

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Teachers' feedback and English academic achievement of grade 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College Laboratory High School

Merna Jane M. Ignacio^{1*}, Nelson U. Julhamid¹, Masnona S. Asiri¹

¹Graduate Studies, Sulu State College, Jolo, Sulu.

*Corresponding author: sscgspub@sulustatecollege.edu.ph

ABSTRACT. Among students at Sulu State College Laboratory High School in Grades 8 and 9, a study was done to look into the connection between academic achievement in English and instructor feedback. The purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of instructor feedback methods on students' performance in English classes. Surveys and an analysis of academic records were used to gather information about how well teachers' feedback improved students' learning outcomes. The results showed a strong relationship between students' academic achievement in English in Grades 8 and 9. Students' levels of academic accomplishment and English proficiency were higher when they received timely and constructive feedback from their teachers. Students' academic growth in English was found to be significantly influenced by effective feedback mechanisms, including encouragement, targeted suggestions for improvement, and personalized comments. The study emphasizes the significance of high-quality feedback in promoting student learning and academic development, particularly in English language subjects. To support students' overall academic achievement and English language proficiency at Sulu State College Laboratory High School, recommendations include implementing continuous assessment practices, promoting a feedback-oriented classroom culture, and improving teacher training on feedback strategies.

KEYWORDS: *Academic Achievement; Teacher feedback; English Proficiency; Academic Growth.*

ARTICLE DETAILS

JEAS-00022; Received: February 29, 2024; Accepted: March 20, 2024; Online: April 26, 2024

CITATION:

Ignacio, Merna Jane M., Julhamid, Nelson U., Asiri, Masnona S. (2024). Teachers' feedback and english academic achievement of grade 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College Laboratory High School. *Journal of Education and Academic Settings*. DOI: 10.62596/fvr96v47

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2024 by author(s). *Journal of Education and Academic Settings* is published by Stratworks Research Inc. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), allowing redistribution and reproduction in any format or medium, provided the original work is cited or recognized.

Introduction

Education is a tool for life improvement. For many years, it has been a major priority to prepare graduates for the rapid advancements in globalization and basic education, particularly at the secondary school level. It is arguably the most significant instrument for changing one's life (Abragan, 2022). As a result, efforts to revise and modify the curriculum were stepped up.

In the Philippines, the K–12 policy was passed in 2013. This curriculum can be customized to meet the needs of particular learner groups and was created to cover a variety of learner demands. Students in this curriculum gain in-depth information, skills, values, and attitudes through continuity and consistency across all levels and courses, making it relevant to learners. The study of language should help students become proficient. In junior high school, English is

the main language of teaching (JHS). Thus, among the seven Learning Areas included in the Core curriculum is English.

Even though it can be arbitrary, feedback can affect students' academic performance (Hattie, 2009 in Carless & Boud, 2018). Students are not very happy with feedback, according to reports from the Student Experience Survey in Australia (Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching 2017) and the National Student Survey in England and Wales (Higher Education Funding Council for England 2016). (Carless & Boud, 2018). Students must have opportunities to apply feedback in the curriculum as well as an understanding of how feedback can function effectively for feedback procedures to be improved (Carless & Boud, 2018).

Feedback, as defined by Boud and Molloy (2013) and Carless (2015), is the process by which students interpret data from several sources and apply it to improve their work or learning techniques. Thus, feedback emphasizes the importance of the student's involvement in sense-making and using comments to improve following work, and goes beyond professors telling students about their strengths, flaws, and how to improve (Carless & Boud, 2018).

Academic achievement of students is thought to be impacted by the caliber of instruction and learning procedures used in English language classrooms. The current study assessed how well students were doing academically in English and how they felt about the comments made by their English language instructors regarding the language proficiency of Sulu State College - Laboratory High School students in Grades 8 and 9. Feedback from teachers helps students build their knowledge, correct mistakes, and become motivated to learn the material and impact achievement. Previous studies on teacher feedback have determined the desired results of the feedback. The levels of feedback suggested by the Hattie & Timperley (2007 in Carless & Boud, 2018) feedback model were the main focus of the current study.

Research Questions

This study determined the English language teachers' feedback and English academic achievement of Grades 9 and 10 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School during the School Year 2022-2023. Specifically, this study sought answers to following questions:

1. What is the level of English language teachers' feedback as assessed by students in the context of:

- 1.1 Task Feedback;
- 1.2 Process Feedback;
- 1.3 Self-regulation Feedback; and
- 1.4 Self Feedback?

2. What is the level of English academic achievement of Grades 9 and 10 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA)?

3. Is there a significant difference in the level of English language teachers' feedback as assessed by students when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of:

- 3.1 Gender;
- 3.2 Age;
- 3.3 Parent's educational attainment; and
- 3.4 Parent's average monthly income?

4. Is there a significant difference in the level of English academic achievement of Grades 9 and 10 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA) when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms

of:

- 4.1 Gender;
- 4.2 Age;
- 4.3 Parent's educational attainment; and
- 4.4 Parent's average monthly income?

5. Is there a significant correlation between English language teachers' feedback and English academic achievement of Grades 9 and 10 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School?

Literature

The study conducted by Dumlao (2019) titled "From Practice to Writing: Using Reflective Journal Instruction in Enhancing Pre-Service Teachers' Professional Development" examined the reflective journal writing experiences of thirteen pre-service English language teaching BSE majors while they were teaching in a foreign classroom. The results, which were based on qualitative data, revealed that the participants saw journal writing as a reflective practice that helped with three primary areas: professional formation, self-efficacy, and personal development for pre-service teachers. According to the study, journal writing should be explicitly included in teacher education programs as a means of supporting teacher candidates' continued professional language acquisition and development as language teaching practitioners.

Balinas, Elvira S. Researchers Saefurrohman (2016) and Filipino and Indonesian high school English teachers' classroom assessment techniques in ESL classes were documented in their study, "English Teachers Classroom Assessment Practices." With 48 English instructors from junior high schools in the Philippines and Indonesia who answered a questionnaire about their methods for classroom assessment, this study was carried out using a mixed method approach. In an effort to provide more details on their assessment procedures in the classroom, twelve respondents took part in an observation and interview. The study discovered that the primary goal of evaluation was learning, a practice shared by junior high school English teachers in Indonesia and the Philippines. While Indonesian junior high school English teachers primarily used things from existing textbooks to generate assessment items, the majority of Filipino junior high school English teachers prepared and made their own assessments. Written comments were the main form of feedback provided by English teachers of junior high school students in both Indonesia and the Philippines. The most popular ways for both Filipino and Indonesian junior high school English teachers to provide a final report were a total score test and a letter grade.

216 eighth-grade students at Philippine Science High School in Northern Luzon's Ilocos Region Campus, Cordillera Autonomous Region, and Cagayan Valley Campus demonstrated academic achievement in science, mathematics, and English, and their proficiency in the English language was found to be correlated with academic performance in their 2016 study, "English Language Proficiency and Academic Performance of Philippine Science High School Students," conducted by Racca and Lasaten. Frequency distribution and Pearson's correlation were the statistical techniques used to process the data. The results show that most Grade 8 students at the Philippine Science High School in Northern Luzon have satisfactory English language proficiency. Furthermore, the majority of students perform at a very good level in math and science and at a passable level in academic English. The students' academic achievement in every topic and their level of English language ability are significantly correlated, according to the results.

Using an experimental technique of investigation, Sicat (2015) determined the value of the Learning Management System (LMS) Schoology in helping college students become more proficient in business writing. One hundred thirty-five (135) college students who were enrolled

in Communication Skills 14-Writing Skills for Specific Purposes during the Second Semester of the School Year 2013-2014 at Centro Escolar University, Makati City, Philippines, participated in the study. The researcher chose the previously indicated respondents using the purposive sample technique in compliance with the predetermined inclusion criteria. A teacher-made exam that had been sufficiently validated by several experts in the field of English education served as the primary research instrument for this study. Prior to the examination, the subjects' pretest scores and midterm grades were determined to be comparable. Furthermore, following the experiment, the students' post-test results, final exam grades, and final class participation were compared for the control and experimental groups. The control group's mean grades differ slightly from the other group's, suggesting that the traditional approach to teaching business writing is still more effective. Nevertheless, there was a highly substantial difference in the experimental group's mean scores when the Pre-test and Post-test data were given to the control and experimental groups and compared independently. After statistical analysis of the pre- and post-test responses, it was discovered that the first semester basic design course's curriculum intervention improved students' divergent thinking skills in terms of fluency and flexibility more than originality in tasks involving verbal and visual stimuli (Ketizmen, 2024). This demonstrates that the LMS Schoology may help students become even more proficient in Business Writing. Overall, the results indicate that in order to improve college students' competency in business writing, teachers should only use Schoology's LMS as an adjunct to more conventional teaching methods.

Research Methodology

Research Design

This study examines the opinions that Sulu State College – Laboratory High School students in Grades 8 and 9 have about their English language instructors using a descriptive research design. The study focuses on a number of contexts, including self-regulation feedback, task feedback, process feedback, and self feedback. Additionally, it looks at the General Point Average (GPA) of students in Grades 9 and 10. Based on the demographic profiles of the students—gender, age, parent's educational attainment, average monthly income, and year level—the study discovered substantial discrepancies in the feedback levels. The Sulu State College – Laboratory High School students provided the data, and other information was found online and in libraries. Questionnaires were used to gather responses.

Participants

The respondents of this study were Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School enrolled during the School Year 2022-2023.

Table 1. Distribution of the target Samples among SSC employees

Sulu State College - Laboratory High School	Grades 8 and 9 Students
Grade 8	50
Grade 9	50
Total	100

Instruments

This study used a survey questionnaire that was modified from Rui, Yang (2019). That study sought to find out how students perceived the feedback they received from their English language professors, using the theoretical framework of the Hattie & Timperley (2007) model of feedback. The four levels of feedback defined by this approach are task, process, self-regulation, and self-level. Rui, Yang created and verified the questionnaire based on the four levels of the feedback model (2019). Validity of the construct and content was established. Confirmatory factor

analysis further validated the questionnaire's four-component structure. The scale's dependability was determined to be 0.956, 0.944, 0.945, and 0.934 for the four dimensions of task, process, self-regulation, and self-level of feedback, respectively.

Rui's (2019) questionnaire consists of sub-categories such as: task (8 items), process (7 items), self-regulation (8 items), and self-level of feedback (6 items).

Data Gathering procedure

The Principal of Sulu State College's Laboratory High School and the Office of the Sulu State College's Dean of Graduate Studies granted permission to administer the questionnaire, and the researcher launched, administered, and collected it all personally.

Data Analysis

A standardized questionnaire that was modeled and modified from the English Teachers' Feedback instrument by Rui (2019) was the study instrument. However, the questionnaire was reviewed by at least two specialists from the Graduate Studies faculty at Sulu State College in order to ensure that it was appropriate for the current study and its local contexts.

Results

1. *What is the level of English language teacher's feedback as assessed by students in the context of: 1.1 Task Feedback; 1.2 Process Feedback; 1.3 Self-regulation Feedback; and 1.4 Self Feedback?*

1.1 On Task Feedback

In the context of Task Feedback, Table 1.1 displays the degree of feedback from English language teachers as evaluated by students. The overall weighted mean score of 3.7050 with a standard deviation of .27208 for the students' assessment falls under this category, meaning it is rated as High Level. The findings of this study suggest that learners who participated in the research process thought that English language instructors offered constructive criticism or remarks regarding the degree of skill with which Sulu State College – Laboratory High School students completed a particular activity.

In particular, both student respondents gave the following items in this area a High level rating: "My English teacher's feedback helps me to decide what to include or exclude in my English tasks", "My English teacher's feedback helps me to create the kind of work that is expected from me", "My English teacher helps me to gain more knowledge about a topic", "My English teacher provides multiple opportunities to learn", and "My English teacher's feedback helps to identify my mistakes".

Table 1.1 Level of English language teachers' feedback as assessed by students in the context of Task Feedback

	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Rating
1	My English teacher's feedback helps me to decide what to include or exclude in my English tasks.	3.6400	.48242	High
2	My English teacher's feedback helps me to create the kind of work that is expected from me.	3.5500	.50000	High
3	My English teacher helps me to gain more knowledge about a topic.	3.8700	.33800	High
4	My English teacher provides multiple opportunities to learn.	3.7400	.44084	High
5	My English teacher's feedback helps to identify my mistakes.	3.7100	.45605	High
6	My English teacher gives details about the errors.	3.6200	.50812	High
7	My English teacher gives feedback on writing skills (neatness, format about margins, spacing, hand writing).	3.8900	.31447	High

8	Most of the time, my English teacher's feedback is for the whole class rather than individual feedback.	3.6200	.48783	High
Total Weighted Mean		3.7050	.27208	High

Legend: (1) 1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree (Very Low); (2) 1.50 – 2.49=Disagree (Low); (3) 2.50 – 3.49= Agree (Moderate); (4) 3.50 – 4.49=Strongly Agree (High)

1.2 On Process Feedback

The level of feedback from English language teachers as evaluated by students within the framework of Process Feedback is displayed in Table 1.2. The overall weighted mean score of 3.5457 with a standard deviation of .33634 for the students' assessment falls under this category, meaning it is rated as High Level. According to this study's learner-respondents, English language instructors help their students better understand the tasks assigned to them, give them advice on how to finish the tasks and make their work better, and concentrate on developing the learner's approaches for making mistakes so that they can use them as a form of self-feedback.

In particular, both student respondents gave the following items in this area a High level rating: “My English teacher understands that feedback is a two way process between teacher and student”, “My English teacher trains the students to use different strategies to learn English”, and “If a student has difficulty in learning English, my English teacher guides the students on how to approach the task”. On the other hand, student-respondents rated with Moderate level the following items: “My English teacher describes student’ work to stimulate discussion about how it could be improved”, “My English teacher emphasizes in-depth learning”, “My English teacher provides different strategies for error detection”, and “My English teacher helps me to think about my wrong answer”.

Table 1.2 Level of English language teachers’ feedback as assessed by students in the context of Process Feedback

	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Rating
1	My English teacher describes student’ work to stimulate discussion about how it could be improved.	3.4700	.50161	Moderate
2	My English teacher understands that feedback is a two way process between teacher and student.	3.6200	.48783	High
3	My English teacher emphasizes in-depth learning.	3.4500	.55732	Moderate
4	My English teacher provides different strategies for error detection.	3.3800	.59933	Moderate
5	My English teacher trains the students to use different strategies to learn English.	3.6600	.49686	High
6	My English teacher helps me to think about my wrong answer.	3.4800	.54086	Moderate
7	If a student has difficulty in learning English, my English teacher guides the students on how to approach the task.	3.7600	.42923	High
Total Weighted Mean		3.5457	.33634	High

Legend: (1) 1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree (Very Low); (2) 1.50 – 2.49=Disagree (Low); (3) 2.50 – 3.49= Agree (Moderate); (4) 3.50 – 4.49=Strongly Agree (High)

1.3 On Self-regulation Feedback

The level of feedback from English language teachers as evaluated by students within the framework of self-regulation feedback is displayed in Table 1.3. The overall weighted mean score of 3.6325 with a standard deviation of .33748 for the students' assessment falls under this category, meaning it is rated as High Level. According to the study's learner-respondents, English language instructors help their students get better at getting self-feedback and self-assessment from tasks. They also help students determine whether they can complete tasks on their own by using previously taught procedures.

Specifically, from among the items under this category, student-respondents rated with High level the following items: “My English teacher’s feedback helps me to self-assess my own work”, “My English teacher encourages me to self-check of my work”, “My English teacher teaches the students to review their own work and check their answers”, “My English teacher encourages the students to reflect on their own learning”, and “My English teacher encourages me to self-monitor my work”.

Table 1.3 Level of English language teachers’ feedback as assessed by students in the context of Self-regulation Feedback

	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Rating
1	My English teacher’s feedback helps me to self-assess my own work.	3.6500	.50000	High
2	My English teacher encourages me to self-check my work.	3.6700	.49349	High
3	My English teacher teaches the students to review their own work and check their answers.	3.7300	.46829	High
4	My English teacher encourages self-checking of my work.	3.4700	.57656	Moderate
5	My English teacher encourages the students to reflect on their own learning.	3.6100	.58422	High
6	My English teacher encourages me to self-monitor my work.	3.5500	.55732	High
7	My English teacher provides confidence in learning English.	3.7900	.40936	High
8	My English teacher helps students who seek feedback.	3.5900	.58767	High
Total Weighted Mean		3.6325	.33748	High

Legend: (1) 1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree (Very Low); (2) 1.50 – 2.49=Disagree (Low); (3) 2.50 – 3.49= Agree (Moderate); (4) 3.50 – 4.49=Strongly Agree (High)

1.4 On Self Feedback

The amount of feedback from English language teachers as evaluated by students within the framework of self-reflection is displayed in Table 1.4. The overall weighted mean score of 3.6283 with a standard deviation of .35522 for the students' assessment falls inside this category, meaning it is rated as High Level. This finding suggests that the participants in the study, who were students, felt that professors of English should give praise and rewards to their pupils in order to encourage them to learn more or to understand the assignments better.

Specifically, from among the items under this category, student-respondents rated with High level the following items: “My English teacher appreciates the task that I did well”, “My English teacher praises the students”, “My English teacher’s feedback enhances the self-esteem of the students”, “My English teacher’s feedback makes the students to feel good about themselves”, and “My English Teacher comments on the effort the students put in their work”.

Table 1.4 Level of English language teachers’ feedback as assessed by students in the context of Self Feedback

	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Rating
1	My English teacher appreciates the task that I did well.	3.7100	.45605	High
2	My English teacher praises the students.	3.5300	.55877	High
3	My English teacher’s feedback enhances the self-esteem of the students.	3.6600	.47610	High
4	My English teacher’s feedback makes the students feel good about themselves.	3.6500	.47937	High
5	My English Teacher comments on the effort the students put in their work.	3.6700	.49349	High
6	My English teacher usually appreciates students who have little information related to content.	3.5500	.57516	High
Total Weighted Mean		3.6283	.35522	High

Legend: (1) 1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree (Very Low); (2) 1.50 – 2.49=Disagree (Low);

(3) 2.50 – 3.49= Agree (Moderate); (4) 3.50 – 4.49=Strongly Agree (High)

2. What is the level of English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA)?

Table 2 shows junior high school pupils at SSC-Laboratory High School's level of academic achievement as measured by their GPA. The overall weighted mean scores of the student responders in this area are 4.0800 with a standard deviation of .76118, meaning they are regarded as Very Satisfactory. This finding suggests that the junior high school respondents who participated in the study are doing exceptionally well in practically every topic included in the curriculum, particularly English. This result suggests that respondents who are students are not having any kind of learning challenges, particularly when it comes to learning the English language.

Table 2 Extent of academic achievement of junior high school students of SSC-Laboratory High School in terms of GPA

Academic Achievement	Mean	S.D.	Rating
GPA	4.0800	.76118	Very Satisfactory
Total Weighted Mean	4.0800	.76118	Very Satisfactory

Legend: 90–100/4.50–5.0 = Outstanding; 85–89/3.50 – 4.49 = Very Satisfactory;
80–84/2.50 – 3.49 = Satisfactory; 75–79/1.50 – 2.49 = Fairly Satisfactory;
74 & below/1.00 – 1.49 = Failure

3. Is there a significant difference in the level of English language teachers' feedback as assessed by students when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of: 3.1 Gender; 3.2 Age; 3.3 Parent's educational attainment; and 3.4 Parent's average monthly income?

3.1 By Gender

Table 3.1 illustrates the variations in the quality of feedback from English language teachers as evaluated by students when data is classified based on the gender demographic characteristics of the students. This table shows that, at alpha.05., none of the mean difference values of the categories included under the level of English language instructors' comments suggest a significant difference. This indicates that responses from male and female students do not differ in how they perceive the instances and methods in which English language instructors provide constructive criticism or remarks regarding the degree of skill demonstrated by students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School.

Table 3.1 Differences in the level of English language teachers' feedback as assessed by students when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of Gender

VARIABLES	Grouping	Mean	S. D.	Mean Difference	t	Sig.	Description
Task Feedback	Male	3.7417	.24306	.04314	.564	.574	Not Significant
	Female	3.6985	.27770				
Process Feedback	Male	3.5524	.22175	.00784	.083	.934	Not Significant
	Female	3.5445	.35372				
Self-regulation Feedback	Male	3.5667	.29831	-.07745	-.818	.415	Not Significant
	Female	3.6441	.34423				
Self- Feedback	Male	3.6111	.34885	-.02026	-.203	.840	Not Significant
	Female	3.6314	.35829				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

3.2 By Age

When data are grouped based on students' age demographic profiles, Table 3.2 shows the variations in the quality of feedback from English language teachers as evaluated by students. This table shows that there is a substantial difference at alpha.05. The values of the F-ratios and P-values for "Process Feedback" and "Self-regulation Feedback" indicate this. As a result, the hypothesis that claims, "When data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of gender, there is no significant difference in the level of English language teachers' feedback as rated by students" is rejected.

Table 3.2 Differences in the level of English language teachers' feedback as assessed by students when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of Age

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Task Feedback	Between Groups	.110	1	.110	1.493	.225	Not Significant
	Within Groups	7.219	98	.074			
	Total	7.329	99				
Process Feedback	Between Groups	.698	1	.698	6.516	.012	Significant
	Within Groups	10.501	98	.107			
	Total	11.199	99				
Self-regulation Feedback	Between Groups	.580	1	.580	5.310	.023	Significant
	Within Groups	10.696	98	.109			
	Total	11.276	99				
Self-Feedback	Between Groups	.399	1	.399	3.232	.075	Not Significant
	Within Groups	12.093	98	.123			
	Total	12.492	99				

*Significant alpha .05

3.3 By Parent's Educational Attainment

When data are grouped based on students' demographic profiles regarding parents' educational attainment, Table 3.3 shows the variations in the quality of feedback from English language teachers as evaluated by students. This table demonstrates that all of the sub-categories included in the level of feedback from English language teachers are not significant, with the exception of the values of the F-ratio and P-value for the "Self-regulation Feedback" category, which shows a significant difference at alpha.05. Thus, the hypothesis that reads, "When data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of parent's educational attainment, there is no significant difference in the level of English language teachers' feedback as assessed by students" is accepted.

Table 3.3 Differences in the level of English language teachers' feedback as assessed by students when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of parent's educational attainment

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Task Feedback	Between Groups	.231	3	.077	1.041	.378	Not Significant

	Within Groups	7.098	96	.074			
	Total	7.329	99				
Process Feedback	Between Groups	.595	3	.198	1.795	.153	Not Significant
	Within Groups	10.604	96	.110			
	Total	11.199	99				
Self-regulation Feedback	Between Groups	1.229	3	.410	3.913*	.011	Significant
	Within Groups	10.047	96	.105			
	Total	11.276	99				
Self-Feedback	Between Groups	.966	3	.322	2.681	.051	Not Significant
	Within Groups	11.526	96	.120			
	Total	12.492	99				

*Significant alpha .05

3.4 By Parent's Average Monthly Income

When data are grouped based on students' demographic profiles pertaining to average monthly income of parents, Table 3.4 displays the variations in the quality of feedback from English language teachers as evaluated by students. This table shows that all of the subcategories that fall under the level of feedback from English language teachers have F-ratios and P-values that are not significant at alpha.05. Thus, the hypothesis that reads, "When data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of parent's average monthly income, there is no significant difference in the level of English language teachers' feedback as assessed by students" is accepted.

Table 3.4 Differences in the level of English language teachers' feedback as assessed by students when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of parent's average monthly income

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Task Feedback	Between Groups	.184	3	.061	.826	.483	Not Significant
	Within Groups	7.144	96	.074			
	Total	7.329	99				
Process Feedback	Between Groups	.682	3	.227	2.075	.109	Not Significant
	Within Groups	10.517	96	.110			
	Total	11.199	99				
Self-regulation Feedback	Between Groups	.140	3	.047	.402	.752	Not Significant
	Within Groups	11.136	96	.116			
	Total	11.276	99				
Self-Feedback	Between Groups	.527	3	.176	1.411	.244	Not Significant
	Within Groups	11.965	96	.125			
	Total	12.492	99				

*Significant alpha .05

4. Is there a significant difference in the level of English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA) when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of: 4.1 Gender; 4.2 Age; 4.3 Parent's educational attainment; and 4.4 Parent's average monthly income?
4.1 By Gender

When data are categorized based on the gender of the students, Table 4.1 displays the variation in the academic accomplishment of junior high school students in English at Sulu State College - Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA). This table indicates that the probability value of .000, $t = -4.032$, and mean difference of $-.80000$ of GPA are significant at $\alpha .05$. Thus, the hypothesis that reads, "When data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of gender, there is no significant difference in the level of English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA)" is rejected.

Table 4.1 Differences in the level of English academic achievement of junior high school students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA) when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of Gender

VARIABLES	Grouping	Mean	S. D.	Mean Difference	t	Sig.	Description
GPA	Male	3.4000	.91026	-.80000	-4.032	.000	Significant
	Female	4.2000	.66904				

*Significant at $\alpha .05$

4.2 By Age

When data are grouped based on the age of the students, Table 4.2 shows the variation in the academic achievement of junior high school students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of their General Point Average (GPA). This table indicates that at $\alpha .05$., the $F = .011$ with probability value of .917 of GPA is not significant. Thus, the hypothesis that reads, "When data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of Age, there is no significant difference in the level of English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA)" is accepted.

Table 4.2 Differences in the level of English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA) when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of Age

SOURCES OF VARIATION	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
GPA	Between Groups	.006	1	.006	.011	Not Significant
	Within Groups	57.354	98	.585		
	Total	57.360	99			

*Significant $\alpha .05$

Note: Post hoc tests are not performed for GPA because at least one group has fewer than two cases.

4.3 By Parents' Educational Attainment

When data are categorized based on the educational attainment of parents and the demographic profiles of the students, Table 4.3 shows the variation in the General Point Average (GPA) of English academic achievement between Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School. This data indicates that the $F = 1.582$ of the GPA, with a probability value

of.199, is not significant at alpha.05. Thus, the hypothesis that reads, "When data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of Parent's Educational Attainment, there is no significant difference in the level of English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA)" is accepted.

Table 4.3 Differences in the level of English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA) when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of Parent's Educational Attainment

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Support Reading Strategies	Between Groups	2.703	3	.901	1.582	.199	Not Significant
	Within Groups	54.657	96	.569			
	Total	57.360	99				

*Significant alpha .05

4.4 By Parents' Average Monthly Income

In terms of General Point Average (GPA), Table 4.4 shows the academic achievement gap in English between students in Grades 8 and 9 at Sulu State College - Laboratory High School. The data is grouped based on the average monthly income of the students' parents. This data indicates that the $F = .162$ of the GPA, with a probability value of.922, is not significant at alpha.05. Thus, the hypothesis that reads, "When data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of Parent's Average Monthly Income, there is no significant difference in the level of English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA)" is accepted.

Table 4.4 Differences level of English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA) when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of Parent's Average Monthly Income

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
GPA	Between Groups	.288	3	.096	.162	.922	Not Significant
	Within Groups	57.072	96	.594			
	Total	57.360	99				

*Significant alpha .05

5. Is there a significant correlation between English language teachers' feedback and English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School?

The relationship between the English language instructors' evaluations and the academic accomplishment of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in English is shown in Table 5. This table indicates that these variables' estimated Pearson Correlation Coefficients (Pearson r) are not significant at alpha.05.

Consequently, the hypothesis that reads, "There is no significant correlation between English language teachers' feedback and students' academic achievement in English in Grades 8 and 9 at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School" is accepted.

Table 5. Correlation between English language teachers' feedback and English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School

Variables		Pearson <i>r</i>	Sig	N	Description
Dependent	Independent				
English Academic Achievement (GPA)	Task Feedback	-.050	.625	100	Nearly Zero
	Process Feedback	.053	.599	100	Nearly Zero
	Self-regulation Feedback	.170	.091	100	Low
	Self-Feedback	.018	.861	100	Nearly Zero

*Correlation Coefficient is significant at alpha .05

Correlation Coefficient Scales Adopted from Hopkins, Will (2002):

0.0-0.1=Nearly Zero; 0.1-0.30=Low; .3-0.5 0=Moderate; .5-0.7-0=High; .7-0.9= Very High; 0.9-1=Nearly Perfect

Discussion

1. What is the level of English language teacher's feedback as assessed by students in the context of: 1.1 Task Feedback; 1.2 Process Feedback; 1.3 Self-regulation Feedback; and 1.4 Self Feedback?

1.1 On Task Feedback

In his study "A mixed-methods study of feedback modes in EFL writing," Bakla, Arif (2020) found that, in the essay-writing task, the audio group made the most correct revisions; however, in the essay-revision task, there was no significant difference between the three feedback modes. They supplied qualitative information about their preferences and how they used each mode to solve problems at both the micro and macro levels through semi-structured interviews and screen recordings. Students in grades 8 and 9 who responded to this category evaluated it as High Extent. Assignment feedback in the Hattie and Timperly (2007) Model of English Language includes remarks regarding the degree of competency of a particular assignment. The teacher's explanation is predicated on the pupils' comprehension of the feedback centers.

1.2. On Process Feedback

Zhenga and Yu (2018) found that although the participants' affective engagement was relatively positive, their behavioral and cognitive engagement was limited in that their behavioral engagement did not always translate into greater language accuracy, and there was little awareness at the level of understanding the Written Corrective Feedback (WCF), particularly for the indirect WCF. The study was titled "Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students." Additionally, it has been discovered that inequalities between the three sub-dimensions of engagement and a detrimental impact on students' cognitive and behavioral involvement with WCF may result from their inferior English proficiency. In a comparable manner, Zhu & Carless's (2018) study, "Dialogue within peer feedback processes: clarification and negotiation of meaning," found that students can get feedback on their written remarks from teachers and that they can also discuss and clarify meaning with the teachers. Students face contextual issues such as needing more direction regarding peer criticism and greater teacher involvement in the process. Students in grades 8 and 9 who responded to this survey gave this area a High Extent rating. According to Carless and Boud (2018), students must have opportunities to use feedback in the curriculum in addition to an understanding of how feedback can function well.

1.3. On Self-regulation Feedback

The study conducted in 2016 by Noroozi, Biemans, and Mulder titled "Relations between scripted online peer feedback processes and quality of written argumentative essay" revealed that successful groups and individuals have different feedback requirements than groups and individuals who are not as successful. This suggests that students produce excellent

argumentative essays when they participate in thoughtful, thorough, and supported peer evaluation processes. Additionally, the findings demonstrate that the online argumentative peer feedback script improves the caliber of argumentative essays produced by students. Students in grades 8 and 9 who responded to this survey assessed it as having a high extent. Hattie and Temperly (2007) Model, they stressed that the teacher provides self-regulation feedback to enhance the student's approach to receiving self-feedback and the self-assessment portions of the task, determining whether students can complete the assignments on their own by using previously taught processes.

1.4. On Self-Feedback

The incremental theory of writing intelligence was found to be a statistically significant predictor of second language (L2) writing motivation in Wallera and Papi's (2017) study, "Motivation and feedback: How implicit theories of intelligence predict L2 writers' motivation and feedback orientation." The participants' orientation toward obtaining feedback was most closely associated with their writing motivation. Students in grades 8 and 9 who responded to this survey gave it a High Extent rating. Despite being shown to be inefficient, self-feedback is frequently utilized in classrooms, according to Hattie and Temperly (2007) in Carless and Boud (2018). It consists of compliments and incentives. Seldom does it show up as a stronger desire to learn or understanding of the task.

2. What is the level of English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA)?

In order to use creative reading techniques, a student needs to have enough confidence in his ability to learn and achieve, according to Bakare (1970). He has to be inspired and encouraged to spend the same amount of time on each subject. Racca and Lasaten (2016) found that the majority of Grade 8 students at the Philippine Science High School in Northern Luzon had English language competence that is within the satisfactory range. This indicates that fostering a culture of reading has been essential to academic success. Additionally, the majority of pupils achieve at a very good level in science and mathematics and at a decent level in English academics. This theory is in line with the findings of (Chavez, 2023) The courses helped them improve both personally and professionally, and the content and structure met their expectations. The students' academic achievement in every topic and their level of English language ability are significantly correlated, according to the results. The academic achievement of grade 8 and 9 student respondents in English is Very Satisfactory. Racca and Lasaten (2016) studied the academic performance of Philippine Science High School students in English and their level of language proficiency. According to the survey, the majority of Northern Luzon schoolchildren in Grade 8 have English language ability that falls within the satisfactory range. They perform well in English and have strong levels in science and math. It was also discovered that there is a connection between the academic achievement of the students in every subject and their level of English language ability.

3. Is there a significant difference in the level of English language teachers' feedback as assessed by students when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of: 3.1 Gender; 3.2 Age; 3.3 Parent's educational attainment; and 3.4 Parent's average monthly income?

3.1 According to Gender

According to the findings, a male student may not always have an advantage over a female student when it comes to gauging the quality of comments from English language professors, or vice versa. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that respondents who are students have no discernible effect on how they evaluate the quality of feedback from English language teachers based on

variable gender. As a result, the hypothesis, which reads, "When data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of gender, there is no significant difference in the level of English language teachers' feedback as rated by students," is accepted. Cabansag, John N. (2013) conducted a study and found that, irrespective of gender, respondents from various courses had similar patterns in their choice of English language learning methodologies. Research has also shown that teacher feedback has a critical role in enhancing student learning. Reducing gaps between students' intended learning goals and their present performance and comprehension is the major objective (Hattie and Temperley, 2007).

3.2 According to Age

The responses from the majority of student respondents between the ages of 17 and under and 20 years old vary regarding how and when English language teachers help students better understand the tasks assigned, give them advice on how to finish the task and make improvements to their work, and concentrate on developing learner's approaches for mistake discovery to use as a form of self-feedback. Comparably, how English language instructors help students get better at getting self-feedback and self-assessment from their assignments, determining whether or not they can do the work on their own by using previously taught techniques. This theory is consistent with the results of (Raaijmakers, 2019), which showed improved self-assessment accuracy on problem-solving tasks; however, not all students benefited equally from the training, and overall, self-assessment accuracy may have been improved even more. This finding suggests that learners who are younger—17 years old and under—may be better able to perceive the quality of feedback from English language teachers than learners who are older—20 years old and above—and vice versa. Nevertheless, student respondents' evaluations of teachers' feedback in terms of Task Feedback and Self-Feedback are similar. Nonetheless, it is safe to say that variable age has significant mediation in ways how student-respondents assess the level of teachers' feedback in terms of Process Feedback and Self-regulation Feedback.

3.3 According Parents' Educational Attainment

The educational attainment of parents varies, yet student respondents' impressions of how English language teachers comment or provide remedial feedback regarding students' task competency remain consistent. This concept is in line with the findings of (Chavez, 2022) regarding the use of the English language, and it can help improve ELT curriculum design, timely and appropriate learning material production, and teacher training programs on activities and teaching techniques. help students better understand the tasks assigned, give them advice on how to finish and polish their work, and concentrate on developing learner's methodologies for mistake discovery to use as a form of self-feedback; additionally, praise and reward students to encourage them to commit to learning or to understand the assignments more. This idea is in line with Yang's (2022) assertion that student behavior plays a crucial role in enhancing learning through self-assessment. This finding suggests that students with college-educated parents may not always be in a better position to perceive the quality of feedback from English language teachers than students whose parents have only completed elementary, high school, or a master's or doctoral degree, or vice versa. Hence, it is safe to say that a variable parent's educational attainment has no significant mediation in ways how student-respondents assess the level of teachers' feedback.

3.4 According to Parents' Average Monthly Income

The average monthly income of the parents of the student respondents varies, but their perceptions of how English language teachers comment or provide corrective feedback regarding the students' level of proficiency on a given task are the same. allow students to better understand the tasks assigned to them, give them tips on how to finish them and make their work better, and

concentrate on developing learners' methodologies for mistake discovery to use as a means of self-feedback; enhance students' methods of receiving self-feedback and the self-assessment portions of the task, determining whether students can complete the task on their own by using previously taught procedures; and give students recognition and incentives to encourage them to learn more and understand the assignments. This idea is consistent with research on the effects of family income on students' academic performance, including English language learning outcomes (Yan, 2022). Research on the use of rewards undermines intrinsic motivation and leads to slower skill acquisition and more errors in the learning process (Baranek, 1996). This result implies that a student whose parent's average monthly income pegged at 30,001 & above may not necessarily put him/her in vantage point towards perceiving the level of English language teachers' feedback than those students whose parents with 10,000 & below, 10,001 – 20,000 and 20,001 – 30,000, or vice versa. Hence, it is safe to say that a variable parent's average monthly income has no significant mediation in how student-respondents assess the level of teachers' feedback.

4. Is there a significant difference in the level of English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School in terms of General Point Average (GPA) when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of: 4.1 Gender; 4.2 Age; 4.3 Parent's educational attainment; and 4.4 Parent's average monthly income?

4.1 According to Gender

Regarding the many subjects they are now enrolled in, male and female student respondents perform differently academically. According to this finding, male learners may have an advantage over female learners in terms of achieving academic excellence, or vice versa. This idea is consistent with research by Selvi (2020) that found that factors such as the classroom environment, student-teacher relationship, and the teaching and learning process all had a positive impact on students' satisfaction. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that a student's gender has a major impact on how well they achieve in terms of academic excellence. Regarding Variations in Students' Academic Performance in English Based on Demographic Profile, GPA is regarded as a significant predictor and indication of students' ultimate academic results. GPA has been found to be a critical determinant of academic achievement and performance in numerous research in the field of education analytics (Hiddere Markov Model, 2003).

4.2 According to Age

The age range of the student respondents varies, but their academic achievement in English does not. This finding suggests that a learner who is 17 years old or younger may not have the same advantage over those who are 18–19 years old, 20 years old or older, or vice versa. This idea is consistent with the research conducted by Deborah (2021), who looked into ways to support the learning and wellbeing of 16–19 year old students enrolled full-time in a college or school setting who have had significant gaps in their education. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that learners in Grades 8 and 9 do not significantly benefit from varying age when it comes to their performance toward academic excellence.

4.3 According Parents' Educational Attainment

In terms of the English courses they are now taking, students in grades 8 and 9 whose parents have college degrees perform academically no differently from students whose parents have elementary, high school, master's, or PhD degrees. This theory is consistent with research by Naidaitè (2023), which found that parents had to immediately adjust and take on the role of teachers by mentoring their kids. This theory is consistent with the findings of (Chavez, 2023) which found that the main determinants of parents' motivation for teaching were competency, application, reputation, and positivity. This research suggests that learners from highly educated

families may not be as likely to achieve academic greatness as learners from homes with learners who just completed elementary and high school, or vice versa. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that learners in Grades 8 and 9 do not significantly benefit from their parents' varying educational attainment when it comes to achieving academic achievement.

4.4 According to Parents' Average Monthly Income

The academic performance of grade 9 and 10 students whose parents make \$20,100 or more is not different from that of students whose parents make \$10,000 or less, \$10,100–15,000, and \$15,100–20,000 depending on the subjects they are currently enrolled in. This view is supported by the research conducted by Casas (2023), which found that students do not view their family's financial situation as a barrier to achieving great academic success. This notion contrasts with the results of (Murro, 2023) which show that the majority of the families are low-income and have struggled to pay for the additional costs associated with raising their children. Being economically disadvantaged is not a guarantee of subpar academic performance for a student. The implication of this study is that students from high-income families may not have the same opportunities to flourish academically as students from low- or meager-income families, or vice versa. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that learners in Grades 8 and 9 do not significantly benefit from their parents' variable family wealth when it comes to their academic achievement.

5. Is there a significant correlation between English language teachers' feedback and English academic achievement of Grades 8 and 9 students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School?

Regarding the correlation between English Language Teachers' Feedback and Students' Academic Achievement in English, Sulu State College - Laboratory High School students in Grades 8 and 9 do not exhibit a statistically significant link with their academic achievement in English. The social environment might have an impact on students' SRL (self-regulated learning), as proposed by Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 2011). One social environment aspect that has a significant impact on students' SRL is teacher feedback (Pereira et al., 2016).

Conclusion

Based on the study's findings, the following conclusions were drawn: Overall, English teachers' feedback is evaluated highly. Academic achievement in English among pupils is generally regarded as extremely excellent. In general, the manner that students evaluated the input from the English professors was greatly mediated by their demographic profiles. In general, the demographic profiles of students have a key role in mediating how they achieved their academic success in English. Students in grades 8 and 9 at Sulu State College Laboratory High School who rated their English instructors' comments as high may not be the same set of students who received Very Satisfactory ratings for their academic performance in the language. This study appears to go against the Hattie & Timperley (2007) feedback model for English language teachers, which explains that this approach is based on the various factors associated with students' academic success. This study found no significant correlation between students' academic progress in English and the comments they receive from their English language professors.

REFERENCES

- Abragan, F. Q., Abarcas, V., Aquino, I. M. & Bagongon, R. E. (2022). Research Review on K-12 Curriculum Implementation in The Philippines: A Generic Perspective. *European Journal of Educational and Social Sciences*, 7 (1), 1 – 8. <https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7272126>
- Alfaki, I.M. (2015). University Students' English Writing Problems: Diagnosis and Remedy. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*; Vol.3, No.3, pp.40-52, May 2015
- Amara, Naimi (2015). Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education* – July 2015 Volume 5, Issue 3

- Bai, Lifang & Hu, Guangwei (2017). In the face of fallible AWE feedback: how do students respond?, *Educational Psychology*, 37:1, 67-81, DOI: 10.1080/01443410.2016.1223275
- Bakla, Arif (2020). A mixed-methods study of feedback modes in EFL writing. *Language Learning & Technology*; February 2020, Volume 24, Issue 1, pp. 107–128. ISSN 1094-3501
- Balinas, Elvira S. and Saefurrohman (2016). English Teachers Classroom Assessment Practices. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*; Vol.5, No.1, March 2016, pp. 82 ~ 92. ISSN: 2252-8822
- Bakare, O. 1970. Bottom deposits as food of inland freshwater fish. In: Kainji, A Nigerian man- made lake. S. A. Visser, (Ed.). Kanyi Lake Studies Vol. 1. Ecology Published for the Nigerian Institute.
- Baranek, Lori Kay,(1996) "The Effect of Rewards and Motivation on Student Achievement" . Masters Theses. 285. <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/theses/285>
- Boud, D., & Molloy, E.K. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 38(6):1-15. DOI:10.1080/02602938.2012.691462
- Casas, Rhino Rienz. (2023). Family Income Classification on Students' Academic Performance: A Correlational Study. 833-836. 10.5281/zenodo.8278214.
- Cabansag, John N. (2013). “Written Language Proficiency of Laboratory High School Students in a State University in Cagayan Valley Philippines.” Unpublished Master’s Thesis. Isabela State University
- Carless, D. & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. Assessment & evAluAtion in HigHer educAtion, 2018; vol. 43, no. 8, 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Carless, David (2019). Feedback loops and the longer-term: towards feedback spirals, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44:5, 705-714, DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2018.1531108
- Carless, D. (2015) Exploring Learning Oriented Assessment Processes. *Higher Education*, 69, 963-976. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9816-z>
- Chavez, Jason & Adalia, Haydee & Alberto, Joebert. (2023). Parental support strategies and motivation in aiding their children learn the English language. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 5. 1541. 10.59400/fls.v5i2.1541.
- Chavez, Jason. (2023). Impact of Massive Open Online Course on the Teacher-Enrollees’ Personal Growth and Professional Development. *Solid State Technology* Volume: 63 Issue: 4 Publication Year. 63. 2
- Chavez, Jason, Narratives of Bilingual Parents on the Real-Life Use of English Language: Materials for English Language Teaching Curriculum (September 24, 2022). *Arab World English Journals*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 2022, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4260753>
- Crusan, Plakans and Gebril (2016). Writing assessment literacy: Surveying second language teachers’ knowledge, beliefs, and practices.
- Deborah E. & Carrier, Judith & Csontos, Judit & Gillen, Elizabeth. (2021). A rapid review of strategies to support learning and wellbeing among 16-19 year old learners who have experienced significant disruption in their education as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic
- Dumlao, R. P. and Pinatacan, J. R. (2019). From Practice to Writing: Using Reflective Journal Instruction in Enhancing Pre-Service Teachers’ Professional Development. *International Journal of Instruction* October 2019; Vol.12, No.4; e-ISSN: 1308-1470. www.e-iji.net p-ISSN: 1694-609X; pp. 459-478
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses related to achievement*. London: Routledge.
- Hattie J., Timperley H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Rev. Educ. Res.* 77 81–112. 10.3102/003465430298487
- Hyun Seon Ahn et al. (2016). Cultural differences in the understanding of modelling and feedback as sources of self-efficacy information. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* (2016), 86, 112–136
- Ketizmen, Gökçe & Gücyeter, Başak. (2024). Effect of first-semester basic design studio on architecture students’ creative skills: a pre-and post-test assessment. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*. 1-53. 10.1007/s10798-023-09873-3.

- Kukulska-Hulme and Viberg (2018). Mobile collaborative language learning: State of the art. *British Journal of Educational Technology* Vol 49 No 2 2018 207–218. doi:10.1111/bjet.12580
- Murro, Rogelio & Lobo, John & Inso, April & Chavez, Jason. (2023). Difficulties of parents with low educational attainment in assisting their children in modular distance learning during pandemic. *Environment and Social Psychology*. 9. 10.54517/esp.v9i1.1957
- Naidaitė, Edita & Stasiūnaitienė, Eglė. (2023). Education in the family (homeschooling) the reasons for the choice of parents. 10.21125/inted.2023.1739
- Noroozi, Biemans, and Mulder (2016). Relations between scripted online peer feedback processes and quality of written argumentative essays. *Internet and Higher Education* 31 (2016) 20–31. 1096-7516/© 2016 Elsevier Inc.
- Pereira, Hélia & Salgueiro, Maria & Rita, Paulo. (2016). Online purchase determinants of loyalty: The mediating effect of satisfaction in tourism. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. 30. 279-291. 10.1016/j.jretconser.2016.01.003.
- Rai, R. (2019), Physics LEarning (PLEA): A hybrid physics guided machine learning approach for predictive modeling of complex systems, AIAA aviation conference, Dallas, TX, USA
- Racca, R.M.A.B. and Lasaten, R.C.S. (2016). English Language Proficiency and Academic Performance of Philippine Science High School Students. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, Vol. 2, No. 2, June 2016
- Raaijmakers, Steven & Baars, Martine & Paas, Fred & Van Merriënboer, Jeroen J. G. & Gog, Tamara. (2019). Effects of self-assessment feedback on self-assessment and task-selection accuracy. *Metacognition and Learning*. 14. 10.1007/s11409-019-09189-5
- Rustandi, A. and Husni Mubarak, A. (2017). Analysis of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) on Classroom Interaction in EFL Speaking Class. *Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*; Volume 2, Number 1, February 2017
- Selvi, Dr.R.Tamil & Devi, Dr.K.Sivananda & Aramuthakannan, Dr.S.. (2020). Best Practices for Student Satisfaction in Achieving Academic Excellence – An Empirical Research. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*. 9. 446-451. 10.35940/ijitee.B8117.019320.
- Sicat, A.S. (2015). Enhancing College Students' Proficiency in Business Writing Via Schoology. *International Journal of Education and Research* Vol. 3 No. 1 January 2015
- Wallera and Papi (2017). Motivation and feedback: How implicit theories of intelligence predict L2 writers' motivation and feedback orientation. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 35 (2017) 54–65. 1060-3743/© 2017 Elsevier Inc.
- Yan, Muchen. (2022). The Effect of Family Income on Parents' Motivation to Support Children's English Learning at Primary Level. 10.2991/978-2-494069-89-3_342.
- Yang, Albert & Chen, Irene & Flanagan, Brendan & Ogata, Hiroaki. (2022). How students' self-assessment behavior affects their online learning performance. 3. 100058. 10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100058.
- Zhenga and Yu (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. *Assessing Writing* 37 (2018) 13–24. 1075-2935/© 2018 Elsevier Inc.
- Zhu & Carless (2018). Dialogue within peer feedback processes: clarification and negotiation of meaning, *Higher Education Research & Development*, DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2018.1446417