structures. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2014.978875>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054>.
- Else-Quest et al. (2006). Gender Differences in Temperament: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(1), 33–72. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.33>.
- Esra C., & Sabri, S. (2018). Reading Comprehension Skills in Terms of the Sentiments Given in Reading Texts. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 7(4), 317–330. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v7.i4>.
- Fakhrul A., Sofyan A.G., B. D. (2019). Lecturers' Feedback in Speaking Class (A Descriptive Study at Ar-Raniry State Islamic). *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, 10(4), 447–472. <http://www.jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id/EEJ/article/view/14983>.
- Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? In F. Hyland & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues* (pp. 81–102). Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, Dana. (2015). Written corrective feedback in L2 writing: Connors & Lunsford (1988); Lunsford & Lunsford (2008); Lalande (1982). *Language Teaching*.

- <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444815000257>.
- Freedberg, M., Glass, B., Filoteo, J. V., Hazeltine, E., & Maddox, W. T. (2017). Comparing the effects of positive and negative feedback in information-integration category learning. *Memory and Cognition*. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-016-0638-3>.
- Galea, J. M., Mallia, E., Rothwell, J., & Diedrichsen, J. (2015). The dissociable effects of punishment and reward on motor learning. *Nature Neuroscience*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3956>.
- Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2004). Does your assessment support your students' learning? *Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 1(1). <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.201.2281&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
- Hartshorn et al. (2010). Effects of dynamic corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44(1), 84–109. <https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2010.213781>.
- Hattie. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hattie. (2011). *Research for Teachers Hattie 's concept of visible teaching and learning*. Reasearch for Teachers. www.gtce.org.uk.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>.
- Havnes et al. (2012). Formative assessment and feedback: Making learning visible. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 38, 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2012.04.001>.
- Hong, L., & Qingying, L. (2007). The Role of Revision and Teacher Feedback in a Chinese College Context. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(4), 230–239. <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/main-editions-new/the-role-of-revision-and-teacher-feedback-in-a-chinese-college-context/>.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39, 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>.
- Junqueira, L., & Payant, C. (2015). "I just want to do it right, but it's so hard": A novice teacher's written feedback beliefs and practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 19–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.11.001>.
- Krish, P. (2006). The Power of Feedback in an Online Learning Environment. *3L: Journal of Language Teaching, Linguistics and Literature*, 12, 95–106. <https://ejournals.ukm.my/3l/article/download/1086/982>.
- Lee, I. (2003). How Do Hong Kong English Teachers Correct Errors in Writing? *Education Journal*, 31(1), 153–169. https://www.academia.edu/download/54436549/How_Do_Hong_Kong_English_Teachers_correct_errors_in_writing.pdf.
- Leh, Ling Ying; Bin Ibrahim, Z. H. (2019). The Influence Of Feedback Environment Towards Job Satisfaction In Tvet Education Organization. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia (JPI)*, 8(1), 96–104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v8i1.16471>.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2001). Factors affecting second language learning in C.N Candlin and N. Mercer. In *English language teaching in its social context* (pp. 28–43).Routledge.
- Mack, L. (2009). Issues and Dilemmas: What Conditions are Necessary for Effective Teacher Written Feedback for ESL Learners? *Polyglossia*, 16, 33–39. https://ritsumei.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_action_common_download&item_id=11622&item_no=1&attribute_id=22&file_no=1.
- Madani., & H. (2016). *The Effects of Reading Skills on the Development of Language Proficiency*. Abou Bakr Belkaid-Tlemcen.
- O'Donnell, M. E. (2014). Peer response with process-oriented, standards-based writing for beginning-level, second language learners of Spanish. *Hispania*, 97(3), 413–429.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2014.0083>.

- Patthey-Chavez, G.G., & Ferris, D. . (1997). Writing conferences and the weaving of multivoiced texts in college composition. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 31(1), 51–90. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40171264>.
- Phuong, T.T., & Huan, N. . (2018). Teacher corrective feedback on students' speaking performance and their uptake in EFL classes. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 3(3), 573–595. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1321246>.
- Rakoczy, K., Harks, B., Klieme, E., Blum, W., & Hochweber, J. (2013). Written feedback in mathematics: Mediated by students' perception, moderated by goal orientation. *Learning and Instruction*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2013.03.002>.
- Safak, P, Yilmaz, H. C., Demiryurek, P., & Dogus, M. (2016). The Effect of Performance Feedback Provided to Student-Teachers Working with Multiple Disabilities. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 5(3), 109–123. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.5.3.109>.
- Sen, N. . (2017). *The Role of Feedback in Employee Performance Improvement*. The University of Liverpool.
- Shute, V. (2008). Focus on Formative Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795>.
- Silver, R., & Lee, S. (2007). What does it take to make a change? Teacher feedback and student revisions. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 6(1), 25–49. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ832137>.
- Sprouls, K. (2011). *Teachers' use of positive and negative feedback with students who are high-risk for emotional behavioral disorders*. Arizona State University.
- Sumarno, Setyosari, P., & H. (2017). Effect of feedback strategy and motivation of achievement to improving learning results concept in learning civic education in vocational high school. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 6(4), 441–453. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.6.4.441>.
- Valente, M.O., Conboy, J., & Carvalho, C. (2009). Student voices on how engagement is influenced by teacher's communication of evaluation results. *The European Conference on Educational Research*, 28–30. Vienna.
- Wanding, R. (2013). Feedback expressions used by an English teacher of Tour and Travel Department. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 53–67. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v3i1.190>.
- Wood et al. (2011). Audio feedback for student writing in online nursing courses: exploring student and instructor reactions. *The Journal of Nursing Education*, 50(9), 540–543. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20110616-04>.
- Yoke et al. (2013). The use of online corrective feedback in academic writing by L1 Malay learners. *English Language Teaching*, 6(12), 175–180. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n12p175>.
- Zuhana et al. (2014). Critical Reading Ability and its Relation to L2 Proficiency of Malaysian ESL Learners. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 20(2), 43–54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17576/3L-2014-2002-04>.