ISSN (Print): 2788-8320 ISSN (Online): 2788-8339

JOURNAL OF SOCIAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT
www.jsrd.org.pk editor@jsd.org.pk

INTERRELATIONSHIP OF TEACHERS' WRITTEN FEEDBACK & STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENTS IN ENGLISH AT SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL

Saba Farid[1], Muhammad Farooq Alam[2] & Nasrullah[3]

[1]Lecturer, Department of Education, University of Wah, Pakistan
[2]Assistant Professor, National University of Modern Languages, Rawalpindi, Pakistan
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Education, University of Wah, Pakistan

KEYWORDS

Feedback; Academic Achievement; Assessment, Observation

ABSTRACT

This quantitative research was conducted in the district of Punjab, Pakistan. Teachers' feedback on 260 secondary students' note book of English subject was evaluated through an observational sheet. The observational sheet was designed by researchers to evaluate the teachers' feedback and categorize it. Main categories were prompt and delayed feedback, positive and negative feedback. Also, classification was done to identify evaluative, improvement, descriptive, and descriptive feedback. Study aims to measure relationship of feedback types with students score in examination in the subject of English. Strong and positive correlation was found amid the prompt positive feedback and students' achievement score. The results provide significant information that are used for making decisions about interrelationships in research issues and reaching conclusion. The results are significant and help in extracting the recommendations to stakeholders and future researchers about research issues. It is recommended to organize training and guidance sessions for the teachers for creating awareness to use the effective feedback techniques in the classroom.

Corresponding Author Nasrullah

Email: nasr.dowling@gmail.com

DOI https://doi.org/10.53664/JSRD/04-01-2023-13-146-153

INTRODUCTION

Written feedback requires teacher concentration and time and allows students to know how and to what extent they have successfully gained information about a concept being taught (Saeed, A., & Akbar, 2021; Didion, Toste & Filderman, 2020). It enables learners to achieve skills of correcting themselves too and ability to correct the errors has maximum effects on their learning proficiency (Kulhavy, 1977; Khan, Khan & Khan, 2017). Relationship of feedback on future practices and the development of students' learning is related with the type of feedback received by the teacher to

learner (Eraut, 2006). The usefulness of feedback to support student learning is significant however, different student surveys across the world have also emphasized that students are dissatisfied with the feedback they receive on their assigned tasks (Nicol, 2010). In this connection, student argues lack of satisfactory and timely feedback they received while their teachers claim that students fail to apply the provided feedback (Orrella, 2006). An approach to increasing the effectiveness of the feedback is to conceptualize feedback as a dialogue rather than as the information transmission to make sure that the information provided is understood by students (Nichol & Dick, 2006). It helps students to not only got written feedback but also have the opportunity to discuss that afterward to enhance its effectiveness.

Effective feedback practices are not only providing information to the students for improvement of their learning but also offers important information to teachers to improve their student's learning experiences. Yorke (2003) argues that process of feedback has an effect on teachers as well as the student. Assessors analyze the extent to which students have and design their teaching accordingly (Behlol & Anwar, 2011). Teachers themselves need to comprise a plan about students' development in the act of relevant and informative feedback to meet the students' needs. The positive feedback by the teacher is considered as a motivating tool for students. Piccinin (2003), and for the utilization the feedback they have received. Feedback plays important part to catch the student's attention to the less successful parts of coursework (Earley & Porritt, 2013). Thus, teachers can improve students' learning by providing feedback positively. It has been observed that sometimes teachers provide irrelevant feedback to the students on their assigned tasks and should limit the amount of feedback (Brinko, 1993), because by doing this the teachers could find their students fed up with feedback, they are getting from them. In this connection, providing written comments on students' assignments in learning process is seen as a central feature of feedback (Vattøy, 2020). Teachers needs to make sure about the quality of feedback and its provision to make sure that standards are maintained (Watt, 2002).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Carless and Winstone (2020) propose new composition for the development of teacher's feedback. It includes three dimensions: (1) describing and planning feedback for target student; (2) to focuses on the interpersonal part of student and teacher feedback exchanges; and (3) a practical dimension to outline teachers' management of feedback practices in classroom. From sociocultural perspective, feedback processes tend to be mediated by teacher conceptions of teaching, student relationships with their teachers, and structural constraints, such as modularized programs or large classes (Plank, Dixon & Ward, 2014). The culture and values of different disciplines might influence the formation of feedback and feedback engagement (Gan, An & Liu, 2021). Traditional classroom teaching only focuses on transmission of information as primary task of teaching so feedback becomes only one-way communication (Askew & Lodge, 2000). The information given to student (i.e., grades, scores, and judgmental comments) is usually in numbers rather than corrective feedback This feedback is known also outcome-based feedback, describing whether or not the results are correct (Butler & Winne, 1995). This type of feedback carries no additional information about the task other than its state of achievement.

Hence, it is likely that verification feedback provides minimal external guidance for learner about how to self-regulate (Butler & Winne, 1995). A delay in feedback cannot produce good extension skills (Dihoff, Brosvic, & Epstein, 2003). A descriptive type of written feedback is effective as it helps in raising the achievement of the learners as compared to feedback which just evaluates the degree to which a task is right or wrong (Bangert-Drowns et al., 1991). In this regard, improvement-oriented feedback is proven to be an effective way of enhancing the achievement of students (Cho, Schunn & Charney, 2006). Improvement-oriented feedback is closely related to effective learning whereas achievement-orientated feedback has a stronger relationship to the performance learning (Rezaeian & Abdollah, 2020). Therefore, in other words, feedback for raising student achievement as compared to feedback that describes whether or not one has been successful feedback and also suggests ways for improvement is more effective (Smits & Janssens, 2020). This type is referred to as teachers making evaluations for students' answers in the type of the words, numbers, and symbols Cullen, (2002).

The use of feedback from the teacher could be one of the factors that may help us to pull out the potential of the learner. Consequently, studying the positive reinforcement of students' academic achievements at the secondary level is desirable. Feedback from the teacher is an important aspect of the instructional process. Feedback from teachers on student performance is closely related to the academic achievement of student. Written feedback is an incentive that has been almost removed from the classroom, and it intends to get individuals to repeat desirable behavior. The reason for conducting this study was to identify association amid teachers' written feedback and achievement of students in the subject of English at secondary level. To explore relationship between teachers 'written feedback and students' achievement at the secondary level in English, the study answers the following question:

How different types of written feedback (improvement feedback, evaluation feedback, positive feedback, negative feedback, descriptive feedback) are related to the academic achievement of students?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research design for this study was quantitative and data were collected through observational sheet. The targeted population of this study was Wah Cantt, Rawalpindi and consisted of the 10th grade students of secondary schools. The convenient sampling technique was used for the selection of the sample. The appropriate sample size consisted of 260 students (10th grade) from secondary schools. The self-developed observational sheet was used for data collection from the students. For conducting this research, researcher developed an observational sheet (OS) as research instrument after reviewing articles related to topic and variables. This OS was aimed to measure the various types of written feedback, from the subjects. One variable written the feedback (positive feedback, negative feedback, evaluation feedback, improvement-oriented feedback, descriptive feedback) was measured by this questionnaire. OS consisted of two sections. Firstly, types of written feedback (the positive feedback, negative feedback, evaluation feedback, improvement-oriented feedback, descriptive feedback) were measured promptly and secondly, same types of written feedback were measured in a delayed manner. For data collection, a self-designed observational sheet was used.

Observational sheet was planned to evaluate written feedback types given by teachers on students' performance in English subjects in the class work and homework. SSC part-1 marks of same students were taken as academic achievement in subject of English. The researcher personally visits schools for data collection.

RESULTS OF STUDY

The following section provides details of correlations between the teachers' feedback and students' academic achievements.

Prompt Feedback

Table 1 Correlations Analysis

		English Marks	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
Prompt Improvement Feedback [1]	r	.283**				
	r2	8.01%				
	p	.000				
	N	260				
Prompt Evaluation Feedback [2]	r	.200**	-.012			
	r2	4.00%	0.01%			
	p	.001	.845			
	N	260	260			
Prompt Positive Feedback [3]	r	.638**	.076	.313**		
	r2	40.70%	0.58%	9.80%		
	p	.000	.219	.000		
	N	260	260	260		
Prompt Negative Feedback [4]	r	-.039	.161**	-.054	-.103	
	r2	0.15%	2.59%	0.29%	1.06%	
	p	.527	.009	.387	.097	
	N	260	260	260	260	
Prompt Descriptive Feedback	r	.313**	.228**	-.028	.107	
	r2	9.80%	6.57%	0.08%	1.14%	0.19%
	p	.000	.000	.655	.084	.476
	N	260	260	260	260	260

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

Table 1 reports a correlation analysis of the variables (marks of English subject in SSC-1 and types of written feedback) for the research question: How written feedback is associated with the academic achievement of students at secondary level? - Table shows weak positive correlation between the marks of students and prompt improvement-oriented feedback, (r= .283, p<.001), accounting for an 8.01 percent variation. There was a positive weak correlation between prompt evaluation feedback and marks of students, (r= .200, p<0.01) accounting for 4.00 percent variation. There was a positive strong correlation amid prompt positive feedback, marks of students, (r= .638, p<0.01) accounting for a 40.70 percent variation. There was a negative correlation between prompt negative feedback and marks of students, (r=-.39, p<0.01) accounting for a 40.70 percent variation. There was positive

weak correlation amid prompt descriptive feedback & students' marks (r= .313, p<0.01) accounting for a 9.8 percent variation.

Delayed Written Feedback

Table 2 Correlations Analysis

		English Marks	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
Delayed Improvement Feedback [1]	r	-.088				
	r2	0.77%				
	p	.158				
	N	260				
Delayed Evaluation Feedback [2]	r	.025	.006			
	r2	0.06%	0.00%			
	p	.686	.918			
	N	260	260			
Delayed Positive Feedback [3]	r	.083	-.003	.034		
	r2	0.69%	0.11%	0.12%		
	p	.180	.968	.582		
	N	260	260	260		
Delayed Negative Feedback [4]	r	-.336**	.082	.025	.032	
	r2	12.30%	0.67%	.001	0.10%	
	p	.000	.185	.694	.603	
	N	260	260	260	260	
Delayed Descriptive Feedback	r	-.047	.187**	.003	.109	.187**
	r2	0.22%	3.50%	0.00%	1.19%	3.50%
	p	.449	.002	.966	.079	.002
	N	260	260	260	260	260

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

Table 2 reports a correlation analysis of the variables (marks of English subject in SSC-1 and types of delayed written feedback). The tables show negative correlation between marks of students and delayed improvement-oriented feedback, (r= -.088, p>.001), accounting for 0.77 percent variation. There was a positive very weak correlation between delayed evaluation feedback and marks of students, (r= .025, p>0.01) accounting for 0.06 percent variation. Thus, there was a positive weak correlation between delayed positive feedback and marks of students, (r= .08, p>0.01) accounting for 0.69 percent variation. There was negative correlation between delayed negative feedback and marks of students, (r=-.33, p<0.01) accounting for 12.3%variation. It was negative weak correlation between delayed descriptive feedback and marks of students, (r=- .047, p>0.01) accounting for a 0.22 percent variation.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Table 1 reports a correlation analysis of the variables (marks of English subject in SSC-1 and types of written feedback). The tables show a weak positive correlation between the marks of students and prompt improvement-oriented feedback, (r= .283, p<.001), accounting for an 8.01 percent variation. There was a positive weak correlation between prompt evaluation feedback and marks of students,

(r= .200, p<0.01) accounting for 4.00 percent variation. There was a positive strong correlation between prompt positive feedback and marks of students, (r= .638, p<0.01) accounting for a 40.70 percent variation. There was a negative correlation between prompt negative feedback and marks of students, (r=-.39, p<0.01) accounting for a 40.70 percent variation. There was the positive weak correlation between the prompt descriptive feedback and marks of the students, (r= .313, p<0.01) accounting for 9.80 percent variation. Table 2 reports a correlation analysis of the variables (marks of English subject in SSC-1 and types of delayed written feedback). The tables show a negative correlation between the marks of students and delayed improvement-oriented feedback, (r= -.088, p>.001), accounting for 0.77 percent variation. There was a positive very weak correlation between delayed evaluation feedback and marks of students in classroom, (r= .025, p>0.01) accounting for 0.06 percent variation.

There was a positive weak correlation between delayed positive feedback and marks of students, (r= .08, p>0.01) accounting for 0.69 percent variation. There was a negative correlation between delayed negative feedback and marks of students, (r=-.33, p<0.01) accounting for a 12.3 percent variation. There was a negative weak correlation between delayed descriptive feedback and marks of the students, (r=- .047, p>0.01) accounting for 0.22 percent variation. Thus, based on the findings, following conclusions were drawn. It was concluded that there was moderate positive correlation between the marks of students and the prompt improvement-oriented feedback. There was positive weak correlation between prompt evaluation feedback and the marks of students. There was a strong correlation between prompt positive feedback and the students' marks. There was a negative correlation between prompt negative feedback and the marks of the students. There was a positive weak correlation between the prompt descriptive feedback and the marks of students. There was a negative correlation between the marks of students and delayed improvement-oriented written feedback. There was a very weak positive correlation between delayed evaluation feedback and the marks of students. There was positive weak correlation between the delayed positive feedback and the marks of students.

There was a negative correlation between delayed negative feedback and the marks of students. There was a weak correlation between delayed descriptive feedback and students' marks. There was negative correlation amid marks of students and delayed improvement-oriented feedback. There was a positive very weak correlation between delayed evaluation feedback and the marks of students. There was a positive weak correlation between delayed positive feedback and the marks of students. There was a negative correlation between delayed negative feedback and the marks of students. There was a weak correlation between delayed descriptive feedback and students' marks. It was decided that prompt positive feedback, prompt improvement feedback, prompt descriptive feedback, delayed positive feedback, and delayed improvement feedback (written feedback types) are the best predictors of academic achievement of students. It is recommended to organize training and guidance sessions for the teachers for creating awareness to use effective feedback techniques in the classroom. It is recommended that teachers use different written feedback techniques during the instructional process for keeping students in the right direction and also the improvement of the learning process.

REFERENCES

Askew, S. (Ed.). (2000). Feedback for learning. London: Routledge.

Bangert-Drowns, R. L., Kulik, J. A., & Kulik, C. L. C. (1991). Effects of frequent classroom testing. *The journal of educational research*, 85(2), 89-99.

Behlol, M.G., & Anwar, M. (2011). Comparative Analyses of the Teaching Methods and Evaluation Practices in English Subject at Secondary School Certificate. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4). 915–945.

Brinko K.T. (1993) The practice of giving feedback: What is effective? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64 (5), 574-593

Butler, L., & Winne, H. (1995). Feedback & self-regulated learning: Theoretical synthesis. *Review of educational research*, 65(3), 245-281.

Carless, D., &Winstone, N. (2020). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1-14.

Cho, K., Schunn, C. D., & Charney, D. (2006). Commenting on writing: Typology and perceived helpfulness of comments from novice peer reviewers and subject matter experts. *Written communication*, 23(3), 260-294.

Didion, L., Toste, J. R., & Filderman, M. J. (2020). Teacher professional development and student reading achievement: A meta-analytic review of effects. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 13(1), 29-66.

Dihoff, R. E., Brosvic, G. M., Epstein, M. L., & Cook, M. J. (2003). Provision of feedback during preparation for academic testing: Learning is enhanced by immediate but not delayed feedback. *The Psychological Record*, 54(2), 207-231.

Earley, P., & Porritt, V. (2013). Evaluating the impact of professional development: the need for a student-focused approach. *Professional Development in Education*, UK, 52(2), 117-136

Eraut, M. Feedback (2006) Learning in Health and Social Care. 5:111–118 Ferguson, P. (2011). Student perceptions of quality feedback in teacher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(1), 51-62.

Esterhazy, R. (2018). What matters for productive feedback? Disciplinary practices and their relational dynamics. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1302-1314.

Gan, Z., An, Z., & Liu, F. (2021). Teacher feedback practices, student feedback motivation, and feedback behavior: How are they associated with learning outcomes? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 697045.

Khan, A., Khan, S., & Khan, M. (2017). Teaching Professionalism and Students Academic Achievements. *Research on Humanities and Social Science*, 7(7), 47-52.

Kulhavy, R. W. (1977). Feedback in written instruction. *Review of educational research*, 47(2), 211-232.

Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 501-517.

Orrell, J. (2006). Feedback on learning achievement: rhetoric and reality. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(4), 441-456.

Piccinin, S. J. (2003) Feedback: Key to learning. Halifax, NS: Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.

Plank, C., Dixon, H., & Ward, G. (2014). Student voices about the role feedback plays in the enhancement of their learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* (Online), 39(9), 98-110.

Rezaeian, S., & Abdollah, Z, E. (2020). Teacher efficacy and its correlates in the EFL context of Iran: The role of age, experience, and gender. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 7(4), 1533-1548.

Sadler, D.R. (1989) Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems, *Instructional Science*, 18, 119-144.

Saeed, A., & Akbar, R. (2021). Relationship of Teachers' Professional Skills and Students' Achievement in English at BA Level. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 43 (1), 31-44.

Smits, T. F., & Janssens willen, P. (2020). Multicultural teacher education: a cross-case exploration of pre-service language teachers' approach to ethnic diversity. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 33(4), 421-445.

Vattøy, K. D. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about feedback practice as related to student self-regulation, self-efficacy, and language skills in teaching English as a foreign language. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 64, 100828.

Watt, S., Simpson, C., McKillop, C., & Nunn, V. (2002). Electronic course surveys: does automating feedback and reporting give better results? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(4), 325-337.

Yorke, M (2003) Formative assessment in higher education: Moves towards theory and the enhancement of pedagogic practice, *Higher Education*, 45(4), 477-501.