



Journal for Social
Science Archives

Journal for Social Science Archives

Online ISSN: 3006-3310

Print ISSN: 3006-3302

Volume 3, Number 3, 2025, Pages 71 – 84

Journal Home Page

<https://jssarchives.com/index.php/Journal/about>



Feedback Practices of Teachers at Primary Level: A Case Study of District Bagh

Saiqa Noreen¹ & Dr. Muhammad Asghar Ali²

¹MPhil Scholar, Department of Education, Women University of AJ&K Bagh, Email: saiqanoreen444@gmail.com

²Professor (Adjunct), Department of Education, Muslim Youth University Islamabad, Email: aamasgharali@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: May 23, 2025
Revised: June 25, 2025
Accepted: July 02, 2025
Available Online: July 14, 2025

Keywords:

Feedback, Practices, Primary schools, Teachers and students

Corresponding Author:

Saiqa Noreen

Email:

saiqanoreen444@gmail.com



ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to find out the feedback practices of teachers at primary level in district Bagh. This study is likely to contribute in apprising the concerned stakeholders in drawing up such policies which will help to promote effective feedback delivery system at schools. The study is descriptive in nature and survey method is adopted by the researchers for this. The target population comprises of all the primary teachers and primary level students in district Bagh of Azad Kashmir. Sample was selected using the stratified and random sampling technique. Standardized written and oral inventory was used. The data was collected by visiting all the schools included for the purpose of this study. Written feedback was given by teachers regarding feedback practices. Data was analyzed with the help of SPSS software. Frequency percentage, were applied. The findings of the study were drawn by analyzing data and conclusions are made by the researchers based on the findings and then recommendations are made based on the conclusions. The study found that feedback has a positive effect on students'. The students who are given feedback by their teachers perform well in their examinations. The researcher recommended improving this practice in schools almost at primary level of education.

Introduction

Feedback is vital for the improvement and advancement of important information and abilities in students. It also improves students' and instructors' learning achievement and execution. Hence, feedback is a significant element in making learning motivational. According to Hattie (2007), feedback is a framed thought of data that is essential for understanding and execution of others such as educators, leaders, companions, books, guardians, oneself, or encounters. Feedback on what is correct or wrong is normally given by educators and guardians to students and by heads

and outer specialists to instructors. Feedback, including helpful data and different decisions, is normally given by instructors to individual educators. Books shape students' thoughts. Guardians intellectually support students who look for information to approve answers or examination results. Feedback: giving headings and arrangements (order feedback) and giving bearings to assist students with further developing their growth opportunities without anyone else's help (facilitative feedback). In aggregate, feedback gives students, educators, and experts clear thoughts and sensible perspectives. In any case, compelling feedback relies upon different factors like qualities of the student's ability, inspiration, and contrasts in expected learning results (for example, learning manageability and weight movement, and so on).

Scholars have used a variety of methods to estimate scholarly performance over the years, including report card grades, grade point midpoints, state administered test scores, instructor evaluations, other mental grades, grade maintenance, and dropout rates (Shute, 2007). As a result, students' academic performance is typically evaluated, and instructors provide feedback to students near the end of the evaluation. It is widely perceived that feedback is a significant piece of the learning cycle, yet the two students and educators every now and again express disillusionment and disappointment according to the lead of the feedback interaction.

Students might gripe that feedback on appraisals is pointless or indistinct, and at times, in any event, unsettling. The classroom evaluation climate as perceived by students is becoming increasingly important in the instructional evaluation field. Numerous teachers have guaranteed that evaluation-related exercises utilized in the classroom pass on significant data about what is valued there and consequently affect students' scholastic exhibition (William and Thompson, 2007). Students' accomplishment objectives have been viewed as significant accomplishment-related results to be advanced in the study hall growing experience (Brookhart, 2017). The connections that educators create with their students play a significant part in a student's scholarly development. Learning is a cycle that includes mental and social mental aspects, and the two cycles should be considered if scholastic accomplishment is to be expanded." In developmental assessment, the student goes through demonstrative exams at various points throughout their examinations and receives feedback based on the test results (Hattie, 2003).

There is the probability that, assuming students' learning is sufficiently assessed routinely during the instructing experience and brief feedback is given, their degree of execution will get to the next level. A critical element of ineffective utilisation of feedback is that it should energize "care" in students' reactions to the feedback (Shute, 2007). Likewise, examination tracked down significant fluctuations in the impacts of feedback. They detailed that feedback about a specific undertaking and how to do it is more powerful than feedback that focuses on acclaim or on disciplines and rewards.

Hattie (2012) stressed that feedback needs to resolve the inquiries of what the objectives are, where the student at present stands in comparison to those objectives, and what the subsequent stages ought to be for arriving at the objectives. They also discovered that feedback focused on the assignment, the cycles expected to complete the responsibility, and self-administrative errand-related exercises is more constructive than feedback focused on the individual (typically, praise).

Finally, Sendziuk (2010) argued that "feedback needs to provoke dynamic data handling with respect to the students." The key to understanding the impacts of feedback as it occurs through developmental evaluation in appropriate learning settings is what Strijbos, Narciss, and Dunnebier (2010) refer to as the care with which it is obtained or what refer to as effectively handling the data. Except if students effectively process the feedback that they get, there is little motivation to

accept that the feedback will emphatically affect learning. However, most feedback analysis connects feedbacks directly to resulting accomplishments, regardless of how well the feedback is deciphered and handled.

It has been observed that the teachers' feedback at the primary level is missing in our setting. The researcher has personally experienced the lack of feedback by our teachers at the primary level, causing a lack of instinct and inspiration amongst the students. This has created a great gulf in the students' academic achievement at the primary level. So this study is likely to focus on the issues related to the students' missing out on feedback from their teachers at the primary level. The objective of study was to identify the written feedback practices of primary teachers in district Bagh

Literature Review

The academic presentation of students depends on the methods of demonstration used by the teachers as well as the type of evaluation (Din and Saeed, 2018). A cycle called developmental evaluation collects information from pupils so that they can improve their learning (Ghazali, Abdullah, Zaini, and Hamzah, 2020). Giving and drawing in (significant) feedback is an essential piece of formative assessment (Reddy, 2019), as Hattie and Timperley allude to it as "among the most fundamental impacts on learner realization," which stir and keep learners involved in their work (Javed, 2017). Feedback extends learners' tirelessness and satisfaction (Brookhart, 2017) and learners embrace more ways of managing useful learning (Reddy, 2019).

Giving constructive feedback to students is perhaps the most compelling procedure that assists them with supporting their self-adequacy (Panadero and Romero, 2014), to take on "students' inspiration for task esteem" (Zumbrunn, Marrs, and Mewborn, 2016), and to work on self-guidelines (Thompson, Wiedermann, Herman, and Reinke, 2021), which ultimately assists students with achieving their learning outcomes (Hattie, 2009).

Concurring, Pakistani education systems show unusual concern for developmental evaluation practices, which are lacking in feedback. Giving constructive feedback is an important component of the fifth assessment standard in the National Professional Standards for Teachers in Pakistan (GoP, 2009) which establishes recommendations for educators. According to the definition offered by Hattie and Timperly (2007) "Feedback is data, for example, knowledge, talents, or mindsets given by instructors, peers, books, guardians, or one's own encounters with one's display." In essence, it is "a consequence of execution." Pakistan's educational system and students' displays are deemed to be inappropriate and insufficient (Din and Saeed, 2018).

In particular, from the most recent three years, from 2017 to 2019, the yearly report and paper of BSEK and DOEE reveal that grades VIII and IX (Science Lot) have improved performance. Continued declines in science achievement for the grade IX group from 74.16 percent (BS.EK., 2017) to 62.63 percent (BS.EK., 2019) and for the grade VIII group from 28.28 percent to 24.5 percent (DOE., 2018) in the district of Karachi cause extraordinary concern for teachers who instruct at the basic or optional level. Due to the lack of proper developmental feedback rehearsals, students struggle to complete annual test papers and perform poorly on the most recent evaluation (Ahmed, Akhtar, and Aslam, 2020).

According to Hattie's (2009) precise written analysis of 12 past meta-examinations, which included 196 inquiries and 6972 impact measures, "feedback effectively improved learning results." John Hattie is the best author anybody could want to locate on feedback, yet according to

the best research, an unanticipated occurrence appears to be that none of the writings available investigate any feedback model's acts at any educational level in Pakistan (Din and Saeed, 2018).

Even so, it is possible to assess the neighborhood writing's effects on students' general English performance at the secondary level, regardless of the feedback model. As a result, the expert identifies a requirement to implement the Hattie and Timperley (2007) laid-out model as a system for the current focus in a science course at the secondary level because this model enables every student who is dependent upon their learning indicators to give distinct and precise information. Feedback, according to Parr and Timperley (2010), is a crucial component of classroom instruction. According to Sadler (2014), feedback is a crucial component of conscious and responsive training, and learning without it would be equivalent to doing so without an instructor. Stronge's (2002) research demonstrated that feedback consistently emerges as a powerful tool to aid student learning.

The text clearly demonstrates how useful constructive criticism is for differentiating between students' levels of success (Harks, et al., 2014). According to Nicol and MacFarlane Dick (2006), effective feedback can be used to hasten students' learning. Feedback lets students know how their presentation compares to pre-set goals and takes corrections into account (Nyiramana, 2017), giving them a better chance of generally succeeding. Effective criticism is essential for power (Black and William, 2009). LFM concurs with the idea that less capable students can succeed provided they are given more meaningful learning opportunities and higher-quality instruction. Feedback was distinguished as one of the vital components of the LFM technique, and giving constructive Feedback is a vital component of value educating. Feedback offers lower capacity students opportunities to gain admittance to better quality instructing. While the examination on LFM is uncertain, a large part of the research obviously distinguished that Feedback assumes a strong part in dominance achievement (Guskey2019).

The next step is to determine what constitutes valuable feedback. According to Hattie and Timperley (2007) effective feedback should answer the following three basic questions: According to Hattie and Timperley (2007) there are four important levels of effective feedback, and the degree to which the feedback is delivered directly affects how appropriate it is. The four levels of feedback are feedback from the undertaking, feedback from the cycle, feedback from one's own self-reflection, and feedback from one's own internal reflection. All of feedback provides students with helpful assistance, giving them a fantastic opportunity to develop their work-related skills. The most effective method for communicating feedback appears to be using this combination of written, verbal, and peer feedback, or any variation of these. Constructive and important criticism can lead to good teaching and learning, as well as the satisfaction of the individual (Smith, et al. 2020).

Research Methodology

The nature of the current investigation is descriptive. A survey method was used as the research study's methodology. It entailed gathering, evaluating, and interpreting data in light of the study's goals. The descriptive research is a purposeful process of gathering, analyzing, classifying, and tabulating data about prevailing conditions, practices, processes, trends, and cause-and-effect relationships and then making an adequate and accurate interpretation of such data with or without the sometimes minimal aid of statistical methods. Also, this method ascertains prevailing conditions of facts in a group under study that give either qualitative, quantitative, or both descriptions of the general characteristics of the group as results. The population of the study was composed of all public-sector primary school teachers and students of classes' 4th and 5th

studying math and science in the district Bagh Azad Jammu and Kashmir. There are 316 schools in total, with 167 male and 149 female students. The teachers of all the primary schools in the public sector from Halqa, Gharbi, Sharqi, Wast, and Headquartered were taken as the population of this study. The total number of male and female primary school teachers in District Bagh is 622. The data were confirmed by the male and female district education offices in Bagh. The total sample was 300 including teachers and students. The researcher used stratified and simple random sampling techniques, so the sample was drawn from school teachers teaching at the primary level in the district Bagh AJ&K. Standardized written inventory was used. For pilot testing, the researcher took five schools from Gharbi Bagh. From the chosen population, the researcher chose 20 participants for the pilot study and Cronbach alpha value was 0.735. The researcher visited the sampled schools in the four halqas of Bagh Azad Jammu and Kashmir and observed teachers and students at work. The researchers looked through the students' homework and notebooks to gather information regarding the written feedback from the teachers. Based on the results, the researchers created a list of every student taking math and science in the fourth and fifth grades of the tested schools.

Data Analysis

The information gathered via the research tool was collated, examined, and then interpreted in light of the study's goals. SPSS-24, a statistical package for social sciences, was employed. Simple frequencies and percentages were employed to examine the data.

Table 1: Teacher Writes Comments Immediately on Notebook

	Scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never (0 time)	39	13.0	13.0	13.0
	Rarely (1 time)	149	49.7	49.7	62.7
	Sometime (2 times)	34	11.3	11.3	74.0
	Normally (3 times)	69	23.0	23.0	97.0
	mostly (4 times)	8	2.7	2.7	99.7
	Always (5 times or more)	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	300	100.0	100.0	

The table 1 summarizes the frequency distribution: The majority of respondents (49.7%) reported that teachers “Rarely (1 time)” write immediate comments, making it the most commonly selected option. 13.0% of participants stated that teachers “Never” write immediate comments, indicating a significant portion of classrooms lack prompt feedback. 23.0% selected “Normally (3 times)”, suggesting that a notable minority observe regular commenting behavior. A smaller portion, 11.3%, reported “Sometimes (2 times)”, showing occasional feedback practices. Very few respondents indicated higher frequencies: only 2.7% said “Mostly (4 times)”, and just 0.3% reported “Always (5 times or more)”. The cumulative percentage shows that 74.0% of the respondents believe teachers write comments either never, rarely, or only sometimes, reflecting limited frequency of immediate written feedback in most cases.

Conclusion

Overall, the data suggests that immediate written feedback by teachers on student notebooks is infrequent, with nearly three-quarters (74%) reporting low engagement (from never to sometimes).

Only a small proportion of teachers are perceived as consistently providing prompt written comments. This highlights a potential area for improvement in formative assessment practices in the classroom.

Table 2: Teachers Corrects the Underline Mistakes

	Scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never (0 time)	37	12.3	12.3	12.3
	Rarely (1 time)	149	49.7	49.7	62.0
	Sometime (2 times)	1	.3	.3	62.3
	Normally (3 times)	37	12.3	12.3	74.7
	mostly (4 times)	74	24.7	24.7	99.3
	Always (5 times or more)	2	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	300	100.0	100.0	

This table presents the frequency distribution of 300 respondents' views on how often teachers correct underlined mistakes in students' notebooks. Nearly half of the respondents (49.7%) stated that teachers "Rarely (1 time)" correct underlined mistakes, indicating a limited practice of providing detailed corrective feedback. 12.3% reported that teachers "Never" correct such mistakes, suggesting a total absence of this feedback behavior in some classrooms. Only 0.3% said teachers' correct underlined mistakes "Sometimes (2 times)", reflecting minimal moderate engagement. Another 12.3% noted that teachers "Normally (3 times)" correct underlined mistakes, showing some consistent, but not frequent, correction behavior. A more encouraging 24.7% responded with "Mostly (4 times)", indicating that around a quarter of the teachers regularly corrects such mistakes. Just 0.7% reported that teachers "Always (5 times or more)" correct underlined mistakes, suggesting that very few teachers maintain consistent and thorough correction practices. The cumulative percentage reveals that 62.3% of teachers are perceived as correcting underlined mistakes rarely or never, while only about 25.4% (Mostly or Always) exhibit a strong tendency to consistently correct them.

Conclusion

The results suggest that a majority of teachers seldom correct underlined mistakes, with nearly two-thirds (62.3%) providing such corrective feedback either never or rarely. Although a quarter of teachers correct mistakes frequently, the overall trend points to a lack of consistent and effective error correction, which may hinder students' learning and self-improvement. This highlights the need for increased attention to formative feedback practices in classrooms.

Table 3: Teachers Write Hints, Reminders to Correct

	Scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never (0 time)	112	37.3	37.3	37.3
	Rarely (1 time)	71	23.7	23.7	61.0
	Sometime (2 times)	21	7.0	7.0	68.0
	Normally (3 times)	9	3.0	3.0	71.0
	mostly (4 times)	84	28.0	28.0	99.0

Always (5 times or more)	3	1.0	1.0	100.0
Total	300	100.0	100.0	

This table displays the frequency distribution of responses from 300 participants regarding how often teachers write hints or reminders to help students correct their mistakes. A significant proportion of respondents (37.3%) stated that teachers "Never (0 time)" provide written hints or reminders, indicating a high lack of supportive corrective feedback. 23.7% reported that teachers "Rarely (1 time)" write such hints, suggesting that more than 60% (61.0%) of teachers provide these supports very infrequently. Only 7.0% selected "Sometime (2 times)", while a minimal 3.0% observed that teachers "Normally (3 times)" offer this guidance. Encouragingly, 28.0% of participants reported that teachers "Mostly (4 times)" write hints and reminders, representing the second highest frequency category. A very small 1.0% indicated that teachers "Always (5 times or more)" provide such feedback. The cumulative percentage shows that by the "Rarely" category, 61.0% of respondents feel that such practices are largely absent or infrequent, while only 29.0% believe teachers mostly or always provide this type of guidance.

Conclusion

The findings suggest that teachers generally do not provide written hints or reminders to help students correct their work. With 61% of respondents indicating rare or no use, the data reflects a significant gap in formative feedback practices. While about one-third of teachers are seen as using such strategies more often, overall usage remains limited. This signals a critical area for professional development, focusing on improving supportive feedback that encourages student self-correction and deeper learning.

Table 4: Teacher Writes to Revise or Correct Work

	Scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never (0 time)	66	22.0	22.0	22.0
	Rarely (1 time)	119	39.7	39.7	61.7
	Sometime (2 times)	5	1.7	1.7	63.3
	Normally (3 times)	65	21.7	21.7	85.0
	mostly (4 times)	14	4.7	4.7	89.7
	Always (5 times or more)	31	10.3	10.3	100.0
	Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Statistical Interpretation of Table 4: Teacher Writes to Revise or Correct Work

This table presents the distribution of 300 respondents' views on how frequently teachers write instructions for students to revise or correct their work. The largest group of respondents (39.7%) reported that teachers "Rarely (1 time)" write such instructions, indicating that this corrective feedback is infrequently provided. 22.0% of respondents stated that teachers "Never" write to prompt revision or correction, which further reinforces the limited use of written corrective feedback. A small proportion (1.7%) selected "Sometime (2 times)", reflecting minimal moderate engagement in this practice. 21.7% reported that teachers "Normally (3 times)" provide such instructions, suggesting some consistency in revision practices among a minority of teachers. Only 4.7% noted that teachers do this "Mostly (4 times)", and 10.3% said "Always (5 times or more)",

reflecting that just 15% of teachers regularly or consistently provide revision guidance. The cumulative percentage shows that 63.3% of respondents believe teachers rarely or never instruct students in writing to revise or correct their work, while only 15% see this as a common or always-practiced behavior.

Conclusion

The data indicates that the majority of teachers do not consistently provide written prompts for students to revise or correct their work. With nearly two-thirds (63.3%) reporting that such feedback occurs never or rarely, and only a small minority (15%) experiencing it frequently; this points to a gap in effective formative assessment practices. Encouraging students to revise through written feedback is essential for learning improvement, and the findings suggest a need for greater emphasis on feedback strategies in teaching practices.

Table 5: Teacher discusses with students about their work

	Scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never (0 time)	43	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Rarely (1 time)	123	41.0	41.0	55.3
	Sometime (2 times)	40	13.3	13.3	68.7
	Normally (3 times)	55	18.3	18.3	87.0
	mostly (4 times)	35	11.7	11.7	98.7
	Always (5 times or more)	4	1.3	1.3	100.0
	Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Statistical Interpretation of Table 5: *Teacher Discusses with Students about Their Work*

This table presents the frequency distribution of 300 participants' responses regarding how often teachers discuss students' work with them, a key component of formative feedback and individualized support. The most frequently selected response was "Rarely (1 time)", reported by 41.0% of respondents, suggesting that teachers seldom engage in direct discussions about student work. 14.3% indicated that teachers "Never" hold such discussions, meaning that more than half (55.3%) perceive this important feedback behavior as either absent or very infrequent. 13.3% selected "Sometime (2 times)", and 18.3% reported "Normally (3 times)", indicating some engagement in this practice but still not widespread. 11.7% of respondents said teachers "Mostly (4 times)" discuss work with students, while only 1.3% observed that this happens "Always (5 times or more)", reflecting very limited consistency in regular discussions. The cumulative percentage reveals that 87.0% of respondents believe this practice occurs three times or fewer, showing that meaningful dialogue about student work is not common in most classrooms.

Conclusion

The data indicates that teacher-student discussions about academic work are infrequent, with over half (55.3%) reporting it happens rarely or never, and only 13% experiencing it frequently (mostly or always). This reveals a critical shortfall in interactive and formative assessment practices, which are essential for clarifying learning goals, addressing misconceptions, and supporting academic growth. Efforts to promote reflective dialogue and individualized feedback between teachers and students could significantly enhance the quality of instruction and student learning outcomes.

Table 6: Teacher writes comments for parents about work

	Scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never (0 time)	65	21.7	21.7	21.7
	Rarely (1 time)	76	25.3	25.3	47.0
	Sometime (2 times)	52	17.3	17.3	64.3
	Normally (3 times)	43	14.3	14.3	78.7
	mostly (4 times)	36	12.0	12.0	90.7
	Always (5 times or more)	28	9.3	9.3	100.0
	Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Statistical Interpretation of Table 6: *Teacher Writes Comments for Parents About Work*

This table illustrates how frequently teachers write comments for parents regarding students' academic work, based on the responses of 300 participants. The highest percentage of respondents (25.3%) reported that teachers "Rarely (1 time)" write such comments, followed by 21.7% who said "Never (0 time)". This means that nearly half (47.0%) of the teachers are seldom or never engaging in written communication with parents about student performance. A moderate portion of respondents noted occasional engagement: 17.3% reported "Sometime (2 times)", 14.3% chose "Normally (3 times)". A smaller group of participants indicated more frequent communication: 12.0% responded "Mostly (4 times)", and 9.3% reported "Always (5 times or more)". The cumulative percentage indicates that 64.3% of respondents observed this practice occurring only occasionally or less, while just 21.3% reported it happening regularly (mostly or always).

Conclusion

The data suggests that teacher communication with parents through written comments about student work is generally infrequent. With nearly two-thirds (64.3%) of respondents reporting low engagement in this practice, there appears to be a significant gap in home-school communication. Since parental involvement is strongly linked to student success, these findings highlight a need to strengthen communication channels between teachers and parents to foster better support for student learning.

Table 7: Teacher writes reports of student's performance

	Scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never (0 time)	13	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Rarely (1 time)	130	43.3	43.3	47.7
	Sometime (2 times)	47	15.7	15.7	63.3
	Normally (3 times)	49	16.3	16.3	79.7
	mostly (4 times)	54	18.0	18.0	97.7
	Always (5 times or more)	7	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	300	100.0	100.0	

This table shows how often teachers write reports about students' performance, based on responses from 300 participants. The most frequent response was "Rarely (1 time)", selected by 43.3% of

participants, suggesting that nearly half of the teachers provide performance reports only once or infrequently. Only 4.3% reported that teachers "Never" write such reports, indicating that this practice is not entirely absent, but largely inconsistent. A combined 31.7% indicated moderate to regular engagement, with: 15.7% choosing "Sometime (2 times)", 16.3% choosing "Normally (3 times)". 18.0% of respondents said teachers "Mostly (4 times)" write reports, while a minimal 2.3% observed that this happens "Always (5 times or more)". The cumulative percentage reveals that 63.3% of respondents believe teachers write reports two times or fewer, whereas only 20.3% see this practice happening frequently (mostly or always).

Conclusion

The data indicates that teachers do write reports on student performance, but for the majority (63.3%), this occurs infrequently. Only a small proportion (20.3%) observe consistent reporting. These findings suggest that while reporting is a known practice, it is not uniformly or regularly implemented. Strengthening this process could enhance accountability, student monitoring, and communication with stakeholders, thereby supporting academic progress and informed instructional decisions.

Table 8: Teacher ticks or crosses work with comments.

	Scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never (0 time)	37	12.3	12.3	12.3
	Rarely (1 time)	88	29.3	29.3	41.7
	Sometime (2 times)	72	24.0	24.0	65.7
	Normally (3 times)	7	2.3	2.3	68.0
	mostly (4 times)	25	8.3	8.3	76.3
	Always (5 times or more)	71	23.7	23.7	100.0
	Total	300	100.0	100.0	

This table presents the frequency distribution of how often teachers mark students' work using ticks or crosses along with comments, based on responses from 300 participants. The most common response was "Rarely (1 time)", reported by 29.3% of respondents, followed closely by "Sometime (2 times)" at 24.0%, indicating that over half (53.3%) perceive this practice as occasional or infrequent. 12.3% of respondents reported that teachers "Never" use this marking method with comments, highlighting a lack of engagement in this feedback strategy in some classrooms. Only 2.3% selected "Normally (3 times)", indicating very low regular usage. On the other hand, 23.7% reported that teachers "Always (5 times or more)" tick or cross students' work and include comments, reflecting a strong, consistent feedback practice among nearly a quarter of teachers. 8.3% reported "Mostly (4 times)", indicating a moderate frequency. The cumulative percentage shows that 65.7% of respondents experience this practice no more than two times, while only 32.0% observe it regularly (mostly or always).

Conclusion

The data reveals that tick or cross marking with comments is not consistently applied across classrooms. Although nearly a quarter of teachers always provide this form of feedback, the majority of students (over 65%) experience it only occasionally or not at all. This suggests a gap in the consistent use of constructive, visible feedback, which can be instrumental in guiding student

improvement. Encouraging regular use of such feedback strategies could greatly enhance learning outcomes and student engagement.

Table 9: Teacher pastes stickers or stars on student's work.

	Scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never (0 time)	35	11.7	11.7	11.7
	Rarely (1 time)	103	34.3	34.3	46.0
	Sometime (2 times)	52	17.3	17.3	63.3
	Normally (3 times)	32	10.7	10.7	74.0
	mostly (4 times)	24	8.0	8.0	82.0
	Always (5 times or more)	54	18.0	18.0	100.0
	Total	300	100.0	100.0	

The table presents the frequency distribution of how often teachers use stickers or stars as a form of reinforcement on student work, based on responses from 300 participants. A majority of teachers (46%) reported using this technique "Never" (11.7%) or only "Rarely" (34.3%), indicating it is infrequently practiced by nearly half of the sample. 17.3% of teachers used stickers or stars "Sometimes" (2 times), while 10.7% reported doing so "Normally" (3 times). More frequent use is seen in 8% of teachers who used it "Mostly" (4 times), and 18% who "Always" (5 times or more) paste stickers or stars on students' work. The cumulative percentages show that approximately 63.3% of teachers use this strategy two times or less, while only 36.7% use it more regularly (three times or more).

Conclusion

While a small group of teachers consistently uses stickers/stars as positive reinforcement, the overall trend suggests that this practice is not widely adopted across the sample. Most teachers either do not use it or do so only occasionally, which may reflect differences in motivational strategies or classroom management styles.

Table 10: Teacher writes correct answer if students make mistakes.

	Scale	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never (0 time)	4	1.3	1.3	1.3
	Rarely (1 time)	120	40.0	40.0	41.3
	Sometime (2 times)	57	19.0	19.0	60.3
	Normally (3 times)	32	10.7	10.7	71.0
	mostly (4 times)	56	18.7	18.7	89.7
	Always (5 times or more)	31	10.3	10.3	100.0
	Total	300	100.0	100.0	

Statistical Interpretation of Table 10: "Teacher writes correct answer if students make mistakes" This table summarizes how frequently teachers write the correct answer in students' work when they make mistakes, based on responses from a sample of 300 participants. The most common response was "Rarely", selected by 40.0% of the teachers, indicating that a large proportion do not

routinely write correct answers when students err. 19.0% reported doing it "Sometimes" (2 times), and 10.7% reported it as a "Normal" practice (3 times). More consistent use of this practice was seen in 18.7% of teachers who reported "Mostly" (4 times) and 10.3% who reported "Always" (5 times or more) writing the correct answer. Only 1.3% of respondents indicated they never write the correct answer when students make mistakes. The cumulative percentage shows that 60.3% of teachers write the correct answer two times or less, while 39.7% use this corrective method more frequently (three times or more).

Conclusion

The data suggests that while **most teachers (60.3%)** use this practice **infrequently**, a significant minority (**nearly 40%**) employ it **regularly**, indicating **mixed approaches** to written corrective feedback. This variation may reflect differences in teaching philosophy or time constraints affecting teachers' marking strategies.

Conclusions And Recommendation

The study concludes that teachers rarely write comments immediately on notebook and only underlines the mistakes committed by the students in their homework. They rarely correct the underlines mistakes. The teachers are found that they never write hints, reminders to correct. Further they rarely write to revise or correct the homework and rarely discuss with students about their work. The study concludes that teachers rarely write comments for parents about work. Sometime they write grades of marks on student's work but rarely tick or cross work with comments. The teachers rarely paste stickers or stars on student's work, rarely display good work before class and rarely write "very good", "Excellent" etc on students' copies. Regarding to the written feedback from the teachers the study concludes that teachers rarely write correct answer if students commit mistakes in their work, rarely ask other students to check the written homework and rarely write for students to assess their homework themselves.

The following recommendations are made on the basis of conclusions of the findings:

1. The written feedback has significant effect on students learning therefore it is recommended to teachers that they should make it a necessary part of their daily academic activities.
2. It is recommended to the principals, head teachers that they should monitor teacher's feedback on students' notebooks on daily basis.
3. It is recommended for the parents that they should check their children notebooks daily and the feedback given to their children by their teachers.

References

1. Ahmed, U., Akhtar, R. N., & Aslam, R. (2020). Formative assessment in elementary English classroom: a case study of semi-government organization of Pakistan. *Academic Research International*, 11(2), 1-9.
2. Brookhart, S. M. (2017). How to give effective feedback to your students. *Ascd*.
3. Din, K. U., & Saeed, M. (2018). Relationship between University Students' English Proficiency, academic achievement and their satisfaction on teacher feedback. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 40(3), 129-143.

4. Ghazali, N. H. C. M., Abdullah, N., Zaini, S. H., & Hamzah, M. (2020). Student teachers' conception of feedback within an assessment for learning environment: Link to pupil aspiration. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 39(1), 54-64.
5. Harks, B., Rakoczy, K., Hattie, J., Besser, M., & Klieme, E. (2014). The effects of feedback on achievement, interest and self-evaluation: the role of feedback's perceived usefulness. *Educational Psychology*, 34(3), 269-290.
6. Hattie, J. (2003). Teachers Make a Difference, What is the research evidence?.
7. Hattie, J., & Gan, M. (2009). Instruction based on feedback. In *Handbook of research on learning and instruction* (pp. 263-285). Routledge.
8. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.
9. Javed, T. (2017). Effect of classroom environment, motivation and teacher feedback on academic achievement of secondary school students in Pakistan (Doctoral dissertation, Mohi-Ud-Din Islamic University Nerian Sharif Aj&K).
10. Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in higher education*, 31(2), 199-218.
11. Nyiramana, C. (2017). Constructive feedback to students: a tool to enhance educational quality. *ZEP: Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik*, 40(2), 14-17.
12. Panadero, E., & Romero, M. (2014). To rubric or not to rubric? The effects of self-assessment on self-regulation, performance and self-efficacy. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 21(2), 133-148.
13. Parr, J. M., & Timperley, H. S. (2010). Feedback to writing, assessment for teaching and learning and student progress. *Assessing writing*, 15(2), 68-85.
14. Reddy, J. N. (2019). *Introduction to the finite element method*. McGraw-Hill Education.
15. Sadler, D. R. (2014). Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. In *Approaches to assessment that enhance learning in higher education* (pp. 55-70). Routledge.
16. Sendziuk, P. (2010). Sink or Swim? Improving Student Learning through Feedback and Self-Assessment. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22(3), 320-330.
17. Shute, V. J. (2007). Focus on formative feedback. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2007(1), i-47.
18. Smith, E. C., Starratt, G. K., McCrink, C. L., & Whitford, H. (2020). Teacher evaluation feedback and instructional practice self-efficacy in secondary school teachers. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(4), 671-701.
19. Strijbos, J. W., Narciss, S., & Dünnebier, K. (2010). Peer feedback content and sender's competence level in academic writing revision tasks: Are they critical for feedback perceptions and efficiency?. *Learning and instruction*, 20(4), 291-303.
20. Stronge, S., Osborne, D., West-Newman, T., Milojev, P., Greaves, L. M., Sibley, C. G., & Wilson, M. S. (2002). The Facebook Feedback Hypothesis of personality and social belonging. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 44(2).
21. Thompson, A. M., Wiedermann, W., Herman, K. C., & Reinke, W. M. (2021). Effect of daily teacher feedback on subsequent motivation and mental health outcomes in fifth grade students: A person-centered analysis. *Prevention Science*, 22(6), 775-785.
22. Thompson, M., & Wiliam, D. (2007, April). Tight but loose: A conceptual framework for scaling up school reforms. In *annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. Chicago, IL.

23. Zumbrunn, S., Marrs, S., & Mewborn, C. (2016). Toward a better understanding of student perceptions of writing feedback: a mixed methods study. *Reading and Writing*, 29(2), 349-370.