

Teachers' Feedback Methods and Students' Motivation in Writing

Therese Mary Anntoinette B. De Los Santos¹, Bernadette E. Dayan²

¹ Ateneo de Naga University Graduate School, Philippines

² Bicol State College of Applied Sciences and Technology, Philippines

Email: tmabdls@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study explored the association between teachers' and students' preferred methods and focus of feedback in academic writing, and students' level of motivation. It used the descriptive-correlational method using questionnaire to derive information about teachers' methods and focus of feedback and students' level of motivation in writing and their preferred methods and focus of teachers' feedback. The respondents were 26 senior high school teachers handling writing subjects and 150 senior high school students from eight public high schools in Camarines Sur, Philippines, in 2020. Results show that students have a higher level of extrinsic motivation than intrinsic one. Both teachers and students showed high preference for *direct feedback*, *comprehensive feedback*, and *student conferencing*, indicating a close correspondence between teachers' methods and students' preferred methods of feedback. However, variation in focus for providing feedback was noted for both groups. The teachers' inclination for direct feedback did not resonate with that of students' preference. This inquiry shows that students' competence influences both student and teachers' preferred methods of feedback. It also suggests that enhancing students' language proficiency through classroom discussions and activities is the first step needed to be done to help the students become more confident to write and revise their compositions.

Keywords: *writing, motivation, methods of feedback, focus*

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the many challenges met by teachers handling writing subjects is the lack of motivation among students. The study of Paurillo (2019) found that senior high school students were bored, passive, and unmotivated in a writing class. They were not confident and felt unsettled every time there is a writing activity. Students' lack of motivation in writing is one of the factors that contribute to the poor writing skills of Filipino students in English based on the findings of Saavedra and Barredo (2020). They argued that teacher's assistance can greatly affect students' motivation to learn and develop language skills. However, students are not given the chance to choose preferred methods and focus of feedback as teachers often hold the decision. Teachers tend to give feedback without considering students preference in providing information about their performance. According to Yamalee and Tangkiengsirisin (2019), this gap between teachers' practices and students' preferences may cause dissatisfaction and loss of motivation among students.

Students' dislike of the teacher's method of giving feedback can be detrimental to students' perception and learning. The findings of Chokwe (2015) and Agbayahoun (2016) revealed that students discard teachers' feedback because they are not satisfied with it. The teachers' method of providing feedback did not motivate them to improve writing, thus they viewed feedback as not good, demotivating, and not beneficial for them. The same observation besets the local setting and is still found a persistent issue in classroom instruction. Students ignore and disregard feedback in writing especially when it is solely focused on grammar correction. Other students complained about not understanding what the feedback meant, so they consequently have difficulty in revising their compositions. In some instances when a teacher asked the class to give feedback on their classmate's composition, the students were

doubtful about the quality of their classmate's feedback, so they hesitated to use their corrections or comments (Robles and Torres, 2020). Mismatch between teacher and learner expectations is considered by Nunan (1987, as cited by Yunus, 2020) as a severe problem because this results in students' low motivation and disappointment which affect the success of feedback (Schulz, 2001, in Black and Nanni, 2016).

Students who have high levels of motivation especially intrinsic motivation perform better than those who are not motivated. Students who are intrinsically motivated become more persistent to learn and succeed (Morrow and Ackermann, 2012, in Balacuit and Inabangan, 2019; Schreiber, 2017) because they are more flexible and do not give up easily when faced with challenging tasks. Extrinsic motivation also helps students perform better especially in the context of Filipino learners based on the studies of King and Ganotice (2013), Datu (2017), Castro (2018), and Balacuit and Inabangan (2019) because the learners consider learning how to write better in English will help them receive tokens, praise, or recognition which give them the feeling of meeting the social expectations and the confidence to succeed in finding a good job in the future and making their families proud. However, students who are extrinsically motivated are more at risk of developing negative feelings like anxiety, boredom, and hopelessness (Ouano, 2011) especially in challenging situations.

Some studies discussed the importance of considering students' preferences for feedback to be beneficial to the students (Boramy, 2010; Agbayahoun, 2016; Singh, 2016; Black and Nanni, 2016; and Al-wossabi, 2019). When their preferred methods and/or focus are considered, the students felt more involved (Middleton and Perks, 2014; Li and He, 2017), optimistic and open to discussion (Boramy, 2010), confident and more intrinsically motivated to improve (Hamouda, 2011; Singh, 2016).

There were studies that showed a consistency between the students' preferences and the methods and focus of feedback students received from their teachers (Sarie, 2013; Leng, 2014; Seker and Dincer, 2014; Bijami et al., 2016; Al-wossabi, 2019), while there were also studies that presented the discrepancies between teachers' practices and students' preference (Hamouda, 2011; Agbayahoun, 2016; Castro, 2017; Nguyen (2019), and Aquino and Cuello (2020). This means that there were studies wherein there was a match between the teachers' and students' preferences, and studies wherein what teachers and students prefer and expect differ from one another.

Consistent with the foregoing studies, the present study considers feedback as an important aspect in academic writing because it helps students learn from errors and thus improve their writing skills. The present study also considers motivation as an essential tool in learning and improving writing skills because it drives and sustains the students to continue working on a given task. However, the foregoing studies did not explore whether a significant relationship between teachers' methods and focus and students' over-all motivation in writing exists or not. The studies also did not examine which among the different method/s and focus of feedback relates with and predicts students' motivation in writing.

What renders this study different from the previous studies is its respondents and its purpose. This study not only aimed to determine whether the methods and focus of teachers' feedback match with what the senior high school students prefer, but to further investigate whether there is a correlation between teachers' methods and focus of feedback and students' motivation in writing. It also examines which among the different methods and focus of feedback predicts students' motivation in writing.

This study aimed to identify whether teachers' methods and focus of feedback in academic writing matched with students' preferences, and whether teachers' methods and focus of feedback are related to students' motivation in writing. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What level of motivation do students have in academic writing?
2. What are the students' preferred methods and focus of feedback in academic writing?
3. What are the teachers' preferred method and focus of giving feedback?
4. What is the difference between students' and teachers' preference in giving feedback?
5. What is the relationship between the students' level of motivation in academic writing and teachers' preferred methods and focus of feedback?

2. METHODS

The descriptive-correlational method was used in the study. Questionnaire was used in gathering data from 26 senior high school teachers handling writing subjects and a stratified random sample of 150 senior high school students from eight public high schools in the municipalities of Nabua, Buhi, Bato, Baa and Bula in Camarines Sur, Philippines during the 2nd semester of S.Y. 2019 - 2020.

The teachers' questionnaire contained statements about methods and focus of feedback. These were used in order to identify the preferred methods of teachers when they give feedback to students' writing by asking them how often they do such. The questionnaire was also utilized to identify which aspects of students' written composition teachers focus on when they give feedback.

The first and second part of the students' questionnaire were meant to identify which methods and focus of teachers' feedback do students prefer. The last part of the questionnaire measured students' level of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation through five factors namely enjoyment, instrumentality, recognition, effort, and self-efficacy. It was adapted from Ashley Payne's Academic Writing Motivation Questionnaire (2012). The items from the 37-item questionnaire were modified and reduced to 24, considering only those applicable to Filipino senior high school learners. The original items were for American college freshmen students, so it was rephrased into words that are fit for Filipino senior high school learners. Some items were changed into negative statements for differentiated semantics and to reduce agreement bias among the respondents.

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data from the questionnaires. Mean and standard deviation were utilized to identify the students' level of motivation, students' preferred methods and focus of feedback, and teachers' preferred methods and focus of feedback. The t test determined whether there is a significant difference between the teachers' methods and focus of feedback and students' preferred methods and focus of feedback. Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine whether there is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' preferred methods and focus of feedback and students' motivation in writing. Estimation of relationships between students' motivation in academic writing and the teachers' preferred methods and focus of feedback was done with the use of regression analysis.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Students' level of motivation in writing

The students' level of motivation in academic writing is presented in Table 1. The aspects of students' motivation are the following: instrumentality which identifies students' beliefs about writing as an means to achieve success in academics and future career, enjoyment which measures students' enjoyment or distaste as they engage in writing tasks, recognition which is related to students' perception of receiving good grades and/or praises from their written works, effort which identifies whether or not students exert effort to complete a writing task, and self-efficacy which determines students' confidence in their ability in writing.

Table 1. Students' level of motivation in writing

Aspects of Motivation	Mean (SD)	Rank	Level
Instrumentality	3.95 (.799)	1	High
Enjoyment	3.69 (.875)	2	High
Recognition	3.52 (.876)	3	High
Effort	3.44 (.709)	4	High
Self-Efficacy	3.20 (.719)	5	Moderate
Overall	3.46 (.629)		High

Note: Scale of interpretation: 1.01-1.80 = Very low; 1.81-2.60 = Low; 2.61-3.40 = Moderate; 3.41-4.20 = High; 4.21-5.00 = Very high

It can be observed that students have an overall high level of motivation ($M = 3.46$, $SD = .629$). Among the aspects of motivation in academic writing, instrumentality is the most motivating aspect ($M = 3.95$, $SD = .799$), followed by enjoyment ($M = 3.69$, $SD = .875$), then recognition ($M = 3.52$, $SD = .876$) and effort ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .709$). Students have high levels of motivation in terms of instrumentality, enjoyment, recognition, and effort. However, it is noticeable that students only have a moderate level of self-efficacy ($M = 3.20$ and $s = .719$).

The overall results show that the students recognize good writing skills as an instrument to succeed in academics and in their future careers that's why instrumentality has the greatest contribution to students' level of motivation. The students also enjoy writing that is why it has the second greatest contribution in their overall motivation. Furthermore, recognition in a form of praise, awards, or grades also motivate the students to write. The students also strive to exert more effort in their writing tasks because of both intrinsic and extrinsic reasons.

The results also reveal that students have higher extrinsic motivation because they are more driven by external sources because they perceive good writing skills as an instrument to achieve academic and future career success. On the other hand, students also have high intrinsic motivation in writing because they feel inner pleasure in the writing activity since enjoyment also has high contribution in students' overall motivation. However, this study shows that students only have a moderate confidence in their writing skills as revealed in their moderate level of self-efficacy which means that they still need to develop the much-needed confidence in their ability to be successful in accomplishing a writing task. The students can have tendencies to avoid writing tasks especially if they find it difficult so there is a need to enhance their confidence in their abilities to write successfully.

Their moderate self-efficacy when it comes to completing a writing task successfully may have been influenced by their previous experiences of success and failures in writing as well as the difficulties they encountered as they work on a writing task. Teachers' and/or classmates' affirmation and coaching may have also influenced students' self-efficacy. This is supported by Van Blankenstein et al.'s (2019) argument that self-efficacy is enhanced when other people express their faith in a student that he can successfully complete a writing task. If other people do not express their faith in a student's ability, self-efficacy will not increase. The coaching done through feedback should also focus on skills that the students can learn realistically so that their difficulties will be eased, thus creating confidence in their skills.

Students' high extrinsic motivation can be explained by Payne's (2012) claim that extrinsic motivation is increasingly becoming important as students grow older because adults assume responsibility for different tasks because of social demands and roles. The result of the present study shows that students believe that having good writing skills is an essential academic and job skill and will enable them to communicate professionally, so this extrinsic belief keeps them motivated. The students wanted to meet the social demands and roles, so they are motivated to do their tasks in their Writing classes and improve their skills in writing. This can also be explained by Ouano's (2011) and King and Ganotice's (2013) claim that receiving tokens or praises gives the students the feeling of meeting social expectations as associated with the collectivist culture among Filipinos. Students feel the importance of meeting social expectations through grades or praises, so these motivate them to strive to do well in their writing tasks.

The findings show similarities to the study of Surastina and Dedi (2018) wherein enjoyment and instrumentality emerged as the two highest contributors to motivation in writing among Indonesian students. This implies that learners in Southeast Asia are motivated to write because they find writing interesting and challenging and that they recognize having good writing skills as a means of achieving success. Being motivated extrinsically and intrinsically means that students can achieve good performance in their writing classes as Balacuit and Inabangan (2019) asserted that both motivations are essential in helping students perform better in any given task.

Since both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are necessary factors for language learning, it can be inferred that the students have chances to succeed in their writing tasks because of their overall high level of motivation. Motivation is a strong predictor of students' language performance as asserted by Castro (2018). Their high level of motivation will energize, direct, and sustain their behavior towards the goal of successfully accomplishing writing tasks. Though it is still better if students' intrinsic motivation will be increased so they can become more

hardworking and can perform better in their writing classes because inherent satisfaction and enjoyment are more powerful and long lasting than external rewards as concluded by Cirocki and Caparoso (2016).

However, the self-efficacy aspect of students' motivation needs to be enhanced so that students can have more confidence in their writing skills and for them not to avoid any writing task. Students should be given more verbal encouragement and more activities that can help them master writing to help them have a higher confidence in themselves. As Moss and Brookhart (2019) claimed, feeling of competence is a powerful motivator. When learners feel confident with their skills, they become more efficient, effective, persistent, and enduring.

Students' and Teachers' Preferred Methods of Feedback

Table 2 presents the comparison of the rankings between students' and teachers' preferred methods of feedback. There were eight methods of feedback that were identified and ranked according to mean score.

Table 2. Comparison between Students' and Teachers' Preferred Methods

Rank	Students' Preference		Teachers' Preference	
	Method of Feedback	Mean (SD)	Method of Feedback	Mean (SD)
1	Comprehensive	4.18 (.826)	Direct	4.37 (.521)
2	Direct	3.97 (1.063)	Comprehensive	4.10 (.635)
3	Student Conferencing	3.86 (.928)	Student Conferencing	3.86 (.672)
4	Metalinguistic	3.53 (1.044)	Selective	3.71 (.635)
5	Selective	3.48 (.919)	Metalinguistic	3.38 (.931)
6	Indirect	3.28 (1.009)	Indirect	2.81 (1.011)
7	Peer	3.21 (1.160)	Electronic	2.38 (1.107)
8	Electronic	2.93 (.969)	Peer	2.25 (1.168)

As seen on Table 2, there is only a slight difference in terms of rank of teachers' and students' preferred methods, but overall, the results reveal that students and teachers have a high preference for direct feedback that has a mean score of 3.97 for students and 4.37 for teachers, comprehensive feedback with a mean score of 4.18 for students and 4.10 for teachers, and student conferencing with 3.86 mean score for both students and teachers. The students and teachers prefer feedback that gives attention to all the aspects of composition and gives direct explicit corrections to errors.

There is a match in the preferred methods of teachers and students because they have the same orientation when it comes to learning and teaching styles. They both prefer teaching and learning styles that require much guidance from the teachers to improve students' knowledge and skills. Both teachers and students favor that the teacher identifies the error, gives explicit corrections, and explains the feedback or comment further for the student to understand and improve his composition.

However, this match between the learning styles and teaching styles reveals that methods that will help students gain more autonomy and become more independent learners are not given a high preference by both teachers and students. This means that teachers and students do not show high preference for methods that provide the students with more chances to learn by discovering and correcting their errors with the help of just clues or symbols given by teachers. Metalinguistic feedback and indirect feedback are not among the top preferred methods and these methods are proven to make students more autonomous and independent because these require students not to rely much on teachers for error identification and correction so they will think critically on how to correct their errors and improve their composition. Students become autonomous and independent if they are given the chance to learn by discovering and correcting their errors with minimal help from teachers. This minimal help can just come in a form of clues, error codes, or symbols for the errors or written suggestions on how to improve the written output.

The top 3 preferred methods by both teachers and students also suggest that the students are not yet confident enough to identify and fix the errors in their composition without teacher's help. Because of students' limited

knowledge and skills as well as confidence in their ability to write well and to identify and correct their errors, both teachers and students prefer methods in which the teachers give comprehensive and explicit corrections and explanations. They both think that comprehensive, direct, and explicit corrections are more suitable for the students' level so there is a match when it comes to students' and teachers' preference for comprehensive feedback, direct feedback, and student conferencing method. The students are not yet proficient in writing as concluded by Leng (2014), Black and Nanni (2016), Castro (2017), and Yunus (2020), so they prefer methods that involve dependence on teacher for correction and feedback and an explicit error correction.

The study also reveals a slight difference in terms of rank of teachers' and students' least preferred methods. Indirect feedback, electronic feedback, and peer feedback got the three lowest mean scores from both teachers and students.

The availability of the gadgets and software as well as lack of trainings on how to give and use feedback electronically have possibly hindered both the students and teachers from using and liking the electronic method. Hyland and Hyland (2006a) confirmed that software and training difficulties make this method appear disadvantageous on the part of both students and teachers. Lorenzo (2016) and Gultiano et al. (n.d.) further cited that the limited access to internet laboratory, internet connection and/or gadgets prevents both teachers and students from using the electronic method of feedback.

Teachers' and students' low preference for indirect feedback and peer feedback shows that both teachers and students still prefer methods that involve direct and explicit corrections from teachers to methods that make the students interact with peers or discover and correct their own errors with the use of clues or symbols only. Both teachers and students believe that it is the teacher's duty to give feedback in the form of error correction or comments to students' composition. Students' writing proficiency and confidence in their ability to write are possible factors that affected their choices of feedback methods. The students are still dependent on teachers for feedback because they are not yet so proficient in identifying their errors and correcting it on their own. The teachers' observations about their students' ability also contributed to this result. Since the teachers observed that students could not yet identify their own errors and do self-correction, they could not use indirect method and peer feedback because these methods do not require explicit corrections from teachers. Teachers think that the students may not appreciate these methods, or these methods will be too difficult for them as these are not yet suitable to their proficiency level. If most students are less proficient, it would be difficult for them to identify and correct their errors with the use of error codes or clues only from the teachers, or to correct the errors in their classmates' compositions.

Comprehensive and explicit corrections are much preferred when students have limited knowledge and skills as pointed out by Leng (2014) and Yunus (2020). These kinds of feedbacks are more convenient for the students because they have the correct answer already and the students exactly know what to improve (Castro, 2017).

This match between the preferred methods of both parties may explain why students have an overall high level of motivation. The students are both extrinsically and intrinsically motivated although students have higher extrinsic motivation.

Hyland (2010) and Hamouda (2011) claimed that students are highly motivated in doing what they prefer. The students felt comfortable with the methods, so they feel motivated. Since there is a minimal gap between the methods students expect their teachers to use and the practices of teachers in giving feedback, students are motivated to write. The students prefer to learn and improve their writing with the help of feedback that gives attention to all aspects of a composition and is characterized by direct and explicit corrections and suggestions from teachers. In the same way, the teachers teach and help students improve their writing when they give feedback on all aspects of a composition, and they identify the errors and give the correct form of these or give explicit suggestions for the students to easily know which should be improved. This is further supported by the claim of Ferris (2003) as mentioned by Hamouda (2011) that motivation is improved if the learning styles and teaching styles match.

Students' and Teachers' Preferred Focus of Feedback

Students' and teachers' preferred focus of feedback are presented in Table 3. There were five identified focus of feedback namely content, grammar and structure, organization, mechanics, and vocabulary. These were ranked according to mean score.

Table 3. Comparison between Students' and Teachers' Preferred Focus of Feedback

Rank	Students' Preference		Teachers' Preference	
	Focus of Feedback	Mean (SD)	Focus of Feedback	Mean (SD)
1	Organization	4.10 (1.079)	Mechanics	4.70 (.468)
2	Content	4.04 (.914)	Organization	4.31 (.736)
3	Grammar and Structure	3.90 (.906)	Vocabulary	4.31 (.736)
4	Vocabulary	3.83 (1.041)	Content	4.23 (.738)
5	Mechanics	3.72 (1.021)	Grammar and Structure	4.17 (.564)

Based on the rankings, a discrepancy exists between teachers' and students' preferred focus of feedback. Students' top preferred focus is organization ($M = 4.10$) while mechanics ranked last ($M = 3.72$). On the other hand, teachers' top preferred focus is mechanics ($M = 4.70$), and their least preferred focus is grammar ($M = 4.17$).

Mechanics ranked first among teachers' preferred focus while it ranked last among the students' preference. It can be inferred that the teachers observed that mechanics remains to be a problematic area in the composition of senior high school students although Palmer et al. (n.d.) asserted that it should have been mastered or improved in the intermediate grades. Because of this, majority of the teachers focus more on mechanics when they give feedback to the students' compositions with the hope that this will be mastered or at least improved before the students reach the tertiary level.

The teachers are more focused on the extensive errors in mechanics because these did not meet their expectations that students should have already known when to use capital letters and observe correct punctuation marks and spelling before reaching senior high school. The teachers wanted to focus first on these errors before they look deeper into the more complicated errors in content and organization. They wanted the students to master first the basics before they give feedback in the content and organization which are more complex. This can be explained by the findings of Ahmadi et al. (2012) and Palmer (n.d.) which state that teachers focus on the aspects that they perceive problematic or should have mastered during the previous educational level.

Also, the teachers may have opted to give much attention for correction on the aspect of composition which they consider as glaring and repetitive errors (Castro, 2017) or extensive errors (Aquino and Cuello, 2020). The teachers adapt the focus of feedback to what they perceive as students' language needs (Magno and Amarles, 2011) because they felt that the senior high school students should already know which nouns or words require capitalization, use correct spelling, and punctuation marks. The teachers perceive errors in mechanics are repetitive and extensive ones because these should have been improved or mastered in elementary or junior high school years as suggested by Palmer et al. (n.d.). The teachers believe that students need to improve or master the mechanics of writing before they reach the tertiary level, so they give more attention to this.

Another possible reason why teachers focus on mechanics which is easier to spot and correct is that most of them were primarily trained on giving feedback on mechanics, grammar, and word choice, so they are more used to identifying and correcting errors on these than on content and organization. This is similar to the findings of Aquino and Cuello (2020) in which teachers' training and orientation played a role in their preferred focus of feedback. Since teachers were mostly trained on giving feedback on the accuracy of language form which includes grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary, they focused more on these because they felt more confident that they can give good feedback on these aspects and help the students.

Also, teachers' workload and the number of students in the class could have possibly affected their choice of focus. They tend to give attention to the errors that are easier to spot and correct like mechanics because of their

limited time for checking students' composition considering the other tasks of the teachers. Teachers are not only expected to teach and check students' outputs. They also need to make reports and they also handle various extracurricular activities like training student contestants, attending seminars, and other tasks that are designated to them by their superiors. Chen et al. (2016) and Aquino and Cuello (2020) cited that teachers focus on the errors that are easier to spot and correct because they only have limited time to check their students' work because of the other tasks that they have which includes preparation of various reports and participation in different extracurricular activities.

On the other hand, this result shows that students think they need more focus on content and organization. The students prefer that their teachers should give more attention to the organization of their compositions. Mechanics ranking last among the preferred focus of students implies that the students want to receive more feedback on the more complicated aspects of composition like organization and content. It can be inferred that they believe that they need to improve more on these aspects. The students perceive their difficulty in conveying and organizing their ideas as they write should be addressed by teachers' focus of feedback.

Saavedra and Barredo (2020) cited that conveying and organizing ideas are among the difficulties of students when they write. This is possibly the reason why organization is the students' most preferred focus of feedback. The students may have been more concerned with how clear and logical they can present their ideas about the given topic when they write. They wanted to improve their use of transitional words and phrases so their ideas can be more organized as it moves smoothly from one idea to the next. Aside from organization, students also want the content of their composition to be given focus by their teachers so they can write relevant, informative, meaningful, and interesting ideas about the given topic.

It can be inferred that teachers may be giving less attention to the content and organization of the composition when they check students' work that's why students wanted them to pay attention on these two. The students may have been used to seeing a lot of corrections or feedback on the grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary of their composition but seldom on the content and organization. This result does not mean that students discredit the importance of good grammar, correct word choice, and mechanics, but they only want that more attention should be given on organization and content so they can express their ideas in a more organized, relevant, and interesting manner. This can be explained by the assertion of Chen et al. (2016) that it did not mean that the students do not value corrections on the accuracy of language forms which includes mechanics and grammar when they showed more preference for organization and content. The students only wanted their teachers to give attention not just on the accuracy of language form but also on how students can communicate their ideas relevantly, interestingly, and logically by focusing on the content and organization of their composition.

Hamouda (2011) explains that teachers and students differ their views on how much emphasis should be given to each focus of composition because of the different demands on the learners and teachers' observations as well. This could possibly explain why there is a discrepancy in the preferred focus of teachers and students. They have different values when it comes to focus. The teachers prefer to focus on the easier aspects first before moving into the more complicated aspects since the students have not yet mastered the basics. On the other hand, the students believe they need more assistance from their teachers when it comes to the more complex aspects because they wanted to see more feedback on these so they can improve on these more difficult aspects of writing.

Difference Between Teachers' and Students' Preference in Giving Feedback in Writing

The *t* test results between the teachers' and students' preference in giving feedback are shown in Table 4. Among the eight methods, teachers and students differ their preference on three methods namely: direct feedback, indirect feedback, and peer feedback.

Table 4. Difference between teachers' and students' preference in giving feedback in writing

Preferred Method	Students	Teachers	<i>t</i> -value	df	<i>p</i> -value (two-tailed)
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)			
Direct Feedback*	3.97 (1.063)	4.37 (.521)	-2.925	68.198	.005
Indirect Feedback*	3.28 (1.009)	2.81 (1.011)	2.203	174	.029
Peer Feedback*	3.21 (1.160)	2.25 (1.168)	3.877	174	.000
Metalinguistic Feedback	3.53 (1.044)	3.38 (.931)	.650	174	.516
Student Conferencing Feedback	3.86 (.928)	3.86 (.672)	-.013	43.502	.989
Electronic Feedback	2.93 (.969)	2.38 (1.107)	2.592	174	0.10
Comprehensive Feedback	4.18 (.826)	4.10 (.938)	.487	174	.627
Preferred Focus					
Grammar and Structure*	3.90 (.906)	4.17 (.564)	-2.025	50.609	.048
Vocabulary*	3.83 (1.041)	4.31 (.736)	-2.258	174	.025
Mechanics*	3.72 (1.021)	4.70 (.468)	-7.779	74.754	.000
Organization	4.10 (1.079)	4.31 (.736)	-.943	174	.347
Content	4.04 (.914)	4.23 (.738)	-.990	174	.323

As shown in table 4, teachers' preference for direct method ($M = 4.37$, $SD = .521$) is relatively higher than that of the students' ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 1.063$), $t(68) = -2.925$, $p = .005$. On the other hand, the students' level of preference for indirect feedback ($M = 3.28$, $SD = 1.009$) is significantly higher compared to the teachers' ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 1.011$), $t(174) = 2.20$, $p = .029$. Students' level of preference ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 1.160$) for peer feedback is also higher than that of the teachers' ($M = 2.25$, $SD = 1.168$), $t(174) = 3.88$, $p = .000$.

Teachers having a higher preference for direct feedback implies that the teachers still hold on to the belief that they are the only source of feedback and regarded feedback as their responsibility (Hamouda, 2011). This could also imply that the teachers think they cannot withdraw yet the support or scaffolds they made for the students through identifying the error and giving its correct form because the students are not yet ready to identify and correct the errors in their composition. The teachers use this method because they think that the students are not yet capable of identifying and correcting their errors in their composition. This is similar to the study of Baculi et al. (n.d.) and Boramy (2010) who reported that direct feedback is used by teachers if the students are not yet proficient with the language because this method helps them improve their skills by means of providing the correct form of the errors, making direct feedback a teacher centered method of feedback. The teachers consider using this method as a means of providing students a guide through the identified and corrected errors which give them the idea on how to write correctly.

On the other hand, students' significantly higher preference for indirect feedback and peer feedback possibly indicate that students also want to experience feedback methods that promote learner autonomy and independence through self-correction and interaction with peers. The students can learn to be autonomous and independent if they are given the chance to learn by discovering and correcting their errors with minimal help from teachers. Indirect feedback and peer feedback may have been among the least preferred methods by both students and teachers in terms of rank but the significant difference between teachers' and students' preference for these methods indicate that there is a chance for students to appreciate and prefer the indirect method and peer feedback in the long run when teachers try to use these methods. Since indirect feedback and peer feedback require students to rely less on their teachers for error identification and correction, there is a need to enhance the students' language proficiency

first through various classroom activities so the students can have the confidence to work on their own as they correct their errors and improve their composition.

Given this significant difference, if teachers will also use these methods of feedback and explain their purpose and importance, it is possible that students will later appreciate these methods as these will give them opportunities for interactions with classmates and challenge them and help them think more critically as they identify errors and correct these, thus making them more autonomous and independent. They can think and decide on how to correct errors and improve their composition without having to rely much on teachers for error identification and correction because the teachers' clues, error codes, or suggestions as well peer's suggestions or comments will only serve as their guide. In the studies of Ahmadi et al. (2012), Li and He (2017), and Bijami et al. (2016), the students believed that indirect feedback is more helpful compared to direct feedback because the students were given the chance to be autonomous and independent because they were challenged to think more critically as they are involved in noticing and revising their errors. When students are challenged to think more critically and with minimal help from teachers, they become more autonomous and independent because they rely on themselves to improve their composition by identifying and correcting their own errors with the help of clues, codes, or suggestions.

In terms of focus, there is a significant difference between the preference of teachers and students in grammar and structure, vocabulary, and mechanics. The teachers' level of preference ($M = 4.17$, $SD = .564$) for grammar and structure, $t(51) = -2.03$, $p = .048$, is higher than students' level of preference ($M = 3.90$, $SD = .906$). Teachers' preference ($M = 4.31$, $SD = .736$) for vocabulary, $t(174) = -2.26$, $p = .025$, as focus of feedback is also significantly higher compared to students' preference ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.041$). The teachers ($M = 4.70$, $SD = .468$) compared to the students ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 1.021$) also demonstrated a significantly higher preference for mechanics, $t(75) = -.778$, $p = .000$.

This means that teachers have higher preference for accuracy in language form. When they give feedback to students' composition, they focus their attention to the correct usage of punctuation marks, capitalization, spelling, tenses, agreement, and choice of words. The teachers wanted the students to master the language form. Teachers could not immediately give feedback on organization and content without looking into the accuracy of form first. If there is no accuracy of grammar and structure, vocabulary, and mechanics, it will be difficult to focus on the organization and content of the composition. Furthermore, teachers may have observed that mechanics, vocabulary, and grammar and structure remain a problematic area (Ahmadi et al., 2012) in students' compositions, so they focused on these areas that have large number of errors. It is also possible that most teachers are primarily trained on giving feedback on accuracy of form, so they tend to give more focus on mechanics, vocabulary, and grammar.

This result shows that teachers in Rinconada area wanted their students to master or at least improve compositions in terms of grammar and structure, mechanics, and vocabulary, during their senior high school years that is why their preference for these areas is relatively higher compared to students' preference. The expectation of which areas of composition should be mastered or at least improved during a particular educational level can be another possible reason why teachers showed a higher preference for grammar and structure, mechanics, and vocabulary.

This can be explained by the claim of Blau and Hall (2002) as cited in Hyland and Hyland (2006a) that feedback should start by focusing on the accuracy of form which includes grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, then move to the development and organization of the content of the composition. Lee (2009) as cited by Boramy (2010) claimed that teachers tend to give more focus on correction of errors in grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary than on the content because of the large number of errors in these areas.

Also, teachers training also play a role in this result as explained by Aquino and Cuello (2020) in which teachers focus on the accuracy of language form when they give feedback to students' writing because they are more trained on these and not much on content and organization.

Relationship Between Students' Motivation in Academic Writing and Teachers' Preferred Methods and Focus of Feedback

The data presented in Table 5 is obtained using correlation to show the relationship between the teachers' preferred method and focus of feedback and students' motivation in academic writing. Among the eight methods, it is evident that only indirect feedback, $r(174) = .434, p < .05$, significantly correlated to students' motivation in writing. It shows a moderate positive correlation.

Table 5. Correlation matrix showing the relationship between the teachers' preferred method and focus of feedback and students' motivation in academic writing

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Motivation in Academic Writing	1													
2. Direct Feedback	-.126	1												
3. Indirect Feedback	.434*	.215	1											
4. Metalinguistic Feedback	-.109	.586**	.294	1										
5. Peer Feedback	-.054	.304	.229	.386	1									
6. Student Conferencing Feedback	-.218	.489*	-.054	.422*	.019	1								
7. Electronic Feedback	-.064	.215	.176	.549**	.386	.409*	1							
8. Comprehensive Feedback	-.088	.601**	.031	.414*	.050	.735**	.377	1						
9. Selective Feedback	.141	.483*	.222	.364	.061	.140	.022	.032	1					
10. Focus on Grammar and Structure	-.285	.218	.043	.287	.114	.222	.369	.213	.106	1				
11. Focus on Vocabulary	-.026	.321	-.159	.229	-.047	.370	.119	.593**	.155	.396*	1			
12. Focus on Mechanics	-.031	.310	.303	.256	.382	.113	.281	.247	-.172	.480*	.213	1		
13. Focus on Organization	.126	.582**	.379	.404*	.047	.532**	.389*	.651**	.197	.396*	.335	.399*	1	
14. Focus on Content	.126	.552**	.370	.419*	.000	.590**	.389*	.732**	-.002	.524**	.453*	.553**	.785**	1

Note: *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Although indirect feedback is among the least preferred methods of both teachers and students, the results show that this is the only method that correlates with students' motivation. This means that if teachers will use more the indirect method when giving feedback, the more the students will feel motivated to write.

This result suggests that teachers must gradually let students do self-correction through the indirect method so that students are given the opportunity to think critically and increase their autonomy, thus, contributing to the students' level of motivation. Both teachers and students need to be open-minded about the benefits of indirect feedback. The students' language proficiency also needs to be enhanced through classroom discussions and activities so that the students will feel confident to use language in writing. The teachers may explain the importance

and the philosophy behind indirect feedback so that the students can manage their expectations and even their anxieties in receiving feedback. Once the students felt at ease with indirect feedback, they may develop preference for this method in the long run.

This is supported by Lam and Law's (2007) conclusion that challenging tasks like letting the learners notice their errors and doing self-correction can help maintain or even increase motivation in writing because students are given the opportunity to practice independence and autonomy and to enhance their critical thinking. The students felt more confident and motivated if they can succeed on their own in a challenging task.

Using indirect feedback could also be another way to enhance students' intrinsic motivation because this method makes the students feel challenged, autonomous, and independent. The students will become more intrinsically motivated if they feel challenged when they are asked to correct their errors and improve their composition without having to rely much on their teachers. The students become more autonomous and independent if they can think critically on how to improve their compositions with the use of clues, codes, and suggestions from teachers rather than simply copying teachers' corrections and purely relying on teachers for error identification and correction. Intrinsically motivated students are those that prefer challenging tasks according to Cirocki and Caparoso (2016). Autonomy and independence are also characteristics of intrinsically motivated students according to Ouano (2011) and Libao et al. (2016).

In terms of focus, none significantly correlated to students' motivation. However, it is shown that students' motivation becomes lower if teacher focuses his feedback on grammar and structure as well as vocabulary. Too much focus of teachers' feedback on grammar and structure $r(51) = -2.03, p < .05$, and vocabulary $r(174) = -2.26, p < .05$, does not increase the motivation of students in writing. This may be attributed to the claim of Lee et al. (2018) that too much focus of teacher feedback on the errors especially in grammar and structure, led to students' low levels of motivation. Students get discouraged seeing their papers full of marks emphasizing their errors in grammar or vocabulary which makes it overwhelming and counterproductive to revision according to Castro (2017).

This result contradicts the findings of Sarie (2013), Palmer et al. (n.d.), and Seker and Dincer (2014) wherein the students showed high preference for vocabulary and grammar and structure and therefore, were more motivated to write. Grammar and vocabulary could be two of the problematic areas of composition, so this may be the reason why teachers focused their feedback on accuracy in grammar and correct choice of words in the composition just like in the studies of Ahmadi et al. (2012) and Sarie (2013).

Predictor of Motivation

Table 6 shows that a simple linear regression analysis was used to test if teachers' methods and focus of feedback significantly predicted students' motivation in academic writing. When motivation was predicted, it was found out that only indirect feedback ($\beta = .147, p < .027$) was a significant predictor. The overall model fit was $R^2 = .188, F(1, 24) = 5.567, p < .027$.

Table 6. Regression analysis estimation of relationships between students' motivation in academic writing and the teachers' preferred methods and focus of feedback

<i>Variables Entered/Removed^a</i>			
Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	(Teacher) Indirect Feedback		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter $\leq .050$, Probability-of-F-to-remove $\geq .100$).
a. Dependent Variable: Motivation in Academic Writing			

<i>Model Summary</i>						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.434 ^a	.188	.154	.31567		
a. Predictors: (Constant), (Teacher) Indirect Feedback						
<i>ANOVA^a</i>						
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	.555	1	.555	5.567	.027 ^b
	Residual	2.392	24	.100		
	Total	2.946	25			
a. Dependent Variable: Motivation in Academic Writing; b. Predictors: (Constant), (Teacher) Indirect Feedback						
<i>Coefficients^a</i>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.912	.186		15.657	.000
	(Teacher) Indirect Feedback	.147	.062	.434	2.359	.027
a. Dependent Variable: Motivation in Academic Writing; b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), (Teacher) Indirect Feedback						

The derived regression model equation is *motivation in academic writing* = $.147 \times \text{level of teachers' use of indirect feedback} + 2.912$. Indirect feedback predicts motivation and 19% of the motivation can be accounted for teachers' use of indirect feedback.

This means that teachers should use indirect feedback to motivate the students to write. To help the students enhance their intrinsic motivation which includes their enjoyment and self-efficacy, teachers may transition to partial use of indirect correction from direct correction as what Castro (2017) suggested. Indirect method is not among students' and teachers' top preferred methods, but this result shows that this is the method that can enhance students' motivation. The teachers may gradually introduce this method and let the students correct their errors with the help of the clues or symbols, instead of giving them the correct form of the errors. This will make the students become aware of their own thinking and regulate their thinking, thus making them feel more independent and autonomous. Once they feel independent and autonomous, they will feel more confident and competent. The more intrinsically motivated they will become because of their increased self-efficacy and enjoyment in doing a writing task. They will feel personal satisfaction from accomplishing challenging tasks like identifying and correcting the errors in their composition with the help of indirect feedback coming from teachers.

This result is consistent with Hyland and Hyland (2006a), Nguyen (2019), and Nabizadah (2020) that recommended the use of indirect method when giving feedback to students' composition as this method encourages critical thinking, learner reflection, and self-editing among students since teachers only indicate the error by using a circle or underline or proofreading symbols, without giving the correct form. This lets the students to discover the error and correct the errors in the writing activity, therefore, helping them to become more autonomous and independent because they rely on themselves more. Once the students feel they are autonomous and independent, their motivation especially their intrinsic motivation to write continues to increase. They feel personal satisfaction and they become proud of themselves if they are able to accomplish a challenging task, therefore enhancing their intrinsic motivation. This confirms the claim of Cheung (2018) that the more student autonomy is promoted in the classroom, the more the students engage and feel intrinsically motivated in doing a task. Autonomy and independence are characteristics of intrinsically motivated students according to Ouano (2011). Students who

manifest autonomy can learn more and succeed because they do a task for personal growth as claimed by Libao (2016).

4. CONCLUSION

The findings in this study reveal that both extrinsic and intrinsic factors motivate students to write although the extrinsic factor of recognizing writing as an instrument to both academic and work success has higher impact on their motivation. Furthermore, students' competence influences both student and teachers' preferred methods of feedback. Students rely much on teachers for corrections and feedback because they see them as models and experts in writing and students are not yet confident in their own writing and revision skills, so they still need their teacher's assistance. Meanwhile, teachers still regard that feedback is their responsibility because think that students are not yet ready for feedback that requires less supervision or less direct help and correction from them.

The focus of feedback does not influence students' motivation in writing. Thus, the discrepancy in teachers' and students' preferred focus of feedback, does not have any bearing on students' motivation in writing. Moreover, students' motivation may be enhanced not just by considering their preferred methods and focus of feedback, but also by giving them tasks and feedback that will help them become more independent and autonomous rather than relying much on the teachers for error correction. Indirect feedback may not be students' most preferred method of feedback, but this study reveals that when students are given feedback that involves or engages them, it can give them a sense of accomplishment for completing the challenging task, thus, enhancing their motivation to write.

The result of this study suggests that enhancing students' language proficiency through classroom discussions and activities is the first step needed to be done to help the students become more confident to write and revise their compositions. Rather than taking the roles of examiner, critic, judge, or proofreader which directly imposes authority in making comments in writing, teachers should take the roles of a coach, facilitator, mentor, or a guide in deciding how to provide feedback so as not to intimidate learners even as they point out and correct errors in their writing performance. Writing workshops for teachers will also be helpful to train them to become more adept in giving feedback on the content and organization of the students' written composition since most of them were trained only on giving feedback to language form.

Considering the limitation of the method of this non-experimental study, experimental studies on the effects of indirect feedback on students' motivation may be done to confirm and strengthen the claim that indirect feedback contributes to students' motivation especially on their intrinsic motivation. Future researchers may also pursue similar studies expanding the scope and involving teachers and students from both private and public schools to increase the generalizability of the results.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors are extremely grateful to the school heads, teachers, and students of the eight public high schools in the 5th district of Camarines Sur for providing the data for this study. They also wish to thank the panel members and the dean of the Graduate School of Ateneo de Naga University for their invaluable suggestions which guided them in the improvement of this study.

REFERENCES

- Agbayahoun, J. (2016). Teacher written feedback on student writing: teachers' and learners' perspective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6 (10), 1895 –1904. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0610.01>
- Ahmadi, D., Mafron, P. & Mehrdad, A. (2012). Investigating the effects of two types of feedback on EFL students' writing. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 2590 – 2595. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.529>
- Al-wossabi, S. A. N. (2019). Corrective feedback in Saudi EFL writing context: A new perspective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9 (3) pp. 325 – 331. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0903.11>
- Aquino, C.J.B. & Cuello, R. (2020). Teachers' beliefs and practices on written corrective feedback: matched or mismatched? *DLSU Research Congress 2020*, DLSU Manila, Philippines

- Baculi, A., Balatbat, R., Mendiola, J.K.Z., Park, I., Vizconde, C. (n.d.). The practice of written corrective feedback among ESL teachers in the Philippines. <http://www.academia.org>
- Balacuit, C.V., and Inabangan, J.E. (2019). Influence of motivation towards academic performance in games and sports among BSED MAPEH interns in SDSSU main campus. *International Journal of Physical Education, Sports and Health*, 6 (3), 220 - 224.
- Bijami, M., Pandian, A., & Singh, M. (2016). The relationship between teacher's written feedback and students' writing performance: Sociocultural perspective. *International Journal of Education and Literary Studies*, 4 (1), 59-66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.4n.lp.59>
- Black, D.A. & Nanni, A. (2016). Written corrective feedback: Preferences and justifications of teachers and students in a Thai context. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 16 (3), 99 – 114.
- Boramy, S. (2010). Using directive and facilitative feedback to improve student writing: a case study in the higher education setting in Cambodia. *Language Education in Asia*, 1 (1), 23-47. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5746/LEiA/10/v1/A04/Sou>
- Castro, M.C.S.A. (2017). Error and corrective feedback in writing: Implications to our classroom practices. *Language and Literature Teaching Journal*, 20 (2). <http://doi.org/110.24071/lt.2017.200210>
- Castro, M.F. (2018). Filipino university students' attitudes and motivation in learning English and their influence on academic achievement. *NELTA ELT forum*. <http://neltaforum.wordpress.com/2018/05/04>
- Chen, S., Nassaji, H, & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: A case study of university students from mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*. Doi: 10.1186/540862-016-0010-y
- Cheung, Y.L. (2018). The effects of writing instructors' motivational strategies on student motivation. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 43 (3). <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol43/iss3/4>
- Chokwe, J.M. (2015). Students' and tutors' perceptions of feedback on academic essays in an open and distance learning context. *Open Praxis*, 7 (1), 39 – 56. <http://doi.org/10.5944/opempraxis.7.1.154>
- Cirocki, A. & Caparoso, J. (2016). Attitudes, motivations, and beliefs about L2 reading in the Filipino secondary school classroom: A mixed-methods study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 5 (7). doi: 10.7575/aiac/ijalel.v.5n.7p.1
- Datu, J.A.D. (2017). Peace of mind, academic motivation and academic achievement in Filipino high school students. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 20 (22), 1-8. doi: 10.1017/sjp.2017.19
- Gultiano, S.A., King, E.M., Orbeta, A.C., and Gordoncillo, P. (n.d.). Internet use among Filipino public high school students. <https://paa2010.princeton.edu/papers/101023>
- Hamouda, A. (2011). A study of students and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Saudi EFL context. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 4 (3), 128 – 141. <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p128>
- Hyland, F. (2010). Future directions in feedback on second language writing: Overview and research agenda. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10 (2), 171 – 182.
- Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39, 83 – 101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- King, R.B. and Ganotice, F.A. (2013). Student motivation as hierarchical and multidimensional: Cross-cultural validation of personal investment theory in the Philippines. *Universitas Psychologica*, 12 (3). http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S165792672013000300004
- Lam, S.F. & Law, Y. K. (2007). The roles of instructional practices and motivation in writing performance. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 75 (2), 145 – 164.
- Lee, I., Yu, S., & Liu, Y. (2018). Hong Kong secondary students' motivation in EFL writing: A survey study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51, 176–187. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.364>
- Leng, K. (2014). An analysis of written feedback on ESL students' writing. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 123, 389 – 397. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1437>
- Li, H. & He, Q. (2017). Chinese secondary EFL learners' and teachers' preferences for types of written corrective feedback. *English Language Teaching*, 10 (3). <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n3p63>
- Libao, N.J.P., Sagun, J.J.B., Tamangan, E.A., Pattalitan, Jr., A.P., Dupa, M.A.D., & Bautista, R.G. (2016). Science learning motivation as correlate of students' academic performances. *Journal of Technology and Science Education*, 6 (3). doi:10.3926/jotse.231

- Lorenzo, A.R. (2016). Effectiveness of the computer and internet literacy project in public high schools of Tarlac Province, Philippines. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 15 (2), 38-46. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1096459.pdf>
- Magno, C. and Amarles, A. (2011). Teachers' feedback practices in second language academic writing classrooms. *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment*, 6 (2), 21-30.
- Middleton, M. and Perks, K. (2014). *Motivation to learn*. Corwin: A Sage Company, California, USA.
- Moss, C.N. and Brookhart, S.M. (2019). *Advancing formative assessment in every classroom: A guide for instructional leaders*. ASCD. Virginia.
- Nabizadah, P. (2020). The impact of formative feedback strategies on EFL Afghan foreign students' writing skills. *International Journal of Advance Academic Studies*, 2 (2), 77 – 82. <http://www.allstudyjournal.com>
- Nguyen, T.T.L. (2019). A case study of teacher feedback on Thai university students' essay writing. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 19 (2), 121-138. <http://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2019-1902-08>
- Ouano, J.A. (2011). Motivational antecedents of academic emotions in Filipino college students. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 20 (1), 127 – 132
- Palmer, B., Evans, C., Barrett, E., & Vinson, J. (n.d.). Understanding the impact of feedback on student writing in upper elementary aged children. *Global Education Journal*. www.franklinpublishing.net73
- Paurillo, P.M. (2019). Research writing ability of senior high school students as perceived by teachers of samples schools in Quezon City. *People: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4 (3), 1788-1800
- Payne, A. R. (2012). Development of the academic writing motivation questionnaire. <http://athenaeum.libs.uga.edu/handle/10724/28576>
- Robles, R.M.V. and Torres, J.M. (2020). Filipino ESL teachers' attitudes, practices, and challenges using peer correction strategy in teaching writing. Retrieved From [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345982871_Filipino_ESL_Teachers%7Attitudes_Practices_and_Challenges_in_Using_Peer_Correction_Strategy_in Teaching_Writing](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345982871_Filipino_ESL_Teachers%7Attitudes_Practices_and_Challenges_in_Using_Peer_Correction_Strategy_in_Teaching_Writing)
- Saavedra, A.D. and Barredo, C.P. (2020). Factors that contribute to the poor writing skills in Filipino and English of the elementary pupils. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity, and Change*, 14 (5), 1090 – 1106.
- Sarie, R. (2013). using directive feedback to improve students' writing skills: a case study of english department students. *Advances in Language and Literature Studies*, 4 (2), 74-92. Retrieved From <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.4n.2p.74>
- Schreiber, J.B. (2017). *Motivation 101*. Springer Publishing Company, New York
- Seker, M. & Dincer, A. (2014). Insight to students' perceptions on teacher feedback in second language writing classes. *English Language Teaching*, 7 (2), <http://doi.dx.org/10.5539/elt.v7n2p7>
- Singh, M.K.M. (2016). Graduate students' needs and preferences for written feedback on academic writing. *English Language Teaching*, 9 (12). <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n12p79>
- Surastina & Dedi, F. (2018). Examining academic writing motivation of prospective Indonesian language teachers using exploratory factor analysis. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(2), 15 – 24. <http://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11229>
- Van Blankenstein, F.M., Saab, N., Van der Rijst, R.M., Danel, M.S., Bakker-van den Berg, A.S., and Van den Broek, P.W. (2019). How do self-efficacy beliefs for academic writing and collaboration and intrinsic motivation for academic writing and research develop during an undergraduate research project? *Educational Studies*, 45 (2), 209-225. doi: 10.1080/03055698.2018.1446326
- Yamalee, E. & Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2019). Effects of integrated feedback on academic writing achievement. *Arab World English Journal*, 10 (3), 250 – 270. <http://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no.3.17>
- Yunus, W.N.M.W.M. (2020). Written corrective feedback in English compositions: Teachers' practices and students' expectations. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 3 (2), 21 – 33.