



ETHIOINQUIRY

Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences

ISSN: Print 2790-539X, Online 2790-5403



The effects of written feedback on students' writing skill, self-efficacy belief, and motivation

Tsegaye Beyene Ashenafi ¹

¹ Jimma University, College of Social Science and Humanities, Department of Ethiopian Language and Literature - Amharic

*Corresponding author:
tsegabeyene74@gmail.com

Citation:

Ashenafi, T. B. (2025). The effects of written feedback on students' writing skill, self-efficacy belief, and motivation; *Ethioinquiry Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 39-49.

Article history:

Submitted: March 5, 2025

Received revised version: May 15, 2025;

Published online: June 25, 2025;

Weblink: <https://journals.hu.edu.et/hu-journals/index.php/erjssh>, ISSN: Print 2790-539X, Online 2790-5403

Full length original article



Abstract

This study focuses on investigating the effects of written feedback on students' writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs and writing motivation. It is a quasi-experimental research. Out of the four sections in the school, two sections were randomly selected and placed to the experimental and control groups. Eighty grade seven students participated in the study. Pre- and post-writing skills tests, along with questionnaires, were employed to gather data. In the pretest, the two groups had no significant difference ($p > .05$) in their writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs, and motivation. Both groups practiced writing essays on the same topics for three months. During the study period, the experimental group received teacher-written feedback, while the control group practiced without receiving teacher written feedback. Finally, post writing skills test was given to both groups and questionnaires were administered. The data were analyzed using independent sample t-test. The statistical results confirmed that there is a significant difference ($P < .05$) between the two groups in writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs, and motivation. The experimental group students improved their writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs, and writing motivation due to teacher written feedback. Overall, the findings suggest that providing written corrective feedback on students' essays has a positive effect on writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs and motivation.

Keywords: writing skill, written feedback, motivation, self-efficacy belief

1 INTRODUCTION

Language is a basic human communication tool. People communicate and express their feelings through language. One of the language skills that enable human beings to do this is writing. Sarwat et al. (2021) states that writing is invented through the development of human history, serving as a primary means of transferring knowledge, thoughts, and perspectives across generations. It is a process in which we represent speech sounds through symbols or letters systematically (Djouambi & Rezaiki, 2021). Djouambi & Rezaiki further emphasize that writing is not merely a representation of speech; it is also a powerful form of communication that encompasses social, cultural, and intellectual issues. According to Babni (2018), writing involves more than just putting symbols on paper; it is a process of exploring and generating ideas, then organizing them according to established guidelines to effectively convey those ideas to the reader.

[Peha \(2003\)](#) explains that writing serves as a means of communication, conveying content to the reader with a specific purpose. The content includes the main idea and any additional information the writer wishes to write. The main goal of writing is to clarify why the writer created the piece, aiming to prompt the reader to reflect on an issue or take action. The intended readers of the written text can be either individuals or groups. Therefore, a written text consists of three key components: content, purpose, and audience.

Writing is an essential skill in all fields, particularly in education. It enables students to express themselves and communicate effectively. As such, writing skills are crucial for composing letters, studying, sending emails, writing reports, and submitting job applications ([Djouambi & Rezaiki, 2021](#)). According to [Kovářiková \(2016\)](#), there is a distinction between writing for learning and writing for communication. In language classes, the writing activities students engage in are primarily for learning or practice purposes (writing for learning), rather than for the goal of written communication. In contrast, writing for communication focuses on helping students convey messages clearly when completing forms, writing letters, and sending emails in real-world situations.

According to [Driver \(2021\)](#) and [Troia et al. \(2012\)](#), writing is not a skill that develops naturally; rather, it requires training, practice, and personal effort. As writing is governed by rules, making mistakes is a natural feature of the process in both first and second languages. Because writing is a complex and procedural skill, mistakes made by beginner students are typically corrected through teacher feedback ([Hidi & Boscolo, 2007](#); [Selvaraj & Aziz, 2019](#)). Errors in vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, organization, and other areas are addressed through this feedback. Additionally, [Ashrafi and Foozunfar \(2018\)](#) emphasized that making mistakes is an expected and natural part of the writing process in the first, second, and foreign language learning. To help students become proficient writers, their drafts should be corrected with feedback.

[Agustiningsih and Andriani \(2021\)](#) point out the importance of feedback support in correcting mistakes, helping students write accurately, following a consistent strategy, reducing repetition, and organizing ideas effectively. Similarly, [Zahida et al. \(2014\)](#) highlight that providing corrective feedback is one aspect of language teaching-learning process and a valuable technique for improving students' writing. They also note that when feedback is carefully chosen and delivered, it enhances students' writing skills and their motivation.

Since teachers' roles are to help and guide students in becoming good writers, providing corrective feedback on students' written work enables them to revise and improve their work based on that feedback. According to [Hattie and Timperley \(2007\)](#), feedback helps the students to answer three basic questions (Where do I go? how do I go and where to next?) and make revisions and improvements based on the feedback. This process encourages revisions and improvements based on the feedback provided. Drawing on the work of [Elashri \(2013a, 2013b\)](#) and [Mi \(2009\)](#) highlights three key benefits of feedback. First, it helps students determine whether their writing is effective. Second, it prompts corrective action to improve when performance is lacking. Finally, feedback not only aids in writing improvement but also it encourages students to shift their perspective, and view things differently.

On the other hand, [Adarkwah \(2021\)](#) argues that feedback is closely related to assessment and plays a fundamental role in it. Adarkwah adds that formative assessment feedback is valuable for enhancing the teaching and learning process. It helps to identify the strengths and weaknesses, close the gap between the current performance of the students and the designed goals so as to suggest alternative strategies for improvement.

According to [Elashri \(2013b\)](#) and [Razali and Jupri \(2014\)](#), feedback is an effective indicator of students' progress in written language. It offers suggestions, raises questions, and provides corrections, helping both students and teachers. For students, feedback highlights areas of strength as well as aspects that need improvement. Additionally, it allows teachers to identify and assess the challenges students face. [Eggleston \(2017\)](#) further emphasizes that feedback provides an input for enhancing students' performance. It provides guidance on where students should direct their efforts and attention to achieve better results.

According to Ken (1990), teachers typically provide comments or feedback on students' written work through writing. Written feedback is a process in which teachers read students' writing and offer written comments and corrections regarding its content and organization. Rahmawati et al. (2015), citing Zhang (2012), states that students prefer teachers' written feedback to verbal feedback. They often view their teacher as an authority figure and rely on the teacher's knowledge and expertise. As a result, teachers' written feedback is considered the primary method for improving students' writing skills.

Teachers' written feedback can take various forms. Form-based feedback focuses on grammatical aspects, while content-based feedback addresses the content and organization of students' essays. Content-based feedback is ineffective without addressing grammatical errors. Integrated feedback combines both form and content (Razali & Jupri, 2014; Wahyuni, 2017). In contrast, Sanavi and Nemati (2014) and Wahyuni (2017) briefly explain that written feedback can be given either directly, by adding words, phrases, or sentences or providing the correct structure, or indirectly, by underlining, circling errors, or coding the areas where errors occurred. This approach gives students the opportunity to correct the errors themselves. In general, written feedback addresses both form and content, with teachers providing guidance on word usage, sentence structure, idea flow, paragraph organization, punctuation, and handwriting in students' essays.

Sethy and Bhati (2022) argue that feedback from teachers help students to develop positive self-efficacy beliefs about their skills & abilities. When students receive encouragement and feedback, they feel more confident in their ability. Duijnhouwer et al. (2011) also highlight that feedback, which suggests improvement strategies, has a significant role in increasing students' self-efficacy beliefs. Students who are shown revision models, strategies, and corrections are likely to have higher self-efficacy beliefs in their practices.

In addition to improving students' writing skills and self-efficacy beliefs, feedback also boosts students' motivation. Duijnhouwer et al. (2011) explains that feedback serves as an educational tool that can increase students' motivation to write. It leads to intrinsic motivation to achieve goals, develop new skills, and learn new concepts, or to extrinsic motivation to achieve results, gain rewards, be popular, or avoid punishment (Agricola et al., 2020).

Just as writing is challenging problem around the world, providing frequent, timely and accurate feedback is also a fundamental problem (Cui et al., 2021). Students have been found to struggle with paragraph writing. When assigned a writing task in class, many students take several minutes just to get started. Therefore, this study focuses on investigating the role of providing appropriate written feedback to the development of students' writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs, and writing motivation.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Writing has significant importance in the curriculum at all educational levels and it significantly impacts students' performance across various subject areas. Hidi and Boscolo (2007) explain that current research and long-term teaching experiences confirmed that the biggest problem in writing task is lack of students' motivation to write. When the researcher of this study went to different primary schools for various supervision, practicum and internship work, he observed that there is a problem in students' writing skill, writing motivation as well as self-efficacy-belief.

Even though studies have confirmed that giving constructive feedback is fundamental in improving writing, it has been found that classroom teachers often fail to provide sufficient and appropriate feedback to students' writing. Teachers tend to view reading students' essays and giving corrective feedback as tedious tasks. Encouraging students to revise and improve their essays is often considered burdensome, and teachers do not implement these revisions properly. Furthermore, students struggle to form complete sentences and express their thoughts effectively in their mother tongue (Amharic) which is a language of instruction in primary schools. As a result, the students' writing problems persist, negatively impacting the quality of education and students' overall learning experiences.

Informal discussions with primary and higher education teachers confirmed that let alone writing com-

plete paragraphs, students often cannot write sentences that are grammatically correct, convey a coherent message, and use appropriate vocabulary. Even though students are expected to develop strong writing skills for their future education and employment, their current writing abilities fail to meet the expected standards. [Agustiniingsih](#) and [Andriani](#) (2021) assert that the number of under qualified students in writing has not decreased over time. Similarly, the Early Grade Reading Assessment ([Reading for Ethiopia's Achievement Developed Technical Assistance \(READ TA\)](#), 2012) in Ethiopia, which includes Amharic, found that primary school students' reading and writing skills are below the expected standard. This highlights the severity of writing skills problem, and the limited attention given to address it.

The issue is not confined to Ethiopia; studies around the world also indicate significant challenges in students' writing abilities. [Rietdijk](#) et al. (2018) cite national studies from various countries showing, despite writing being a fundamental skill for communication and knowledge acquisition, that many students' writing skills are alarmingly low. In the U.S., for example, one-fifth of eighth- and twelfth-grade students scored below basic literacy levels, and only 27% performed above the expected standard. Similarly, in England, many primary school students score below the expected writing proficiency level, while over half of fourth-grade students in Portugal struggle with writing. In Germany, one-third of ninth-grade students write texts considered unacceptable, and in the Netherlands, students completing primary education show significant flaws in content, organization, style, and communication. Hence, [Rietdijk](#) et al. (2018) conclude that the issue of students' low writing skills is a widespread problem that needs urgent attention.

The low writing levels observed globally are often linked to insufficient application of proper writing instruction, lack of focus on the writing process, and inadequate feedback. [Sarwat](#) et al. (2021) identified several factors contributing to low writing skills in primary students, including lack of motivation, insufficient time to write, limited reading and writing experience, lack of constructive feedback, inadequate resources, overcrowded classrooms, and students' social backgrounds. [Rahman](#) (2017) further supports the idea that the absence of feedback significantly impacts students' writing performance.

[Zahida](#) et al. (2014) also noted that lack of appropriate feedback is a key factor preventing students from becoming motivated to write. [Yuk](#) and [Yunus](#) (2021) emphasized that the absence of constructive feedback from teachers contributes to poor writing performance. This highlights that investigating whether lack of feedback is the causes for low writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs & motivation to write.

Studies by [Ferris](#) (2003) and [Wahyuni](#) (2017) suggest the positive impact of feedback on improving students' writing, though opinions vary as to which feedback is most effective. [Ferris](#) (2003) & [Wahyuni](#) (2017) mentioned some studies, such as those by [Mansourizadeh](#) and [Abdullah](#) (2014) and [Truscott](#) and [Hsu](#) (2008) who argue that feedback does not significantly improve writing skills. Others, including [Hyland](#) and [Hyland](#) (2006), emphasize the central role of feedback in developing writing abilities, particularly for second language learners. This ongoing debate raises important questions: Does feedback make a difference in students' writing? If so, which types of feedback-teacher, peer, oral, written, or technology-assisted- are most effective? [Ferris](#) (2003) suggests that further research is needed to determine which feedback strategies are most effective in improving writing quality.

In the context of Amharic language, studies by [Dawit](#) (2008), [Endale](#) (1992), [Solomon](#) (1987), and [Tigist](#) (1998) explored the importance of giving feedback to students' writing. However, these studies focused on secondary, preparatory & university students. Moreover, they did not examine whether written feedback has an effect on primary students' writing skills, motivation, and self-efficacy beliefs. Therefore, the purpose of this study is investigating the impacts of written feedback on the writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs and motivation of primary students. It attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference between the experimental group and control groups in the post-test writing skills?
2. Is there a difference between the experimental group and control groups in the post-test writing self-efficacy beliefs?
3. Is there a difference between the experimental and control groups in post-test writing motivation?

2 Literature Review

2.1 Feedback and Self efficacy belief

Self-efficacy belief indicates a belief that a person has about his/her ability for specific task. It represents a personal judgment of his/her capability to accomplish a task at a certain level of competence (Agricola et al., 2020). According to Bandura (1989), self-efficacy beliefs influence individual thinking, actions, and emotional responses. Bandura mentioned four sources of students' self-efficacy beliefs. These are past experiences, observations of others' performance, feedback from others, and internal pressure. While previous outcomes (successes or failures) are key factors in shaping self-efficacy beliefs, feedback from teachers and peers about the successes or failures plays an irreplaceable role in shaping students' beliefs Sivyer (2005). According to Bruning et al. (2010) cited in Akkuzu (2014) social support, such as feedback is an environmental factor that affects self-efficacy beliefs.

Schunk (2012) argued that feedback enhances self-efficacy beliefs by improving skills, increasing abilities, and providing self-regulating learning strategies. Therefore, students who receive constructive feedback tend to develop high self-efficacy beliefs in their writing skills and more likely to participate actively, remain motivated, work hard, and persist through challenges. Upon successfully completing a task, they gain confidence for future tasks (Agricola et al., 2020; Schunk, 2012). Generally, feedback on written work has long-term effects on students' belief in their writing abilities, extending beyond a single course (Bandura, 1995; Cui et al., 2021).

2.2 Feedback and Motivation

Another very important issue in learning is motivation. Agustiningsih and Andriani (2021) noted that motivation in language learning is a driving force that encourages students to engage in activities and determines the level of effort they exert. Feedback is an educational tool that can boost students' motivation to write (Duijnhouwer et al., 2011). Chea and Shumow (2015), citing Reid (2007), described the importance of motivation for students as "a Car will not run without fuel, students will not learn without motivation which is the fuel of learning". Teacher feedback, learning goals, and outcome expectations significantly influence both learning and motivation. In the case of intrinsic motivation, feedback helps students achieve their goals, develop new skills, and gain new insights. Conversely, in the case of extrinsic motivation, feedback is used to achieve outcomes, earn rewards, and gain approval from others (Agricola et al., 2020). Kluger and DeNisi (1996) in their goal-setting theory emphasized that feedback has a vital role in enhancing motivation by narrowing the difference between students' current learning & their goals.

According to Hamidun et al. (2013), referencing Ellis (2009), feedback is instrumental in motivating students to write better essays and expand their ideas. Similarly, Selvaraj and Aziz (2019) argue that peer review offers valuable support for classroom writing. Ferris (2003) and Hyland and Hyland (2006) explained that feedback is an ongoing, interactive process, not just from teachers but also from peers, family, and friends, and takes the form of results, suggestions, error corrections, peer reviews, counseling, and discussions. This implies that feedback is dynamic and conversational. They further added that both teacher and peer feedback should be provided on students' first drafts to encourage revisions.

2.3 Theories of Feedback

In the teaching-learning process, giving feedback is supported by various theories. In goal-setting theory, feedback strengthens the relationship between goals, performance & behavior. Feedback helps an individual to achieve a goal or standard and to assess how effectively his/her performance aligns with that goal (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). According to feedback intervention theory, individuals assess whether their performances are positive or negative. Positive feedback is provided when the recipient meets or exceeds the goal, while negative feedback is given when performance falls short of the goal.

As [Hattie and Timperley \(2007\)](#) state, the main purpose of feedback is linking the current performance and the designed goal.

As [Daffern and Mackenzie \(2020\)](#) describe, Behaviorist theory is one of the earliest educational theories expanded in the 1950s and 60s and its primary proponent was B.F. Skinner. According to Behaviorists view, feedback is a form of positive and negative reinforcement. In this theory, students' learning is influenced by their responses to environmental stimuli. The learning process involves reinforcing correct responses with rewards and eliminating incorrect ones through punishments ([Panadero & Lipnevich, 2021](#)). Feedback in this context is tied to incentives and punishments ([Kluger & DeNisi, 1996](#)). Positive feedback is related to reinforcement, while negative feedback corresponds to punishment. In this model, a learner first receives a task, then responds, and finally receives feedback (either reward or punishment) to confirm whether his/her answer is correct or incorrect ([Daffern & Mackenzie, 2020](#); [Panadero & Lipnevich, 2021](#)).

Another influential theory is the socio-cultural theory, proposed by Lev Vygotsky. This theory emphasized that learning takes place within a social and cultural context. Proponents of this theory emphasize that students' learning is supported by those with greater knowledge, such as teachers or peers ([Daffern & Mackenzie, 2020](#)). Vygotsky's central idea is that for new learning to take place and for students to progress to higher levels, they need support from others who possess more knowledge or expertise. For instance, students begin to learn to write with the assistance of a more knowledgeable person, and over time, they gradually gain the ability to write independently.

According to this theory, learning cannot occur in isolation from socio-cultural influences ([Nurfaidah, 2018](#); [Selvaraj & Aziz, 2019](#)). A key tenet of socio-cultural theory is that human learning is inherently social, with interactions among teachers, peers, and family members, as well as cultural values, shaping the learning process. Cognitive development is understood to take place through social interactions ([Farajnezhad, 2021](#)). [Bandura \(1989\)](#) and [Schunk \(2012\)](#) describe the zone of proximal development - ZPD as the difference between what learners can do independently and what they can achieve with the help of others. [Zubaidi \(2015\)](#) adds that in socio-cultural theory, cognitive development occurs through self-awareness (internalization) and through support (scaffolding) that enables learners to progress to higher levels of development. Unlike other theories, socio-cultural theory frames feedback as a dynamic and dialogic process, involving interaction not only between teachers and students but also between peers ([Daffern & Mackenzie, 2020](#); [Nurfaidah, 2018](#)).

3 Methods

3.1 Research Design

This research has a quasi-experimental research design with two groups. Participants were assigned to the experimental and control groups, and were given pre- and post-writing tests. Questionnaires were also administered. The research design is outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Design of the research

Groups	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental groups	Test 1	√	Test 2
Control group	Test 1	°	Test 2

3.2 Study Participants

The participants of the study were Grade seven students of Haik Elementary School in South Wollo who attend classes in 2017 E.C. Out of the four sections, two sections were randomly selected and assigned to the experimental and control group. Section B was assigned to the experimental group, and section D

to the control group. Totally 80 students (40 in each group) participated in the study. The homogeneity of the two groups in terms of sex was calculated using the Chi-square test ($\chi^2 = 0.05$, $p = 0.82$), and there was no significant difference between them. Additionally, the age balance was checked using Levene's test ($F(78) = 0.41$, $p = 0.52$), indicating that the two groups have the same age distribution.

3.3 Data Collection instruments

Writing skills tests and questionnaires were employed to assess the effect of written feedback on students' writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs & motivation.

The primary goal of the writing essay tests was to measure students' writing skills. The first test was a pre-test, which was aimed at determining whether the experimental and control groups were comparable in terms of writing skills prior to the treatment. The second test was a post-test, administered after the experimental group had practiced writing essays with written feedback, while the control group wrote without receiving any feedback, following the usual teaching methods. The validity of the writing activities was evaluated by experienced language teachers based on the prepared criteria. In addition, the reliability of both the writing skills pre & posttest was computed using Pearson's correlation coefficient. The tests were administered to 80 students and scored by two raters. The inter-rater reliability is $r = .93$ for the pre-test and $r = .91$ for the post-test.

The self-efficacy belief questionnaire was designed to measure students' writing self-efficacy beliefs. This questionnaire was given to both groups before and after the intervention. The questionnaire consisted of 20 items, all are closed-ended with five option responses, strongly agree (5), agree (4), neutral (3), disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1). The reliability of the questionnaire was calculated using Cronbach's alpha, yielding $r = .76$ and $r = .81$ for pre and posttests, respectively.

The motivation questionnaire aimed at assessing students' motivation to write, both before and after the intervention. It consisted of 20 closed-ended items, with the same response options. This questionnaire was distributed to 80 students. Its reliability was calculated using Cronbach's alpha. The reliability is $r = .78$ and $r = .83$, for pre & posttests, respectively.

Procedure

In the study process, first, the aim of the study was explained to the class teacher. Next, the teacher received two days' training on the overall implementation of written feedback, as well as the processes of writing and strategies for writing different types of essays (narrative, expository, and argumentative). The writing activities were evaluated by experienced primary-grade teachers and textbook authors, with adjustments made before presenting them to the students. A total of 20 writing activities were prepared, but two were excluded. One was evaluated to be too advanced for the students, while the other was evaluated to be culturally inappropriate for some students due to religious differences. Therefore, six topics were selected for the pre & posttest (three for each), and 12 topics were chosen for the classroom writing activities.

Initially, both the experimental and control groups completed a pre writing test, as well as self-efficacy belief and motivation questionnaires. Following this, the selected writing topics were introduced, and the teacher conducted writing lessons over the course of three months (12 sessions). During the writing sessions, students were tasked with writing a narrative essay in the first week, an expository essay in the second week, and an argumentative essay in the third week and so on. Written feedback was given to the experimental group continuously, while the control group received no feedback, but only recorded scores. Finally, the post-test writing, self-efficacy belief, and motivation questionnaires were administered to both groups.

Data Analysis

The data for this study were gathered through writing skill tests and questionnaires. The data analysis was conducted using descriptive and inferential statistics with SPSS version 23. The normality of the data was also checked using both the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests, and the data were found to be normally distributed. The first research question was: Is there a difference between the experimental group and group in the post-test writing skills? To answer this question, first the two groups were compared on their pre-test writing skills using an independent samples t-test. The results are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: writing pretest of the group by Independent sample t-test

	Group	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.
Writing skill	Experimental group	40	28.3	4.3	78	-0.87	0.38
	Control group	40	29.4	5.8			.

As shown in Table 2, the mean of the experimental group is 28.3 and that of the control group is 29.4. The two groups are not different in their mean. In addition, the independent samples t-test analysis showed that there is no a significant difference ($t(78) = -0.87$, $p = 0.38$) between the two groups because the obtained p value which is 0.38 indicates that there is no significant difference ($p > 0.05$) between the groups at pre-test. Therefore, it can be concluded that the students had similar writing skills before the treatment. Then, the groups' post-test writing skills were also computed using an independent t-test. The result is presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Groups' posttest writing skills by independent t-test

Writing Skill	Group	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig
	Experimental Group	40	37.05	6.1	78	5.8	.000
	Control Group	40	29.1	5.8			

Table 3 above indicates that the mean of experimental group ($m=37.05$) is higher than the mean of control group ($m= 29.1$) in post-test. The independent t-test ($t(78) =5.8$, $p=.000$) also assured that there is significant difference ($p<.05$) between the two groups. As a result, the experimental group improved their writing skill due to written feedback.

The other question of the study is "Is there a difference between the experimental and control group in the posttest writing self-efficacy beliefs?". To answer this basic question, first the group's self-efficacy beliefs were tested in the pre-test. The result is presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Groups' pretest self-efficacy belief by independent t-test

Self-efficacy Belief	Group	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.
	Experimental Group	40	65.4	11.76	78	2.4	.80
	Control Group	40	64.7	11.59			

As shown in Table 4 above, both the mean scores and independent t-test analysis result indicate no difference ($p > .05$) between the experimental and control groups in the pre-test. Both groups were almost similar in their writing self-efficacy beliefs before the treatment. Next, the self-efficacy beliefs the students have about their writing skills were tested after the experiment. The groups' post-test result of independent sample t-test is presented in Table 5 below.

The independent t-test group analysis ($t(78) = 3.8$, $P= .000$) shown in Table 5 indicates that there is a significance difference ($p<.05$) between the groups in writing self-efficacy beliefs posttest. This shows that experimental group improved writing self-efficacy beliefs due to written feedback.

The last question is "Is there a difference between the experimental and control group in the writing motivation post-test?" First the pretest result of writing motivation of the experimental and control

Table 5: Posttest writing self-efficacy beliefs of the groups by independent t-test

Self-efficacy Belief	Group	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.
	Experimental Group	40	74.67	10.18	78	3.8	.000
	Control Group	40	65.02	12.14			

group was analyzed using independent sample t test as shown below in Table 6.

Table 6: Pretest writing motivation of the groups by independent t-test

Motivation	Group	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.
	Experimental Group	40	63.60	12.34	78	-0.21	.83
	Control Group	40	64.17	12.09			

The results presented in Table 6 show that the groups had the same writing motivation in the pretest ($t(78) = -0.21$, $p = 0.83$). The obtained p-value (0.83) indicates no difference ($p > 0.05$) between the two groups in their writing motivation. To examine whether there was any difference in writing motivation between the two groups after the treatment, the post-test results were computed as described in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Post-test writing motivation of the groups computed with independent sample t-test

Motivation	Group	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.
	Experimental Group	40	71.35	12.56	78	2.48	.015
	Control Group	40	64.37	12.54			

As shown in Table 7 above, there is a difference between the mean scores of the experimental group ($M = 71.35$) and the control group ($M = 64.37$). An independent t-test analysis ($t(78) = 2.48$, $p = .015$) indicates that the difference between the two groups is statistically significant ($p < .05$). Discussion This research is intended to test the effect of written feedback on students' writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs & writing motivation. Data were gathered through writing tests and questionnaires. Then it was analyzed using mean & independent t-test. The results provided insights into the basic questions.

Before the intervention, both groups were homogeneous and showed no significant differences in their writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs, or writing motivation. After confirming that the data were normally distributed, a parametric data analysis method was applied. First, a test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in post-intervention writing skills between the two groups. The results of an independent t-test ($t(78) = 5.8$, $p = .000$) revealed a significant difference ($p < .05$). This indicates that students in the experimental group, who received written feedback, performed better in terms of writing skills compared to the control group. This suggests that written feedback improves students' writing skills. As a result, the alternative hypothesis was accepted and null hypothesis was rejected. This finding is consistent with the studies by [Ismail et al. \(2008\)](#), [Rahmawati et al. \(2015\)](#), and [Sobhani and Tayebipour \(2015\)](#), which suggested that written feedback enhances the writing skill of students. However, it disagrees with the findings of [Mansourizadeh and Abdullah \(2014\)](#) and [Truscott and Hsu \(2008\)](#) as cited in [Wahyuni \(2017\)](#).

The second aspect this study addressed was the writing self-efficacy beliefs of the students. The result from independent t-test ($t(78) = 3.8$, $p = .000$) showed that there is a significant difference ($p < .05$) in writing self-efficacy belief between the experimental and control groups in posttest. Due to written feedback, the experimental group showed greater improvement in writing self-efficacy belief than the control group. When a student is supported by teacher's written feedback, his/her self-efficacy belief to write greatly increases. Based on the findings, the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected (H_0). This finding aligns with that of [Cui et al. \(2021\)](#), who reported that teacher feedback significantly enhances students' writing self-efficacy belief.

Finally, the study examined the effects of written feedback on writing motivation. There were no differences between the groups before the intervention; however, the post-test results ($t(78) = 2.48$, $p = .015$)

revealed a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the groups. Students who received written feedback showed an increase in motivation to write, as indicated by their higher post-test scores. This finding is consistent with Agustiningsih and Andriani (2021), who found that teacher feedback, can improve students' writing motivation.

4 Conclusion and Implications

In conclusion, the study found a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs, and writing motivation after the treatment. The results suggest that written feedback has a positive effect on students' writing skills, self-efficacy beliefs, and motivation.

The study highlights that primary school students often face challenges in writing, including low self-efficacy beliefs and a lack of motivation. One effective strategy to address this problem is implementing appropriate writing activities in language classes and giving constructive written feedback to enhance students' writing. In summary, teacher feedback plays a crucial role in improving students' writing skills, self-efficacy belief, and motivation. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers should regularly provide written feedback to their students to foster growth in these areas.

5 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

No conflict of interest was reported.

6 FUNDING INFORMATION

No fund was received

References

- Adarkwah, M. A. (2021). The power of assessment feedback in teaching and learning: A narrative review and synthesis of the literature, 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-021-00086-w>
- Agricola, B., Prins, F. J., & Dominique, M. A. (2020). Impact of feedback request forms and verbal feedback on higher education students' feedback perception, self-efficacy, and motivation. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 27(1), 6–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2019.1688764>
- Agustiningsih, N., & Andriani, F. (2021). A study on direct corrective feedback in improving students' writing performance and motivation. 2(1).
- Akkuzu, N. (2014). The role of different types of feedback in the reciprocal interaction of teaching performance and self-efficacy belief. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 39(3).
- Ashrafi, S., & Foozunfar, M. (2018). The effects of oral, written feedback types on efl learners' written accuracy: The relevance of learners' perceptions. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.10968.60169/1>
- Babni, A. (2018). Teaching writing: From theory to practice. 7(10), 490–494. <https://doi.org/10.21275/ART20191562>
- Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development: Vol. 6. six theories of child development* (pp. 1–60). JAI Press.
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chea, S., & Shumow, L. (2015). The relationships among writing self-efficacy, writing goal orientation & writing achievement, 1–69. <https://doi.org/10.5746/Leia/14/V5/I2/A07>

- Cui, Y., Schunn, C. D., Gai, X., Jiang, Y., & Wang, Z. (2021). Effects of trained peer vs. teacher feedback on efl students' writing performance, self-efficacy, and internalization of motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.788474>
- Daffern, T., & Mackenzie, N. M. (2020). Theoretical perspectives and strategies for teaching and learning writing. In *Teaching writing: Effective approaches for the middle years* (pp. 15–34). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003117834-2>
- Dawit, F. (2008). *Yememihir-temari mikikir (conferencing) inna yememihir yets'ihuf migabe milash (written feedback) betemariwoch yemetsafkihil lay yalew tets'ino* [Doctoral dissertation, Addis Ababa University].
- Djouambi, A., & Rezaiki, I. (2021). *The effect of written feedback on students' motivation towards the writing skill: Case study of second year students at mila university center* [Master's thesis, Mila University Center].
- Driver, M. (2021). Cognitive theoretical perspectives of corrective feedback. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789.004>
- Duijnhouwer, H., Prins, F. J., & Stokking, K. M. (2011). Feedback providing improvement strategies and reflection on feedback use: Effects on students' writing motivation, process, and performance, 171–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2011.10.003>
- Eggleston, B. (2017). *Relationship between writing self-efficacy and writing fluency in a performance feedback intervention* [Master's thesis, Syracuse University].
- Elashri, I. I. (2013a). *The impact of the direct teacher feedback strategy on the efl secondary stage students' writing performance*.
- Elashri, I. I. (2013b). *The impact of the direct teacher feedback strategy on the efl secondary stage students' writing performance* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield].
- Endale, T. (1992). *Betemariwoch dirset lay yememihiran ts'ihufawi migabe milash mina* [Master's thesis, Addis Ababa University].
- Farajnezhad, Z. (2021). Sociocultural theory and second language development [Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350037786>]. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.10125.46566>
- Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to students writing: Implication for second language students*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hamidun, N., Hizwari, S., & Othman, N. F. (2013). Students' motivation by providing feedback on writing: The case of international students from thailand. 2(6), 591–594. <https://doi.org/10.7763/IJSSH.2012.V2.179>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hidi, S., & Boscolo, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Writing and motivation*. Elsevier Ltd.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. In *Feedback on second language students' writing* (pp. 83–101). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Ismail, N., Maulan, S., & Hasan, N. H. (2008). The impact of teacher feedback on ESL students' writing performance. *Academic Journal of Social Studies*, 8(1), 45–54. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259632965>
- Ken, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model & method for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294–304. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/44.4.294>
- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 254–284. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254>
- Kovářková, M. (2016). *Teaching writing to primary school learners*.
- Mansourizadeh, K., & Abdullah, K. (2014). The effects of oral and written meta-linguistic feedback on esl students writing. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 20(2), 117–126. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2014-2002-10>
- Mi, L. (2009). Adopting varied feedback modes in the efl writing class. *US-China Foreign Language*, 7(1).
- Nurfaidah, S. (2018). Vygotsky's legacy on teaching and learning writing as social process. *Langkawi: Journal of The Association for Arabic and English*, 4(2), 149–156. <https://doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v4i2.1038>

- Panadero, E., & Lipnevich, A. (2021). A review of feedback models and theories: Descriptions, definitions, and conclusions. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.720195>
- Peha, S. (2003). *The writing teacher's strategy guide*.
- Rahman, N. M. (2017). Incorporating different forms of feedback in teaching writing: An insight into a real classroom. *I*(1), 64–82. <https://doi.org/10.36832/beltaj.2017.0101.04>
- Rahmawati, E., Raja, P., & Nurweni, A. (2015). Student's oral & written feedback on students' writing quality at one of pre intermediate writing class.
- Razali, R., & Jupri, R. (2014). Exploring teacher written feedback and student revisions on esl students' writing. *19*(5), 63–70. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-19556370>
- Reading for Ethiopia's Achievement Developed Technical Assistance (READ TA). (2012). *Ethiopia early grade reading assessment report of findings* (tech. rep. No. AID-663-A-12-00013). USAID.
- Rietdijk, S., Weijen, D., Jassen, T., & Bergh, H. (2018). Teaching writing in primary education: Classroom practice, time, teachers' beliefs and skills. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000237>
- Sanavi, R. V., & Nemati, M. (2014). The effect of six different corrective feedback strategies on iranian english language learners' ielts writing task 2, 1–9.
- Sarwat, S., et al. (2021). Problems and factors affecting students english writing skills at elementary level. *Ilkogretim Online*, 20(5), 3079–3086. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2021.05.332>
- Schunk, D. H. (2012). *Learning theories: An educational perspective* (6th). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Selvaraj, M., & Aziz, A. A. (2019). Systematic review: Approaches in teaching writing skill in esl classrooms. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 8(4), 450–473. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v8-i4/6564>
- Sethy, T. P., & Bhati, K. M. (2022). Self-efficacy: Theory to educational practice. *10*(1), 2–18. <https://doi.org/10.25215/1001.112>
- Sivyer, D. L. (2005). *The effect of positive/negative feedback awareness on self-efficacy and writing performance* [Master's thesis, Florida State University].
- Sobhani, M., & Tayebipour, F. (2015). The effects of oral vs. written corrective feedback on iranian efl learners' essay writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(8), 1601–1611. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0508.09>
- Solomon, T. (1987). *Ye bit'e erimat tegibarawinetna wutetamanet be 11gna kifil* [Master's thesis, Addis Ababa University] [MA Thesis].
- Tigist, T. (1998). *Bebahir dar yuniversity beityopiya quanqawochina sine ts'ihuf timihirt kifil yebbesal dirset memihiran yets'ihuf miggabe millash tikuret fittesha* [Master's thesis, Addis Ababa University].
- Troia, G., Shankland, R., Harbaugh, A., & Wolbers, K. (2012). Relationship between writing motivation, writing activity and writing performance: Effects on grade, sex & ability. *Reading and Writing*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-012-9379-2>
- Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 292–305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.05.003>
- Wahyuni, S. (2017). The effect of different feedback on writing quality of college students with different cognitive styles. *17*(1), 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v17i1.649>
- Yuk, K., & Yunus, M. (2021). Using peer-modelled feedback at the pre-writing stage to improve year 4 pupils' writing performance. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research*, 8(1), 116–124. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2021.81.116.124>
- Zahida, R., Farrah, M., & Zaru, N. (2014). The impact of three types of written feedback on the motivation and writing skill of english major students at hebron university. *28*(5).
- Zubaidi, N. (2015). Sociocultural theory [Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277892662>]. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.2642.1921>