

The Correlation Between Teachers' Feedback And Students' Writing Achievement In Academic Writing Class

Jusak Patty^{1*}, Sophia Binnendyk², Abu Kasim Kelirey³
¹²³ Universitas Pattimura, Indonesia

Email:

jusak.patty@gmail.com^{1*}, binnenedyksophia@yahoo.co.id²,
abukasimkelirey@gmail.com³

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the correlation between teacher feedback and students' writing achievement in academic writing classes at Pattimura University, Indonesia. Using a quantitative correlational design, data were collected from 30 students through a 22-item Likert-scale questionnaire measuring perceptions of feedback and document analysis of final writing grades. Statistical analysis revealed a weak and statistically insignificant relationship between teacher feedback and students' writing achievement ($r = 0.075$; $p = 0.695$), indicating that positive perceptions of feedback do not automatically translate to improved writing performance. Students demonstrated positive perceptions of feedback ($M = 4.18$, High category) but showed lower scores in motivation and self-regulation ($M = 3.93$). Writing achievement exhibited clustering at developmental thresholds—particularly at minimum passing (55 points) and minimum excellence (85 points) levels. The findings suggest that feedback effectiveness is mediated by factors such as self-regulation abilities, motivation, and existing writing proficiency. This study contributes to feedback theory by demonstrating that feedback functions within a complex system of writing development rather than as an isolated intervention, highlighting the need for a paradigm shift toward creating learning environments where students develop skills to engage with feedback effectively.

Keywords: *Teacher Feedback, Writing Achievement, Academic Writing, Feedback Effectiveness, Self-Regulation, Higher Education*

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini menginvestigasi korelasi antara umpan balik guru dan prestasi menulis mahasiswa dalam kelas academic writing di Universitas Pattimura, Indonesia. Dengan menggunakan desain penelitian korelasional kuantitatif, data dikumpulkan dari 30 mahasiswa melalui kuesioner skala Likert 22 item yang mengukur persepsi terhadap umpan balik dan analisis dokumen nilai akhir menulis. Analisis statistik mengungkapkan hubungan yang lemah dan tidak signifikan secara statistik antara umpan balik guru dan prestasi menulis mahasiswa ($r = 0,075$; $p = 0,695$), yang mengindikasikan bahwa persepsi positif terhadap umpan balik tidak secara otomatis diterjemahkan menjadi peningkatan kinerja menulis. Mahasiswa menunjukkan persepsi positif terhadap umpan balik ($M = 4,18$, kategori Tinggi) tetapi menunjukkan skor lebih rendah dalam motivasi dan regulasi diri ($M = 3,93$). Prestasi menulis menunjukkan pengelompokan pada ambang perkembangan—khususnya pada tingkat kelulusan minimum (55 poin) dan keunggulan

minimum (85 poin). Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa efektivitas umpan balik dimediasi oleh faktor-faktor seperti kemampuan regulasi diri, motivasi, dan kemahiran menulis yang sudah ada. Penelitian ini berkontribusi pada teori umpan balik dengan mendemonstrasikan bahwa umpan balik berfungsi dalam sistem kompleks pengembangan menulis dan bukan sebagai intervensi terisolasi, menyoroti kebutuhan akan pergeseran paradigma menuju penciptaan lingkungan belajar di mana mahasiswa mengembangkan keterampilan untuk terlibat dengan umpan balik secara efektif.

Kata Kunci: *Umpan Balik Guru, Prestasi Menulis, Menulis Akademik, Efektivitas Umpan Balik, Regulasi Diri, Pendidikan Tinggi*

INTRODUCTION

Effective academic writing remains a persistent challenge in higher education, with significant implications for student success both academically and professionally. Despite decades of research on instructional practices, a fundamental question persists: why does teacher feedback—a cornerstone of writing instruction—often fail to translate into improved writing performance? This disconnect between feedback provision and writing development represents a significant challenge for educators and students alike, particularly in higher education settings where sophisticated writing skills are essential for academic success.

Writing serves as a foundation for critical thinking, reflection, and communication. In academic settings, especially higher education, putting thoughts into words requires introspection and analysis, which promotes self-awareness and deeper understanding (Carden et al., 2021; Rahmat et al., 2020). As Patty (2024) highlights, writing allows students to demonstrate expertise by thinking critically and logically, assessing arguments, and making sound decisions. The importance of writing achievement extends beyond academics. According to Bora (2023), strong writing skills not only support success in academic tasks but also prepare students for the demands of written communication in the professional world. High writing achievement is often associated with analytical abilities, creativity, and critical thinking skills, which are essential for long-term success (Akpur, 2020; Fatmawati et al., 2019). For students in language education programs, mastering various forms of written communication is particularly crucial for their professional development.

Teacher feedback—both written and oral—plays a theoretically central role in enhancing these writing skills. According to Muste (2020), effective feedback helps students grasp

their learning objectives, evaluate their performance, and develop strategies to close the gap between their current abilities and desired outcomes. Hattie (2012) emphasizes that effective feedback must answer three fundamental questions: "Where am I going?" (clarifying goals), "How am I going?" (assessing current performance), and "Where to next?" (providing steps for improvement). Different types of feedback serve specific functions in the writing development process. Oral feedback, characterized by its immediacy and interactivity, allows instructors to address students' writing issues in real time. Gul et al. (2023) note its effectiveness in helping students recognize and correct errors through direct engagement. Written feedback provides a detailed and structured analysis of students' work, serving as a permanent record that students can refer to during revision and future writing tasks. Nakamura (2016) distinguishes between responsive feedback, which addresses content development and organizational structure, and corrective feedback, which identifies technical errors in grammar, mechanics, and conventions.

However, as Henderson et al. (2019) notes, feedback practices in education remain problematic. The subjective nature of evaluating written communication, inconsistencies in feedback quality, and the substantial time required for thorough evaluation can all undermine feedback effectiveness. While extensive research has established the theoretical importance of feedback (Lim & Renandya, 2020; Scherer et al., 2024), evidence of its actual effectiveness in improving writing outcomes remains inconsistent and sometimes contradictory.

The relationship between teacher feedback and writing achievement operates within complex theoretical frameworks. The socio-cognitive model proposed by Burstein et al. (2020) conceptualizes writing achievement as the interaction between individual cognitive processes and external social influences, encompassing domain-specific writing knowledge, general cognitive skills, and interpersonal factors like motivation and collaboration. Various factors influence writing achievement. Language proficiency, including syntax, grammar, and vocabulary, forms the foundation that enables students to express ideas clearly and accurately. Ibna, (2018) notes that higher proficiency equips students to handle the complexities of academic writing more effectively. Environmental factors, particularly reading habits, significantly influence writing achievement by exposing students to various writing styles, structures, and vocabulary. Motivation and

self-efficacy also play crucial roles, with students who have high confidence in their abilities more likely to take greater risks in writing and produce high-quality work (Binnendyk et al., 2024; Cheng, 2020; Raoofi & Maroofi, 2017; Rasteiro & Limpo, 2023). Effective engagement with feedback requires more than passive reception—it demands active implementation strategies. Brookhart (2017) notes that direct interaction with instructors can deepen students' understanding of writing expectations. Utilizing available learning resources and collaborating with peers to refine writing based on feedback offers diverse perspectives and creates a supportive learning community. Motivation and self-regulation play crucial roles in students' willingness to engage in writing tasks and apply feedback effectively (Wilby, 2022). Ayres (2023) emphasize the importance of celebrating progress alongside identifying areas for improvement. Students with strong self-regulation set writing goals, monitor their progress, and adjust their strategies based on feedback, demonstrating the ability to manage their writing process independently (Abdulhay et al., 2020; Klein et al., 2022; Roderick, 2019). The effective application of feedback to subsequent writing tasks is a critical component of writing skill development. Hattie et al. (2021) note that specific comments on structure, argumentation, and word choice can significantly improve the quality of final assignments.

Previous research has approached the feedback-achievement relationship from various angles but with mixed results. Cui et al. (2021) found that peer and teacher feedback significantly improved essay writing achievement in their context. However, Cohen-sayag (2016) study of student-teachers revealed that learning to write formative feedback did not consistently lead to better writing skills for the feedback providers themselves. Similarly, Gul et al. (2023) found that while ESL students valued oral feedback for promoting academic writing, many teachers lacked formal training in effective feedback delivery. These varied findings highlight a critical gap in our understanding: we lack comprehensive quantitative evidence regarding the specific correlation between different types of teacher feedback and writing achievement, particularly in the Indonesian higher education context.

A preliminary study at Pattimura University involving 26 students in the English study program revealed intriguing patterns in feedback preferences. A substantial majority (77%) preferred oral feedback over written feedback (15%) or a combination of both (8%). Students reported that oral feedback provided immediate clarification and

personalized guidance, with 85% rating it as "Very Effective" or "Effective." However, 15% struggled with written feedback, finding it less clear without additional explanation. In terms of academic writing ability, 65% rated their skills as "Fair" or "Good," while 12% rated their ability as "Poor," indicating a need for more targeted support. These preliminary findings suggest a complex relationship between feedback preferences, perceived effectiveness, and actual writing proficiency that warrants further investigation. This study diverges from prior work by examining not only perceptions of feedback but also their statistical relationship to actual writing achievement, providing a more comprehensive understanding of feedback effectiveness. Contrary to previous research that often assumes a direct relationship between feedback and performance, we propose a more nuanced investigation that examines the statistical strength of this relationship while considering the role of student engagement, motivation, and self-regulation.

This study addresses three essential research questions: (1) How do students perceive teacher feedback in academic writing classes? (2) What are the learning outcomes of students in academic writing classes? (3) Is there a significant correlation between teacher feedback and students' learning outcomes in academic writing classes? By examining these questions through a quantitative approach, this study aims to provide empirical evidence that can inform more effective feedback practices in academic writing instruction.

The significance of this research lies in its potential to bridge the gap between feedback theory and practice. While numerous studies have explored either students' perceptions of feedback or writing outcomes separately, few have examined the direct statistical relationship between these variables in the Indonesian context. By analyzing this relationship, we can better understand when and how feedback effectively contributes to writing development, allowing educators to design more targeted and impactful feedback interventions. Additionally, this study contributes to the growing body of research on feedback effectiveness in non-Western educational contexts, providing valuable insights for comparative analysis across different cultural and educational settings.

METHOD

This study employed a quantitative correlational research design to examine the relationship between teacher feedback and students' writing achievement in academic

writing classes. A correlational approach was appropriate as it allowed for statistical analysis of two variables: teacher feedback (X) as the predictor variable and students' writing achievement (Y) as the outcome variable (Kittur, 2023). According to Creswell & Creswell (2023), correlational research uses statistical tests to assess the degree and direction of relationships between variables without manipulating the conditions. This design enabled the researcher to determine whether and to what extent a relationship exists between teacher feedback and writing achievement while maintaining the natural educational setting.

The research was conducted at the English Education Study Program at Pattimura University, Ambon, Indonesia. The population consisted of 73 students enrolled in academic writing classes for the academic year 2023/2024. These students had already completed foundational writing courses, making them suitable for analyzing the impact of teacher feedback on writing achievement. Using convenience sampling, 30 students were selected based on their availability and willingness to participate. This sampling method was chosen to ensure efficient data collection while obtaining relevant insights from students actively engaged in academic writing classes. The participants included both male and female students who had completed multiple writing assignments and received various forms of teacher feedback throughout their academic writing course. This selection process ensured the validity and relevance of the findings, providing meaningful insights into how teacher feedback influences writing achievement.

Two primary methods were employed for data collection: surveys using questionnaires and document analysis. A structured 22-item Likert-scale questionnaire was distributed to participants via Google Forms. The items were organized into five key indicators: Perception of Oral Feedback (3 items), Perception of Written Feedback (3 items), Strategies for Responding to Feedback (5 items), Motivation and Self-Regulation (3 items), and Application of Feedback (8 items). Responses were rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 - Strongly Disagree to 5 - Strongly Agree). The mean score for each indicator was categorized using the interval scale shown in Table 1, with intervals ranging from Very Low (1.00-1.80) to Very High (4.21-5.00). For the document analysis component, students' final grades in academic writing classes were collected and analyzed as an objective measure of writing achievement. The grades were interpreted according

to the university's scoring categories, as shown in Table 2, ranging from Excellent (A: 85-100) to Very Poor (E: <40).

Table 1. Interpretation of Mean Scores for Questionnaire

Interval Mean	Interpretation
1.00 – 1.80	Very Low
1.81 – 2.60	Low
2.61 – 3.40	Medium
3.41 – 4.20	High
4.21 – 5.00	Very High

Table 2. Scoring Categories for Writing Achievement

Score Range	Grade	Category
85 – 100	A	Excellent
70 – 84	B	Good
55 – 69	C	Enough
40 – 54	D	Poor
< 40	E	Very Poor

The questionnaire underwent rigorous validation procedures to ensure its accuracy and consistency. An expert validator evaluated the questionnaire's relevance to research objectives, clarity of instructions, appropriateness of language, and suitability of the measurement scale, rating it suitable in all evaluated aspects. Using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation method in SPSS, all questionnaire items showed correlation values higher than the critical r-table value of 0.361 (at n=30), confirming their validity. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha, which yielded a coefficient of 0.935, indicating a very high level of internal consistency. This confirms that the questionnaire items consistently measured the constructs under investigation and that the responses are dependable for analysis.

The data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical methods through SPSS version 26. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, and mean scores) were calculated to summarise the data on teacher feedback perceptions and students' writing achievement. Prior to correlation analysis, two assumption tests were performed. The Shapiro-Wilk test examined data distribution normality, with $p > 0.05$ indicating normal distribution. Linearity tests assessed the relationship between variables, with $p > 0.05$ indicating a linear relationship. After confirming that these assumptions were met, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was applied to examine the relationship between teacher feedback and students' writing achievement. The strength of the correlation was interpreted using the criteria in Table 3, ranging from Very Weak (0.00-0.199) to Very Strong (0.80-1.00). The significance of the correlation was determined using the criteria $p < 0.05$ for statistical significance. If $p < 0.05$, the null hypothesis would be rejected; if $p > 0.05$, the null hypothesis would be accepted.

Table 3. Correlation Coefficient Interpretation

Coefficient (r)	Interpretation
0.00 – 0.199	Very Weak Correlation
0.20 – 0.399	Weak Correlation
0.40 – 0.599	Moderate Correlation
0.60 – 0.799	Strong Correlation
0.80 – 1.00	Very Strong Correlation

DISCUSSION

Students' Perceptions of Teacher Feedback

To understand how students perceive teacher feedback in academic writing classes, this study analyzed responses to a 22-item questionnaire. The results revealed a predominantly positive view of teacher feedback among students, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Overall Perception of Teacher Feedback

Indicator	Mean Score	Category
Perception of Oral Feedback	4.24	Very High
Perception of Written Feedback	4.29	Very High
Strategies for Responding to Feedback	4.23	Very High
Motivation and Self-Regulation	3.93	High

Indicator	Mean Score Category	
Application of Feedback	4.20	High
Overall Mean	4.18	High

The overall mean score across all indicators was 4.18, placing students' perceptions in the High category according to the interpretation scale. This suggests that students generally value and appreciate the feedback they receive from their instructors, recognizing its importance in their writing development. Perceptions of written feedback received the highest rating (mean score of 4.29), followed closely by perceptions of oral feedback (mean score of 4.24) and strategies for responding to feedback (mean score of 4.23), all in the Very High category.

Students demonstrated a very positive perception of oral feedback, finding it particularly helpful in clarifying and improving their writing. Among respondents, 90% agreed or strongly agreed that oral feedback helped them clarify and improve their writing. In comparison, 83% felt it provided detailed and constructive criticism that helped them correct mistakes and strengthen arguments. Similarly, students valued written feedback highly, with 96.7% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that they appreciated when teachers provided both general comments on writing content and specific corrections on sentence structure.

Despite these positive perceptions, the analysis revealed potential gaps in how students engage with feedback. Regarding strategies for responding to feedback, students generally adopted effective approaches (mean score 4.23). A total of 96.7% of students felt confident in applying feedback positively to enhance their writing. However, about 30% of students did not actively seek help from their lecturers when facing writing challenges, indicating a reluctance to engage in dialogue about feedback. This aligns with Henderson et al.'s (2019) argument that feedback must be conceptualized as a dialogic process rather than a one-way transmission. Without active engagement and implementation strategies, even well-received feedback may fail to produce measurable improvements in writing quality.

The motivation and self-regulation indicator received the lowest mean score (3.93) among the five dimensions measured, though still in the High category. While most students felt encouraged by positive feedback from their lecturers, only 23.3% were highly motivated by such feedback. Additionally, engagement in writing was influenced by interest in the

given topics, with 36.7% of students strongly agreeing that they were more engaged in writing when the topic interested them. This finding illuminates a crucial mediating factor in the feedback-achievement relationship and explains why positive perceptions of feedback might not translate to improved writing performance. As Zimmerman (2000) theorizes, self-regulation—the ability to monitor and adjust learning processes—significantly influences academic achievement. Students with stronger self-regulation can better process feedback, identify improvement areas, and implement necessary changes, while those with weaker self-regulation may acknowledge feedback without effectively applying it.

This finding diverges from the often assumed direct relationship between feedback appreciation and application. Unlike studies that focus solely on students' satisfaction with feedback, our analysis reveals the complex interplay between perception and application. This finding underscores Hattie (2012) emphasis that effective feedback must answer three fundamental questions: "Where am I going?" (clarifying goals), "How am I going?" (assessing current performance), and "Where to next?" (providing steps for improvement). Students may understand and appreciate the first two components but struggle with the third, particularly when self-regulation skills are underdeveloped.

While our study robustly captured students' perceptions through validated survey instruments, a limitation lies in relying on self-reported perceptions rather than direct observation of feedback practices. Future research should incorporate observational components to examine how students actually process and implement feedback in real-time writing contexts.

Students' Academic Writing Achievement

Academic writing proficiency represents a critical skill for university students, serving as both an assessment tool and a fundamental competency for scholarly communication. To evaluate students' writing achievement, this study analyzed the final grades of 30 students enrolled in academic writing classes. The analysis revealed a varied distribution of writing achievement among the students, as presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Distribution of Students' Writing Achievement

	Grade Score Range	Number of Students	Percentage	Category
A	85 - 100	6	20.0%	Excellent
B	70 - 84	12	40.0%	Good
C	55 - 69	12	40.0%	Enough
D	40 - 54	0	0%	Poor
E	< 40	0	0%	Very Poor
Total		30	100%	

The analysis shows that all students achieved at least the minimum passing score of 55, with no students falling into the Poor (Grade D) or Very Poor (Grade E) categories. This suggests that while there is variation in performance levels, all students demonstrated at least basic competency in academic writing skills.

Further examination of the grade distribution revealed critical patterns that provide insights into writing development trajectories. Among the students who achieved Excellent status (Grade A), all six scored exactly 85 points, placing them at the minimum threshold for this category. This clustering at the lower boundary of the Excellent range suggests that while these students demonstrated strong writing skills, there may be room for improvement in reaching higher levels of excellence.

In the Good category (Grade B), which comprised 40% of the students, scores ranged from 70 to 82.2 points, showing a more varied distribution. The specific scores in this category were 70, 70, 71.2, 71.5, 72.7, 74.2, 74.5, 75, 76, 79.7, 80.6, and 82.2, indicating incremental improvements in writing proficiency. This suggests that a substantial portion of students possessed solid academic writing skills but had not yet reached the highest level of achievement.

The Enough category (Grade C) also included 40% of students, with scores ranging from 55 to 68.6 points. Within this category, eight students scored exactly 55 points, placing them at the minimum threshold for passing. The remaining four students in this category scored 62, 65.2, 67.7, and 68.6 points. The concentration of scores at the minimum passing threshold indicates that a significant number of students met basic requirements but may need additional support to develop stronger writing skills.

Statistical analysis of the grades revealed that the mean score across all 30 students was 70.37, placing the class average in the Good category, though very close to the lower

threshold of this range. The median score was 71.35, also in the Good category, while the most frequently occurring score (mode) was 55, reflecting the concentration of students at the minimum passing threshold.

This finding aligns with Ibna's (2018) assertion that language proficiency equips students to handle the complexities of academic writing and supports Binnendyk et al. (2024) emphasis on the role of self-efficacy in writing performance. The concentration of scores at categorical thresholds suggests that students may be able to meet basic requirements but require additional scaffolding to achieve higher levels of writing proficiency.

Contrary to approaches that view writing development as a continuous progression, our findings suggest the existence of developmental plateaus that require specific interventions to overcome. This pattern supports Burstein et al. (2020) socio-cognitive model, which conceptualizes writing achievement as the interaction between individual cognitive processes and external influences. Students appear to reach certain thresholds of achievement that correspond to their current cognitive processes and external supports, requiring additional scaffolding to progress further.

The overall class performance showed that 60% of students (18 out of 30) achieved Good or Excellent grades, while 40% (12 out of 30) achieved grades in the Enough category. This indicates that most students demonstrated at least good proficiency in academic writing based on the established grading criteria. However, the bimodal distribution, with concentrations at the minimum passing score (55 points) and in the mid-70s range, suggests a potential divide in writing abilities that might warrant attention in instructional approaches.

A limitation of our analysis is that we measured writing achievement using final grades, which may incorporate elements beyond writing quality. Future research should employ more fine-grained writing assessment tools to understand better specific areas of development and the nature of these apparent developmental plateaus in writing achievement.

Correlation between Teacher Feedback and Students' Writing Achievement

The central question of this study concerned the relationship between teacher feedback and students' writing achievement in academic writing classes. After analyzing students' perceptions of teacher feedback and their writing achievement separately, this study

sought to determine whether there was a significant relationship between these two variables. A series of statistical tests were conducted to examine this relationship, beginning with tests to ensure the appropriateness of correlation analysis and culminating in a correlation test to measure the strength and significance of the relationship.

Before conducting the correlation analysis, assumption tests were performed to ensure the validity of the statistical approach. A normality test was conducted using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, yielding an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.055, which is greater than 0.05. This result confirmed that the data followed a normal distribution, making it suitable for parametric statistical analysis. Additionally, a linearity test was performed, resulting in a significance value of 0.729 for linearity and 0.796 for deviation from linearity, both greater than 0.05. These results confirmed a linear relationship between the variables, further validating the use of Pearson's correlation test.

With these assumptions satisfied, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was conducted to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between teacher feedback and students' writing achievement. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Pearson Correlation Results

		Teachers Feedback	Students Writing Achievement
Teachers Feedback	Pearson Correlation	1	.075
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.695
	N	30	30
Students Writing Achievement	Pearson Correlation	.075	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.695	
	N	30	30

The analysis revealed a correlation coefficient (r) of 0.075 with a p -value of 0.695. According to the correlation coefficient interpretation scale, this r -value indicates a very weak correlation, suggesting an almost negligible relationship between teacher feedback and students' writing achievement. Furthermore, since the p -value (0.695) is greater than 0.05, the correlation is not statistically significant, indicating that any observed relationship could be attributed to chance rather than a true underlying effect.

Based on these results, the null hypothesis (H_0) that there is no significant correlation between teacher feedback and students' writing achievement in academic writing classes was accepted, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was rejected. This finding challenges

the widely held assumption that teacher feedback directly leads to improved writing performance, suggesting that the relationship between feedback and achievement is more complex than a simple linear correlation.

Unlike Cui et al. (2021), who found that teacher feedback significantly improved essay writing achievement, our study revealed no significant correlation between feedback and writing outcomes, indicating that positive perceptions of feedback do not automatically translate to improved writing performance. This finding aligns with Cohen-sayag (2016) observation that learning to write feedback did not necessarily lead to better writing skills, highlighting the complex relationship between receiving feedback and improving performance. This suggests that the mere provision of feedback, regardless of how positively it is perceived, is insufficient to drive writing improvement without additional supporting structures.

The descriptive statistical analysis further supports this conclusion. Although students have a positive perception of teacher feedback ($M = 4.18$, High category) and actively apply it ($M = 4.20$, High category), their actual writing achievement remains in the Good category ($M = 70.37$), suggesting that feedback alone is not a determining factor. Additionally, the slightly lower mean score for motivation and self-regulation ($M = 3.93$, High category) may indicate that students struggle to independently use feedback effectively, which could explain the lack of correlation.

Several explanations may account for this finding. First, the data revealed a disparity between students' confidence and their help-seeking behaviors. While 96.7% of students reported confidence in applying feedback, 30% did not actively seek help from instructors when facing writing challenges. This reluctance to engage in dialogue about feedback reflects Henderson et al. (2019) argument that feedback must be conceptualized as a dialogic process rather than a one-way transmission. Without active engagement and implementation strategies, even well-received feedback may fail to produce measurable improvements in writing quality.

Furthermore, our findings highlight the critical role of motivation and self-regulation in mediating the relationship between feedback and achievement. The motivation and self-regulation indicator received the lowest mean score ($M = 3.93$) among the five dimensions measured, suggesting that students may lack the self-regulatory skills necessary to translate feedback into practice effectively. This interpretation aligns with

Zimmerman's (2000) theory that self-regulation—the ability to monitor and adjust learning processes—significantly influences academic achievement.

The bimodal distribution of writing scores, with concentrations at the minimum passing threshold (55 points) and in the mid-70s range, further suggests that students may respond differently to feedback based on their existing writing proficiency. This pattern aligns with Burstein et al.'s (2020) socio-cognitive model, which conceptualizes writing achievement as the interaction between individual cognitive processes and external influences. Students with stronger foundational writing skills may be better equipped to interpret and apply feedback productively. In comparison, those with weaker skills may struggle to understand how to implement suggested changes, regardless of how positively they view the feedback.

These findings have significant implications for writing pedagogy. First, they suggest that instructors should move beyond simply providing feedback to actively teaching students how to interpret and apply it. This could involve structured feedback workshops, guided revision sessions, and explicit modeling of how to transform feedback into concrete revisions. Second, our findings highlight the importance of developing students' self-regulation skills alongside their writing abilities. Incorporating goal-setting, progress monitoring, and reflection activities into writing instruction may enhance students' capacity to engage productively with feedback. Third, the clustering of grades at categorical thresholds suggests that feedback approaches should be differentiated based on the student's existing writing proficiency, with more scaffolded support for struggling writers and more autonomy for advanced students.

While our correlational approach provided valuable insights into the relationship between these variables, a limitation lies in the cross-sectional nature of our research, which prevents examination of how this relationship might evolve. Longitudinal studies tracking the relationship between feedback and writing development could provide deeper insights into how this relationship changes as students develop greater writing proficiency and self-regulation skills.

Reconceptualizing the Feedback-Achievement Relationship

These findings reframe our understanding of the relationship between teacher feedback and writing achievement, moving beyond simplistic cause-effect assumptions toward a

more nuanced, ecological view. The weak correlation between feedback and achievement ($r = 0.075$) does not suggest that feedback is unimportant; rather, it indicates that a complex interplay of factors including self-regulation capabilities, existing proficiency levels, engagement strategies, and feedback literacy mediates feedback effectiveness.

Our findings challenge educators to move beyond simply providing better or more detailed feedback to creating learning environments where students develop the skills, motivation, and understanding needed to transform feedback into meaningful writing development. The implications extend beyond academic contexts to professional settings, supporting Bora (2023) assertion that strong writing skills prepare students for the demands of written communication in professional environments. This study calls for a paradigm shift in writing instruction—reconceptualizing feedback as part of a comprehensive system of writing support rather than as an isolated intervention.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the correlation between teacher feedback and students' writing achievement in academic writing classes, revealing a weak and statistically insignificant relationship ($r = 0.075$; $p = 0.695$) despite students' positive perceptions of feedback. Our findings challenge conventional assumptions about feedback effectiveness and demonstrate that positive perceptions of feedback do not automatically translate to improved writing outcomes. The disconnect between perception and performance suggests that feedback functions as one element within a complex system of writing development, mediated by factors such as motivation, self-regulation, and existing proficiency levels. The developmental plateaus observed in writing achievement—with clustering at the minimum passing threshold (55 points) and the minimum excellence threshold (85 points)—further indicate that students require different types of support to progress beyond specific performance thresholds. These findings call for a paradigm shift in writing instruction, reconceptualizing feedback as part of a comprehensive system of writing support rather than as an isolated intervention.

Our findings have significant implications for writing pedagogy, suggesting that instructors should transform feedback from a one-way transmission to a dialogic process, explicitly teach feedback literacy, differentiate feedback approaches based on students' proficiency levels, and intentionally foster self-regulation skills. Future research should

include observational studies of feedback practices, more comprehensive writing assessment methods, longitudinal tracking of writing development, and intervention studies testing structured feedback literacy training. Ultimately, this study highlights that the challenge for writing instructors is not simply to provide better feedback but to create learning environments where students develop the skills, motivation, and understanding needed to transform feedback into meaningful writing development. By addressing the complex factors that mediate feedback effectiveness, educators can better support students in developing the sophisticated writing skills necessary for academic and professional success in an increasingly communication-driven world.

REFERENCES

- Abdulhay, H., Ahmadian, M., Yazdani, H., & Amerian, M. (2020). Examining the Relationship between EFL University Students' Goal Orientations and Self-Regulation in Writing. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, 17(2), 395–413. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2020.17.2.6.395>
- Akpur, U. (2020). Critical, Reflective, Creative Thinking and Their Reflections on Academic Achievement. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 37, 100683. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100683>
- Ayres, R. (2023). *Celebrating Writers: From Possibilities Through Publication* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032680798>
- Binnendyk, S., Patty, J., & Jamil, A. (2024). Self-Efficacy as a Predictor of Writing Performance: A Correlational Study of Indonesian Secondary School Students. *J-Shelves of Indragiri (JSI)*, 6(2), 129–148. <https://doi.org/10.61672/jsi.v6i2.2853>
- Bora, P. (2023). Importance of Writing Skill to Develop Students' Communication Skill. *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, 7(35). <https://doi.org/10.54850/jrspelt.7.35.009>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2017). How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students. In *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development* (2nd ed.). Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Burstein, J., McCaffrey, D., Elliot, N., & Beigman Klebanov, B. (2020). Exploring Writing Achievement and Genre in Postsecondary Writing. In *Grantee Submission*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED608273>
- Carden, J., Jones, R. J., & Passmore, J. (2021). Defining Self-Awareness in the Context of Adult Development: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Management Education*, 46(1), 140–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562921990065>
- Cheng, S. (2020). Roles of Self-Efficacy and Learning Motivation in Learning. *2020 3rd International Conference on E-Education, e-Business and Information Management (EEIM 2020)*. 2020 3rd International Conference on e-Education, e-Business and Information Management. <https://doi.org/10.23977/EEIM2020028>
- Cohen-sayag, E. (2016). Student-Teachers across the Curriculum Learn to Write Feedback: Does It Reflect on Their Writing? *Journal of Effective Teaching*, 16(2), 5–19.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches Sixth Edition* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.

- Cui, Y., Schunn, C. D., & Gai, X. (2021). Peer feedback and teacher feedback: A comparative study of revision effectiveness in writing instruction for EFL learners. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(6), 1838–1854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1969541>
- Fatmawati, A., Zubaidah, S., Mahanal, S., & Sutopo. (2019). Critical Thinking, Creative Thinking, and Learning Achievement: How They are Related. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1417, 012070. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1417/1/012070>
- Gul, A., Saleem, Z., & Zahra, N. (2023). Teachers' Oral Feedback Practices in Promoting Academic Writing Skills of ESL Learners. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 3(1), 302–309. <https://doi.org/10.54183/jssr.v3i1.157>
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible Learning for Teachers* (0 ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203181522>
- Hattie, J., Crivelli, J., Van Gompel, K., West-Smith, P., & Wike, K. (2021). Feedback That Leads to Improvement in Student Essays: Testing the Hypothesis that “Where to Next” Feedback is Most Powerful. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 645758. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.645758>
- Henderson, M., Ryan, T., & Phillips, M. (2019). The challenges of feedback in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(8), 1237–1252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1599815>
- Ibna, F. (2018). Factors That Influence Writing in English Language Classrooms: A Case Study of a Secondary School in the Maldives. *International Journal of Social Research and Innovation*, 2(1), 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.55712/ijrsri.v2i1.25>
- Kittur, J. (2023). Conducting Quantitative Research Study: A Step-by-Step Process. *Journal of Engineering Education Transformations*, 36(4), 100–112. <https://doi.org/10.16920/jeet/2023/v36i4/23120>
- Klein, P., Bildfell, A., Dombroski, J. D., Giese, C., Sha, K. W.-Y., & Thompson, S. C. (2022). Self-Regulation in Early Writing Strategy Instruction. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 38(2), 101–125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2021.1919577>
- Lim, S. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in Writing Instruction: A Meta-Analysis. *TESL-EJ*, 24(3). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1275821>
- Muste, D. (2020). The role of feedback in the teaching-learning process. *Educatia* 21, 19, 137–142. <https://doi.org/10.24193/ed21.2020.19.17>
- Nakamura, S. (2016). Insights from Studies on Written Corrective Feedback: Implications for Language Pedagogy. *rEFLECTIONS*, 22, 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v22i0.112330>
- Patty, J. (2024). Critical Thinking Integration in Writing Development. *HUELE: Journal of Applied Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 4(1), 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.30598/huele.v4.i1.p40-48>
- Rahmat, N. H., Aripin, N., Maizura Lin, N., Whanchit, W., & Khairuddin, Z. (2020). Exploring the Connection between Critical Thinking Skills and Academic Writing. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 10(2), 118–128. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.1.2020.102.118.128>
- Raooft, S., & Marooft, Y. (2017). Relationships among motivation (self-efficacy and task value), strategy use and performance in L2 writing. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 35(3), 299–310. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2017.1391706>

- Rasteiro, I., & Limpo, T. (2023). Examining Longitudinal and Concurrent Links Between Writing Motivation and Writing Quality in Middle School. *Written Communication*, 40(1), 30–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883221127701>
- Roderick, R. (2019). Self-Regulation and Rhetorical Problem Solving: How Graduate Students Adapt to an Unfamiliar Writing Project. *Written Communication*, 36(3), 410–436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088319843511>
- Scherer, S., Graham, S., & Busse, V. (2024). How effective is feedback for L1, L2, and FL learners' writing? A meta-analysis. *Learning and Instruction*, 93, 101961. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101961>
- Wilby, J. (2022). Motivation, self-regulation, and writing achievement on a university foundation programme: A programme evaluation study. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(5), 1010–1033. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820917323>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining Self-Regulation. In *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 13–39). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50031-7>