FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

THE CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TEACHER'S ORAL FEEDBACK AND THE STUDENTS' WRITING MOTIVATION

Edita Dininorani Seran[1]; Rifki Irawan[2]*
[1,2] Universitas PGRI Yogyakarta

rifkizam@upy.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the correlation between the teacher's oral feedback and the students' writing motivation. This study is quantitative research with a correlation method. The researcher conducted this study at SMPN 2 Kasihan. The population of this study included all of the 8th graders and one teacher. The sample of this study consists of 93 students. To gain the data, the researcher distributed the questionnaires to the students and a teacher. The data analysis technique used in this research used Rank Spearman Correlation, with SPSS version 23 for the windows program. The result of the research showed that there is a correlation between the teacher's oral feedback and the students' writing motivation. It is evidenced by the Rank Spearman correlation test results with the significance value of 0.000, where it is <0.05.

Keywords: Corrective Feedback, Writing Motivation, Teaching Writing Skills

INTRODUCTION

Teacher's role in classroom teaching and learning activities is crucial in achieving the specified learning objectives. Mostly the teaching-learning process and the students learning outcomes are determined by the role of a teacher. The teacher's task is not only to teach but also to motivate the students to be enthusiastic and active in learning, whether they are any subject matter, including English that in Indonesia is regarded as a foreign language. There are still many students who do not like English, especially English as Foreign Language (EFL) students because it has many skills that have to be mastered as listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. It can affect the learning process and learning outcomes.

Writing is the pretty complex language skills, especially for EFL students. The teacher often finds mistakes in students writing assignments. Whether it misspelling, punctuation, lost or misuse articles, and others. It can affect the results of students writing. Teachers sometimes only give the students writing assignments and scribble the wrong parts of students' work without telling them why it is wrong. If it is forwarded, it will certainly make the students dislike or have no motivation to write. One way to motivate students in writing is to provide feedback on student writing (Ellis, 2009). By giving feedback, the teachers can also correct the students' work, whether true or false. In this case, the teacher should scribble the students' answers and inform the students where it goes wrong and the correct answers to the question, so the students can find out their shortcomings and improve them. Providing

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

feedback helps students to become conscious of the differences between their actual performance and learning objectives. Besides, feedback can also be a helpful tool to help recognize and correct errors (van Loon & van de Pol, 2019). By giving the students feedback, they can know their strengths and shortcomings to improve them for their learning progress.

Oral feedback is one of the several types of feedback that the teacher can give to the students. It is a form of feedback that involves direct interaction between students and teachers. Oral feedback is the teacher's feedback orally during the learning activities to the learners (NSW Education and Communities, 2015). For example, a student can answer a question or do it correctly, then the teacher says good, brilliant, or well done, then the student will feel happy and satisfied with his/her work and feels that the teacher appreciates his / her effort. It can make the students motivated to continue to learn. Whereas for the students who cannot answer the question or their answers are incorrect or make errors and mistakes in writing, the teacher can say their answer is not entirely correct, the article they use is false, or the spelling is correct others. Thus, the students know their errors and mistakes and then improve them. Giving feedback to the students' writing can be provided direct and indirectly, but the researcher focuses on the direct feedback. Direct error correction resulted in more accurate revisions than indirect error feedback (Jamalinesari, Rahimi, Gowhary, & Azizifar, 2015).

However, not all teachers realize that providing feedback can motivate students to write. The teacher focused only on correcting the right or wrong answer or the results of students' work in doing assignments and giving scores without telling them why it is wrong. Besides, the teacher also rarely gives recommendations or praising to the students who answer or do their assignments correctly. Finally, the students do not know their writing result progress and do not know or confuse why he/she gets the bad scores in the writing learning. As a result, they make the same mistake repeatedly because the teacher does not provide feedback to the students' writing. Therefore, the researcher is interested in researching the correlation between the teacher's oral feedbacks with the students' writing motivation. The research title is "The Correlation between the Teacher's Oral Feedback and the Students' Writing Motivation".

Feedback is an information on aspects of one's performance or knowledge offered by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, books, parents, self, experience) as a result of performance (Hattie JA, 2007). Feedback is about presenting knowledge in a way that allows the receiver to consider it, focus on it, learn from it, and hopefully make improvements (Deanery, 2019). When teachers share their feedback verbally, students have a positive opinion of it (Agricola, Prins, & Sluijsmans, 2020). Moreover, Feedback affects students' emotions and learning in a positive and productive way (Bajaj, Kaur, Arora, & Singh, 2018).

From the above statements, the writer can conclude that feedback refers to the information given to someone related to his/her performance or behavior, whether it is good or not, so he/she can improve that is not good to be better than before. It also helps the students in learning activities, for they are more motivated to study.

Some recommendations for making feedback more effective and meaningful in terms of student learning have been made. First, make the students comprehend what constitutes

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

a good performance or achievement. Then, simplify the process of learning improvement through self-assessment or reflections. Thirdly students should be provided with accurate information about their studies. Moreover, peer dialogue should be allowed in order to better grasp the feedback. The next is providing opportunities to reduce the gap between current and desired performance, and instilling positive motivating attitudes. Effective feedback can give teachers with information that can be used to assist shape their instruction. The teacher should provide positive feedback. Finally, choose the appropriate time and place and a variety of E-Feedback approaches(Mamoon-Al-Bashir, Kabir, & Rahman, 2016).

To give learners feedback, it is essential to pay attention to provide feedback strategies and feedback content to the students to be helpful and valuable for them. There are several dimensions of feedback strategies. They are timing, amount, mode, and audience. On feedback content, choosing feedback requires choices about focus, comparison, function, and valence (Arapakis, 2008).

The purpose of focus is to describe specific qualities of the work about learning objectives, analyze the learning processes and techniques of the students to help them to find out how to develop and promote the student self-efficacy by creating links between the work of the students and their active, deliberate actions, and avoid personal comments. There are three comparisons in giving feedback to the students: norm-referencing (comparing the performance of the student with the other students); criterion-referencing (comparison of the students' results to standard) with the test score; and self-referencing (comparing the students' performance with his or her previous outcomes). The purpose of functions is to describe students' work and avoid measuring or judging the students' work to deter the students from attempting to improve. The purpose of valence is to use constructive words to explain what does right and give recommendations about what to develop.

Clarity is important. The students need to understand the details about feedback as the teacher expects to. The students have different languages, diverse cultures, and diverse experiences. The clarity criterion is whether the writing or expression is transparent to the individual students Specificity means to give the students direction but not to do the job. It also means to offer suggestions that are sufficiently clear to encourage the students to take concrete next steps.

In this study, the researcher conducted one type of feedback, named oral feedback. Oral feedback is given orally as one form and followed by an interaction between feedback giver and recipient. This form of feedback can be provided before, during, and after writing activities to one learner, several learners, and all learners as a whole

METHODS

In this study, the researcher uses a quantitative approach. The method used in this research is the correlation method. A correlation study aims to assess if two or more variables are related (Marvasti, 2018). The population is all members of the human community, organisms, activities, or objects that exist together in one location and intended to become the final results of a research target conclusion. The population of this research is

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

123 of 8th graders at SMPN 2 Kasihan. To determine the sample size, the researcher uses Slovin's Formula.

In this study, the researcher uses questionnaires as the data collection technique. The definition of a questionnaire is simply a list of printed questions completed by a respondent to give his/her opinion (Roopa & Rani, 2012). The researcher uses the questionnaires to measure the teacher's oral feedback and students' writing motivation.

Table 1. The questionnaire grille of the teacher's oral feedback

Dimensionof giving feedback	Indicators	Description	Number of item	Sum
Feedback Strategies	Timing	Timing refers to when the right time to provide feedback.	11, 12, 13	3
	Amount	To decide how much feedback to give — howmany, on how many points.	7, 8	2
	Audience	It refers to whether the feedback is providing individual or groups/classes.	14, 15	2
Feedback Content	Focus	Focus on students' tasks, processes, and techniques, which part of students' work should give feedback.	1, 2, 9	3
	Comparison	It refers to compare students' performance to others and to the past performance of the student itself, compare students' results to standards for successful work.	3,4,5	3
	Function	It refers to whether the feedback given is a descriptionor evaluation/judgment.	6, 10	2
	Valence	It means using a positive or negative comment to describe what on students' work.	20	1
	Clarity	Use vocabularies and concepts that students will understand. In providing feedback, it is better to consider the amount and content of comments by the developmental stage of the students.	16, 18, 19	3

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

	Specificity	Provide feedback clear enough that students know what to do and notice mistakes or types of error, but avoid correcting them.	17	1
	Total		20 items	

Table 2. The questionnaire grille of the students' writing motivation

Dimension of Students' Writing Motivation	Indicators	Numberof Item	Sum
Integrative Motivation	A learner is motivated by integration as he/she wants to know more about the culture and values of the foreign language community, to communicate with the language speakers, or to live in the country concerned.	11	1
Instrumental motivation	The learner's aim to learn a language to achieve a particular practical objective, such as abetter job or a higher salary, or to pass an exam at school.	14, 15, 18	3
Intrinsic motivation	The eagerness and interest in doing and participating in any other things because an individual think that those things are attractive and fun.	1,2,3,4,5,6, 9 13	8
Extrinsic motivation	Extrinsic motivation is the propensity to participate in the actions for reasons not linked to the purpose of hoping for reward or punishment, such as success at a test or having a high score.	7, 8, 10,12, 16, 17 19, 20	8
	Total	20 Items	

Research Instrument Testing

Validity

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

Validity refers to the degree to which, in quantitative analysis, a definition is accurately measured (Heale & Twycross, 2015). Here the researcher will use Pearson Product Moment for the validity test.

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N\sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2].[\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

If the significance <0.05, it means that the instrument or the items of the question correlate significantly towards the score total (totally valid), whereas if the significance value >0.05, it means that the question items are invalid (Raharjo, 2014). Whereas, reliability refers to an instrument score consistent and stable (Creswell, 2012). To measure the reliability of the research instrument, the researcher will use Cronbach Alpha.

Reliability measurement can determine by Cronbach's Alpha (Mohamad, Sulaiman, Sern, & Salleh, 2015). If Cronbach's Alpha score is >0.6, then an instrument is reliable. If Cronbach's Alpha score is <0.6, then an instrument is not reliable. To test the validity and reliability of the questionnaires, the researcher distributed the questionnaires to 15 respondents. Then the researcher used the Pearson Correlation formula to process the data with the SPSS 23 program. The validity and reliability tests showed that the questionnaires are proper to use to collect the research data.

To analyze the data, the researcher uses the rank Spearman correlation. Spearman correlation coefficient is a statistical measure of the intensity of a monotonic relationship paired data. Monotonic relationships are when one variable increases, one another increases, or one variable decreases one other decreases. The researcher used the rank Spearman coefficient of correlation was due to the data from the instrument using the Likert scale resulted in ordinal or tiered data. Spearman's formulation (Kalra, 2017)

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6\sum di^2}{N(N^2-1)}$$

Where:

r_s=rank spearman correlation

di^2 = total squared differences between the ranks

N = number of the research sample

The followings are the guidelines to describe the strength of the correlation for the absolute value of r_s .

Table 3. The guidelines to describe the strength of the correlation between the variable

Size of Correlation	Interpretation
.00-.19	Very weak
.20-.39	Weak

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

.40-.59	Moderate
.60-.79	Strong
.80-1.0	Very Strong

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The Results of Validity and Reliability Test

The Results of Validity Test

To test the validity of the questionnaires, the researcher distributed the questionnaires to 15 respondents. Then the researcher used the Pearson Correlation formula to process the data with the help of the SPSS 23 program. Table 2 is the results of the questionnaire trials for the teacher's oral feedback and the students' writing motivation variables.

Table 4. The validity test of the teacher's oral feedback

Number of items	Significance value	Criteria	Explanation
Item 1	0.000	0.000<0.05	Valid
Item 2	0.005	0.005<0.05	Valid
Item 3	0.010	0.010<0.05	Valid
Item 4	0.053	0.053>0.05	Invalid
Item 5	0.000	0.00<0.05	Valid
Item 6	1.000	1.000>0.05	Invalid
Item 7	0.030	0.030<0.05	Valid
Item 8	0.000	0.000<0.05	Valid
Item 9	0.000	0.000<0.05	Valid
Item 10	0.076	0.076>0.05	Invalid
Item 11	0.003	0.003<0.05	Valid
Item 12	0.105	0.105>0.05	Invalid
Item 13	0.053	0.053>0.05	Invalid
Item 14	0.010	0.010<0.05	Valid
Item 15	0.008	0.008<0.05	Valid
Item 16	0.024	0.024<0.05	Valid
Item 17	0.000	0.000<0.05	Valid
Item 18	0.029	0.029<0.05	Valid
Item 19	0.001	0.001<0.05	Valid
Item 20	0.065	0.065<0.05	Invalid

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

Based on table 2, we can see that there are six invalid items. It is because the significance value of these items is>0.05. So the researcher repaired the invalid items and redistributed them. Then the researcher conducted a validity test on the items. The results are in table 3.

Table 5. validity test results of redistributed items for the teacher's oral feedback

Number ofitems	Significancevalue	Criteria	Explanation
Item 4	0.04	0.04<0.05	Valid
Item 6	0.115	0.115>0.05	Invalid
Item 10	0.000	0.000<0.05	Valid
Item 12	0.000	0.000<0.05	Valid
Item 13	0.051	0.051>0.05	Invalid
Item 20	0.006	0.006<0.05	Valid

From the table above, we can see that the significance value ofthe six items where four items are valid with the significance < 0.05. Meanwhile, there are two invalid items because the significance value of the items is >0.05.

Table 6. The validity test for the students' writing motivation

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Item 1	0.076	0.076>0.05	Invalid
Item 2	0.018	0.018<0.05	Valid
Item 3	0.001	0.001<0.05	Valid
Item 4	0.003	0.003<0.05	Valid
Item 5	0.002	0.002<0.05	Valid
Item 6	0.002	0.002<0.05	Valid
Item 7	0.007	0.007<0.05	Valid
Item 8	0.096	0.096>0.05	Invalid
Item 9	0.014	0.014<0.05	Valid
Item 10	0.293	0.293>0.05	Invalid
Item 11	0.011	0.011<0.05	Valid
Item 12	0.003	0.003<0.05	Valid
Item 13	0.002	0.002<0.05	Valid
Item 14	0.001	0.001<0.05	Valid
Item 15	0.066	0.066>0.05	Invalid
Item 16	0.057	0.057>0.05	Invalid
Item 17	0.002	0.002<0.05	Valid

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

Item 18	0.003	0.003<0.05	Valid
Item 19	0.012	0.012<0.05	Valid
Item 20	0.259	0.259>0.05	Invalid

Based on table 4, we can see that there are six invalid items. It is because the significance value of these items is greater than 0.05. From the six invalid items, the researcher excluded two items. For the four invalid items were repaired and redistributed. Then the researcher conducted a validity test of the four redistributed items. From the table 5, we can see that the significance of 4 items is <0.05, which means the items are valid. Below are the results:

Table 7. validity test results of redistributed items for the students'writing motivation

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Item 8	0.001	0.001<0.05	Valid
Item 10	0.000	0.000<0.05	Valid
Item 15	0.004	0.004<0.05	Valid
Item 16	0.007	0.007<0.05	Valid

The Result of Reliability Test

Table 8. reliability test results for the teacher's oral feedback variable.

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.907	18

Table 9. The reliability test results of students' writing motivation variable.

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.900	18

In table 6 and 7, the results or the reliability test analysis on the teacher's oral feedback variable was 0.907 and on the students' writingmotivation variable was also 0.900. Based on the results of the reliability test of the two variables, when compared with the Cronbach Alpha value of 0.6, the scores of the two variables >0.6. It means that the two variables are reliable. From the results of validity and reliability tests, we can conclude that the questionnaires are proper to use to collect the research data.

The Analysis of Each Research Variable

Data from the Teacher' Oral Feedback for Feedback Content Indicator

The researcher made a description of the data to find out the description of the oral

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

feedback from the teacher for indicator of feedback content of the VIII grade students at SMPN 2 Kasihan. Thedata was presented in the form of a frequency distribution table and scorecategorization. In obtaining the oral feedback content data, the researcherused a questionnaire instrument consisting of twelve statement items. The questionnaires have been tested for validity and reliability. Then, the researcher distributed the questionnaire to 93 of class VIII students of SMPN 2 Kasihan. The highest score of the data is 57, the lowest score is 29 and the range is 28. Moreover, based on the calculation of the central tendency and variability of the data, it is known that the mean is 41,505 (round up 42), the median is 42.00, the mode is 38, and the standard deviation is 5,633 (roundup 6). The total of the class is 7,539 (roundup 8) and the length of the class is 3,713 (roundup 4). Furthermore, the feedback strategies data from the teacher is presented in a frequency distribution table in the following table. Then, the data is presented in a categorization table the score of feedback content in table 9.

Table 10. frequency distribution of the scores of the teacher's oralfeedback (indicator of feedback content)

No.	Interval Class	Frequency	Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency
1	29–32	4	0,043	0,043
2	33–36	12	0,129	0,172
3	37–40	25	0,269	0,441
4	41–44	19	0,204	0,645
5	45–48	23	0,247	0,892
6	49–52	8	0,086	0,978
7	53–56	1	0,011	0,989
8	57–60	1	0,011	1,000
	TOTAL	93	1,000	

Table 11. Categorization of the teacher's oral feedback (indicator of feedback content)

Indicator	Score	Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)	Category
Feedback Content	X≥48	13	14%	High
	36≤X<48	66	71%	Moderate
	X<36	14	15%	Low
Total		93	100%	

Based on the table of the score categorization of the indicator of feedback content, it is shown that the students' responses towards the feedback content given by the teachers at SMPN 2 Kasihan, the majority are included in the moderate category, namely at the percentage of 71%.

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

Data from the Students' Writing Motivation

In obtaining the students' writing motivation data, the researcher used a questionnaire instrument consisting of 18 statement items. The questionnaire has been tested for validity and reliability. Then, the researcher distributed the questionnaire to 93 class VIII students of SMPN 2 Kasihan. The highest score of the data is 90, the lowest score is 30 and the range is 58. Moreover, based on the calculation of the central tendency and variability of the data, it is known that the mean is 59.82 (roundup 60), the median is 59.00, the mode is 54, and the standard deviation is 10.67 (roundup 11). Furthermore, the students' writing motivation data is presented in a frequency distribution table in the following table.

Table 12. frequency distribution of the scores of the students' writing motivation

No.	Interval Class	Frequency	Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency
1	32–39	1	0,011	0,011
2	40–47	10	0,108	0,119
3	48–55	23	0,247	0,366
4	56–63	29	0,312	0,678
5	64–71	16	0,172	0,850
6	72–79	10	0,108	0,957
7	80–87	3	0,032	0,989
8	88–95	1	0,011	1,000
	TOTAL	93	1,000	

Table 13. categorization of the students' writing motivation

Variable	Score	Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)	Category
The students' writing motivation	X≥60	43	46%	High
	49≤X<60	36	39%	Moderate
	X<49	14	15%	Low
Total		93	100%	

Based on the score categorization of the students' writing motivation, it is shown that the students' writing motivation at SMPN 2 Kasihan, the majority are included in the high category, namely at the percentage of 46%.

The Correlation Analysis between the Research Variables

The researcher formulated the hypothesis to analyze the correlation between the teacher's oral feedback and the students' writing motivation variable, the hypotheses are:

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN: 2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN: 2776-8880**

Null Hypothesis (Ho): The teacher's oral feedback does not relate to the students' writing motivation.

Alternative Hypothesis (Ha): The teacher's oral feedback relates to the students' writing motivation.

The hypothetical test criteria are as follows:

Null Hypothesis (Ho) is accepted if the significance > 0.05 means the Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) is rejected.

Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) is accepted if the significance < 0.05, which means the Null Hypothesis (Ho) is rejected.

In analyzing the correlation between the teacher's oral feedbacks with the students' writing motivation data, the researcher used the Spearman rank correlation test with the help of the SPSS 23 for the windows program. Below are the results of t Rank Spearman Correlation analysis.

Table 14. the results of rank spearman correlation test

			The Teacher's Oral Feedback	The Students' Writing Motivation
Spearman's rho	The Teacher's Oral Feedback	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.426
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	93	93
	The Students' Writing Motivation	Correlation Coefficient	.426	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	93	93

Based on the Spearman rank correlation analysis test, the significance value of the two variables is .000. From the result, the significance value of the correlation test results of the two variables is .000. When the result is compared with a significance value of 0.05, both variables' significance value is <0.05. It means that there is a correlation between the teacher's oral feedback and students' writing motivation. So the conclusion is the Null Hypothesis (H0) is rejected, whereas the Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. It means that there is a relationship between the teacher's oral feedback and student writing motivation.

The guideline for the strength of the relationship between the two variables when viewed from the rs value is .426. The 0.426 in the relationship strength guideline table is at moderate strength (.40-.59). The relationship direction shows that it is unidirectional and positive, which means that the higher/often the teacher provides oral feedback on students' writing, the higher the students' writing motivation.

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN**: **2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN**: **2776-8880**

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the rank Spearman correlation analysis, the statement of hypothesis alternative (Ha) of this study is that says there is a relationship between the teacher's oral feedback and the students' writing motivation is accepted; whereas the statements of the Null hypothesis (H0) that says the teacher's oral feedback does not relate to the students' writing motivation is rejected. It is evidenced by the significance value of the rank Spearman correlation test of 0.000 is <0.05. So the conclusion is there is a correlation between the teacher's oral feedback and student motivation in writing.

REFERENCE

Agricola, B. T., Prins, F. J., & Sluijsmans, D. M. A. (2020). Impact of feedback request forms and verbal feedback on higher education students' feedback perception, self-efficacy, and motivation. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *27*(1), 6–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2019.1688764

Arapakis, I. (2008). Affective feedback. In *Proceedings of the 31st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval - SIGIR '08* (p. 891). New York, New York, USA: ACM Press. https://doi.org/10.1145/1390334.1390566

Bajaj, J. K., Kaur, K., Arora, R., & Singh, S. J. (2018). Introduction of Feedback for Better Learning. *JOURNAL OF CLINICAL AND DIAGNOSTIC RESEARCH*. https://doi.org/10.7860/JCDR/2018/36744.12402

Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (fourth edi). Boston: Pearson Education. Retrieved from http://www.ghbook.ir/index.php?name=فرهنگ و رسانه های نوین&option=com_dbook&task=readonline&book_id=13650&page=73&chkhashk=ED9C9491B4&Itemid=218&lang=fa&tmpl=component

Deanery. (2019). What is feedback and why is it so important ? Retrieved from http://www.bradfordvts.co.uk/educational-supervision/feedback/

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.5070/L2.V1I1.9054

Hattie JA, T. H. (2007). The power of feedback. [5];77:81-112. *Review of Educational Research.*, *5*, 81–112.

Heale, R., & Twycross, A. (2015). Validity and reliability in quantitative studies. *Evidence Based Nursing*, *18*(3), 66–67. https://doi.org/10.1136/eb-2015-102129

Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H., & Azizifar, A. (2015). The Effects of Teacher-Written Direct vs. Indirect Feedback on Students' Writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *192*, 116–123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.018

Kalra, A. (2017). Decoding the Bland–Altman plot: Basic review. *Journal of the Practice of*

FOSTER JELT
Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol.2, No. 3, July 2021
***e*-ISSN**: **2723-4126**
***p*-ISSN**: **2776-8880**

Cardiovascular Sciences, *3*(1), 36. https://doi.org/10.4103/jpcs.jpcs_11_17

Mamoon-Al-Bashir, M., Kabir, M. R., & Rahman, I. (2016). The Value and Effectiveness of Feedback in Improving Students' Learning and Professionalizing Teaching in Higher Education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *7*(16), 38–41.

Marvasti, A. (2018). Research Methods. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Social Problems* (pp. 23–38). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108656184.003

Mohamad, M. M., Sulaiman, N. L., Sern, L. C., & Salleh, K. M. (2015). Measuring the Validity and Reliability of Research Instruments. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *204*, 164–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.129

NSW Education and Communities. (2015). Types of feedback Oral and written feedback Oral feedback. Retrieved from http://www.ssgt.nsw.edu.au/documents/1types_feedback.pdf

Raharjo, S. (2014). Cara melakukan Uji Validitas Product Moment dengan SPSS.

Roopa, S., & Rani, M. (2012). Questionnaire Designing for a Survey. *Journal of Indian Orthodontic Society*, *46*(4_suppl1), 273–277. https://doi.org/10.1177/0974909820120509S

van Loon, M., & van de Pol, J. (2019). Judging own and peer performance when using feedback in elementary school. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *74*, 101754. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.101754