

**ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL**Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>

Vol. 04 No. 01. July-September 2025. Page#.1656-1669

Print ISSN: [3006-2497](#) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](#)Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)<https://doi.org/10.55966/assaj.2025.4.1.093>**Feedback Dilemma in Higher Education: Perspectives and Practices of Faculty in a Public University****Aliya Kousar**Student, Department of Educational Development,
Karakoram International University, Gilgit-Baltistan**Dr. Zahra Jabeen**Head, Department of Educational Development
Karakoram International University, Gilgit-Baltistan**Dostdar Hussain***

Ph.D. Scholar, Lobachevsky State University, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia

Lecturer, Department of Business Management
University of Baltistan, Skardu, Gilgit-Baltistan, Pakistandostdar.hussain@uobs.edu.pk**Abstract**

The study examined the faculty's perception, preferences, and practice of providing feedback at a public university in Gilgit-Baltistan, Pakistan. A qualitative research design was used, focusing on the design of case studies. Four professors from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities were specially selected to participate in the research. Data was collected using a semi-structured questionnaire. Classroom observations and documentary analysis were used to strengthen the reliability of findings and to triangulate data. The results showed that faculty members primarily conceptualised feedback as a response to student performance, to promote academic growth and development. Written and oral feedback were both recognised as essential, but oral feedback emerged as the most commonly used feedback method. Participants stressed that their choice of feedback method was influenced by the context and nature of the challenge. It is noteworthy that while the practices of some of the professors were in line with the established approaches, in others, inconsistencies were found through observation and documentary evidence. Teachers should therefore be provided with training courses organised by HEC. In addition, teachers should carry out a survey on student preferences for feedback at the departmental level.

Key words: Perceptions, preferences, practices, written feedback, oral feedback, higher education

Introduction

Feedback is a procedure in which a learner is informed about their performance and progression and takes a considerable part to enhance learners' intellectual abilities and overall academic development (Selvaraj et al., 2021). In higher education, feedback is considered a fundamental pedagogical tool for all stakeholders in the academic process (Baartman & Quinlan, 2023; Malik

et al, 2021), which improves the learning process of a learner (Amjad &Awan, 2020; Jurs & Špehte, 2020). Furthermore, it enables students to identify their strengths and weaknesses for improvement, fostering self-awareness and personal growth (Farid et al., 2021; Selvaraj et al., 2021). In different countries and within a country or state, the provision of feedback differs due to cultural, institutional, and policy differences (Gul et al., 2016; Rovagnati et al., 2021). In higher education across Western countries and South Asian countries like Pakistan, feedback is provided through several key methods, reflecting diverse pedagogical approaches (Gul et al., 2016 &Williams, 2024). In many western settings, feedback is often formalized and delivered in detailed, formative, and structured written formats (Carless & Boud, 2018; Malik et al., 2016). Furthermore, Western educators typically emphasized personalized, constructive, and formative written feedback. However, in England, many teachers prefer oral feedback, valuing it for its immediacy, two-way interactivity, and ability to be explicit and implicit, as well as specific and non-threatening (Mapplebeck & Dunlop, 2023).

On the other hand, a study conducted in a Pakistani medical college by Malik et al. (2021) revealed that faculty in a culturally diverse learning environment lack formal feedback practices, with their concepts and techniques both aligning and diverging from the Western literature. Gul et al. (2016) further entailed that in the Pakistani context, written feedback is widely used, particularly in fields like nursing, education, and applied linguistics. Teachers provide comments on students' assignments, pointing out areas for improvement. However, a significant portion of educators tend to directly correct errors instead of giving feedback that promotes self-correction due to time limitations and lack of formal training (Gul et al., 2016).

Despite the well-documented importance of feedback in enhancing student learning outcomes, significant variations remain in how feedback is perceived, practiced, and preferred across different educational and cultural contexts (Boud & Dowson, 2021; Carless & Boud, 2018; Jur & Sphete, 2024; Rovagnati, Pitt, &Winstone, 2021). Moreover, despite the importance of feedback, there is limited research conducted on how feedback operates in a university setting (Morris et al., 2021), especially in the context of Gilgit-Baltistan. Lee et al. (2016) found that faculty shape their feedback practices based on their beliefs and perceptions about students' needs and abilities, and contextual limitations often led to discrepancies between their intended and actual feedback practices. Therefore, this study aimed to explore faculty's perceptions, preferences, and practices of feedback at the university level in one of the public sector universities of Gilgit-Baltistan.

Literature Review

Many studies have shown that teachers' feedback practices are largely influenced by their perceptions and beliefs about feedback, individual teaching philosophies, experiences, cultural and institutional policies, and disciplinary norms (Lee et al., 2016; Rovagnati et al., 2021) For instance, the qualitative research employed by saeli and Cheng (2022) investigated 14 Iranian EFL teachers beliefs in Tehran about students' expectations, institutional guidelines and parents' expectations which direct their feedback decision. Moreover, Saeli and Cheng (2022) found that teachers who perceived feedback primarily as a corrective tool tend to focus on error-correction and grading, whereas those who viewed feedback as dialogic placed greater emphasis on comments that encouraged self-correction. In other words, teachers' underlying conceptions of

what feedback is for directly influenced how they enacted it in the classroom. Most studies have found that teachers consider feedback as an important tool for the teaching-learning process, as it develops intellectual abilities and different skills (Amjad & Awan, 2020; Jurs & Špehte, 2020; Malik et al., 2021; Selvaraj et al., 2021). Besides, feedback encourages a good relationship between the teacher and the learners, which helps the learners to improve their learning (Fonseca et al., 2015). There are various kinds of feedback (Aprilia et al., 2023), but written and oral feedback are two main modes of feedback discussed in many studies (Ali et al., 2023; Adel, 2017; Harnin et al., 2022; Lyster et al., 2013; Quresh et al., 2023). Moreover, the mixed-method study conducted by Gul et al. (2016) in Karachi aimed to explore teachers' perceptions and practices, revealing that written feedback assists the learner to advance the writing skills, which is similar to the study of Aprilia et al. (2023), for instance, improving grammar and lexical errors (Aridah et al., 2017; Berkent et al., 2020; Budianto et al., 2020). Besides, the study by Muhammad et al. (2023) at Government High School Rasool Pur Tehsil Jampur district Rajan Pur Mathematics classes aimed to compare the impacts of oral and written feedback on students' academic achievement discussed that written feedback is very valuable for low achievers, and can be used by a learner for later review (Somba et al., 2016). Many studies have discussed different types of written feedback (Aprilia et al., 2023; Azad, 2014; Salimi & Valizadeh, 2014; Wicaksono, 2017). For example the study of Aprilia et al. (2023) conducted in the English Language Education Program (ELEP), the Faculty of Language and Arts, Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana intended to explore the students' perceptions of teachers' written feedback in academic classes explored three types of written feedback; Positive written feedback, negative written feedback and mixed written feedback (Aprillia et al., 2023), direct feedback, indirect feedback, focused feedback and unfocused written feedback (Wei & Cao, 2020). The literature study by Sia and Cheung (2017) revealed that written feedback is also given with the help of technology to facilitate learning (Sia & Cheung, 2017). Likewise, another literature study by Bashir et al. (2016) revealed that teachers provide feedback using online platforms like WhatsApp and Email. Furthermore, the study by Harnin et al. (2022) intended to explore the teacher perceptions and practices of giving feedback and challenging feedback during online learning through an online questionnaire adapted from Gul et al. (2016) found that teachers also consider marks and comments as types of feedback (Harnin et al., 2022).

A study conducted by Qureshi et al. (2023) to conduct critical discourse analysis of verbal feedback patterns used by EFL teachers in the classroom reported that oral feedback enriches learners' involvement and promotes in-depth learning by encouraging two-way communication and reflection. However, Lyster et al. (2013) argued that no single type of corrective feedback can fully address all aspects of language learning, such as communication skills and curricular objectives. In light of this, a qualitative study employed by Sawaluddin and Tajjuddin (2017) at the University of Sultan Zain Ul Abidin, Malaysia, emphasized the need for teachers to develop a better understanding of the effective use of different types and timing of corrective feedback to dress students' oral errors more successfully. Additionally, an action research with a qualitative nature by Somba et al. (2016) at Jaffery Secondary School reported that teachers found oral feedback valuable for interpreting students' body language, which assists in determining their comfort with a given topic and provides opportunities for students to seek further clarification.

Many studies have shown various types of oral feedback preferred by teachers in an academic setting, i.e., recast and explicit, clarification request and repetition, meta-linguistic feedback, and elicitation (Sabio, 2023; Sawaluddin & Tajjuddin, 2017). Additionally, Mendez and Cruz (2012) conducted a descriptive study in a Mexican university and discussed unfocused oral feedback. Furthermore, Sawaluddin and Tajjuddin (2017) found that teachers generally preferred providing explicit types of feedback, such as explicit correction, meta-linguistic explanations, and clarification requests, over implicit feedback strategies like implicit correction, repetition, and elicitation in their teaching practices. Sawaluddin and Tajjuddin further added that they give delayed feedback, which is meant to save time and avoid interruption while the students are speaking. Explicit corrective feedback: In this type of feedback, the learner's errors are corrected directly by the teacher, making it beneficial for those who cannot identify their own mistakes (Qureshi et al., 2023). However, Cubukcu and Aksak (2020) reported that this type of feedback is not very beneficial as it does not promote active learning; instead, it makes the learner passive. Recast/Implicit Feedback: Implicit/ recast feedback is a type of feedback where a learner is given a clue to identify and correct their errors themselves, promoting active learning Quresh et al., 2023; Mapplebeck & Dunlop, 2019; Sabio, 2023). Meta-Linguistic Feedback: Meta-linguistic feedback provides students with specific clues that help them identify and correct errors in their utterances (Cubukcu & Aksak, 2020). Repetition: In repetition, the teacher emphasizes students' errors by replicating the wrong part of the utterance with rising intonation (Cubukcu & Aksak, 2020). Elicitation: In elicitation, the teacher encourages the learner to identify and correct their errors by prompting them to self-correct or reformulate their utterances (Cubukcu & Aksak, 2020).

Moreover, a meta-linguistic approach was found to be most effective and preferred for teaching grammar, while recasts were preferred for vocabulary and pronunciation instruction; in contrast, elicitation and clarification requests were the least utilized techniques in teaching English at secondary schools in Sudan (Hussein & Ali, 2014). Similarly, Cubukcu and Aksak (2020) reported that in second language acquisition contexts, at universities and primary schools in Turkey, recast corrective feedback was the most commonly used, whereas explicit feedback was the least preferred. Likewise, in the context of China, the teachers in higher education give preferences to facilitative feedback over praise (Gan, Zhujun & Liu, 2021). A study conducted in Pakistan by Shehzadi and Irshad (2022) reported that teachers in Pakistan mostly preferred oral feedback compared to written one. Moreover, the faculty has no expertise or training on how to provide oral feedback accordingly. Similarly, various studies (HosseiniZade et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2016) found that teachers' practices are mostly based on their perceptions and beliefs; however, there is a noteworthy discrepancy between teachers' beliefs regarding feedback and what they actually practice in the class. Therefore, this study aimed to explore faculty's perceptions, preferences, and practices of feedback at the university level in one of the public sector universities of Gilgit-Baltistan.

Research Questions

1. What is the faculty's perception of feedback to students at the university level?
2. How does the faculty prefer to give feedback to students at the university level?
3. What feedback practices are employed by the faculty at the university level?

Research Methodology

This study adopted the qualitative research design focusing on case study design in order to explore faculty's perceptions, preferences, and practices of feedback at a public sector university in the context of Gilgit Baltistan. Qualitative research, as defined by Aspers and Corte (2019), involves an iterative process to develop an in-depth understanding by closely engaging with the phenomenon. It is particularly effective in examining human behaviors, opinions, and complex ideas (Akyildiz & Ahmed, 2021; Samaduzzaman et al., 2014). This approach enabled the researcher to investigate the variation in feedback practices and their alignment with students' preferences. Data was collected through interviews, observation, and document analysis for comprehensive insights. A convenience sampling strategy was used. Four faculty members from Arts and Humanities were chosen based on their willingness and accessibility, which is called a convenience sampling strategy (Andrade, 2021).

Data was collected through semi-structured interviews in order to explore the perceptions, preferences, and practices of feedback (Mannon, 2020), which was triangulated through classroom observations and document analysis for the validation of findings. Faculty interviews covered 13 open-ended questions. The semi-structured interview protocol was developed after a thorough literature review. Moreover, four unstructured, non-participatory classroom observations captured real-time feedback interaction in natural settings. Field notes documented faculty feedback methods, tones, and context (Jamshed, 2014; Smritirekha, 2019). Institutional document analysis, feedback policies, assessment rubrics, and a sample of feedback were analyzed to understand formal feedback structure (Armstrong, 2021; Bowen, 2009).

Firstly, semi-structured interviews of the four faculty members were conducted after taking their consent. The interviews were recorded through a phone recorder, and along with the interviews, the researcher also analyzed the documents. Then she went through classroom observations to get more insights into the findings. The researchers undertook a meticulous analysis of the data, following the six stages of data analysis outlined by Braun and Clark, i.e., familiarization with data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report. This structured approach enabled a deep and nuanced evaluation, leading to insights that were both comprehensive and enlightening. Each stage was carefully executed to ensure that every detail was captured and understood, contributing to a robust understanding of the research findings. A strict code of ethics was upheld throughout the research. Institutional involvement was obtained through letters of informed consent. Through these consent letters, it was ensured that they participated willingly.

Findings

Perceptions of Faculty about Feedback

Faculty perceptions of feedback fall into four main categories: feedback as an individual response, feedback as a source of improvement, feedback as a source of development, and feedback as a mentor's instruction. Feedback was mentioned by all the faculty as a source of improvement. Three faculty members considered feedback as a reaction of an individual to a learner's performance. For instance, faculty A stated, "In my opinion, feedback is a response to my students' learning, achievement, performance, and behavior, aimed at either enhancing their development or acknowledging their efforts". Similarly, faculty D stated, "Feedback is a source

of guidance by a mentor for learning". He further stated that feedback helps learner what to learn"? All faculty members considered that it is a source of improvement however; faculty A further entailed the purpose of feedback "as to improve and assess students, particularly through formative assessment, where it focuses on correction, encouragement, and reinforcement". Likewise, faculty D reported that "I see feedback as source of development". He further explained that "I focus on three areas; their cognitive development where students develop their intellectual abilities; personal development where the emphasis is on their character building, and their skill development, which focuses on students writing, speaking, and their analyzing skills". Moreover, faculty A and D considered marks as a form of feedback.

Preferences and practices of faculty for the feedback mechanism

All four faculty members considered both written and oral feedback as important in higher education, and both forms of feedback were observed in their practices. Three out of four faculty members (A, B, and D) reported that they give feedback according to the nature of the task or situation, whereas one faculty member stated that he gives feedback according to students' preferences.

For instance, faculty A stated that "Mostly, it depends on the nature of the task. At times, I give oral feedback, and sometimes I go for written feedback. Moreover, I believe written and oral feedback go hand in hand. At times, immediate oral feedback is necessary. In such cases, you cannot wait to provide feedback later in written form, like writing an appreciation letter the next day. On the other hand, when students complete written tasks such as essays, assignments, OHTs, or projects, it becomes essential to provide written feedback to guide them. She claimed that she provides direct, indirect, focused, unfocused, detailed, general, individual collective feedback and digital feedback. From the document analysis and classroom observations, it was evident that the faculty was practicing all the types of feedback mentioned in her interview. In addition, she was also practicing uncoded feedback, general comments, informal feedback, and marks as feedback. Though she was practicing all the types but she was frequently using oral-focused feedback using rubrics.

Similarly, faculty B mentioned that she gives both written and oral feedback based on the nature of the task or situation. Moreover, she preferred to give explicit, implicit, general collective feedback, focused, and digital feedback. For instance, she stated, "I am mostly teaching the course 'teaching practicum". So, all the associated concepts that come under teaching practicum, for example, the student, how to develop an exam paper? How to develop: syllabus organization, comparing different levels in terms of syllabus progression, or the lesson plan itself. So depends on the nature of the task, I usually give feedback to students". She further articulated that she gives written feedback on lesson plans or written tasks while giving oral feedback on presentation of micro or macro teachings. Moreover, she mentioned the nature of oral feedback that "...Most of the time I give oral feedback, because students are large in number, so sometimes it becomes very difficult to check each and every student's work and give them individual feedback so most of the time I give just general and collective feedback, but at specific times". She further added that "I mostly prefer giving direct feedback. As teachers, we often view our students like our own children, so nothing should be hidden from them. That is why I believe in being open and clear, providing direct feedback in front of the class when necessary. Even if

the mistake is made by a few students, I often give general feedback to the entire class so that everyone can learn from each other's experiences. At times, I also give indirect feedback, though I am not always certain what qualifies as indirect feedback. For instance, when I notice a mistake but want to avoid discouraging a particular student, I use collective general feedback, which I consider indirect feedback. Ultimately, I give direct feedback because students are in the learning process, and they need to be clearly informed about where they are going wrong. If they are not meeting the requirements of a task or assignment, it is important that they understand their mistakes so they can improve". Here, it can be noticed that the concept of faculty about indirect feedback deviated from the concept present in the literature. She merged the two different types of feedback into one category.

From the classroom observations and document analysis of faculty B, it was evident that she was teaching the course "long-term teaching practicum". She was practicing both the forms of feedback, written and oral, according to the task or situation. She said that she used to give written feedback on lesson plans or written tasks while giving oral feedback on micro-teaching, macro-teaching, and presentations, which are aligned. The nature of feedback observed through document analysis and classroom observations was direct, indirect, focused, unfocused feedback and general collective feedback. Though she often practiced written feedback but she frequently provided oral feedback which was explicit, focused, and collective in nature. On the other hand, the faculty C claimed that she provides focused feedback, direct and detailed feedback on written tasks, i.e., tests and assignments. She articulated that "In writing, it is direct, detailed, and focused. It deals with their grammatical and structural mistakes. Therefore, my focus is on content and language especially on written assignments, tests, and in final papers". She further stated that "In written, I highlight students' major mistakes, grammar, spelling, sentence structure and content". She further added that "In oral, during presentations and during class participations, I correct their mistakes" and further specify it by articulating that "In, oral, it is always implicit". Hence, from the document analysis and classroom observation, it was evident that she gave written feedback on students' tests. However, no assignment with feedback was observed. The nature of written feedback was focused, as the focus was on grammar, sentence structure, content, and spelling mistakes. Furthermore, no detailed feedback was observed, neither in written nor in verbal form. Moreover, through document analysis, it was found that her written feedback was both implicit and explicit. This showed a misalignment between teachers' feedback preferences and feedback practices. On the other hand, oral feedback was implicit, but it was negligible. For instance, the teacher was teaching a subject, "Renaissance Drama," and the topic was "The Duchess of Malfi," written by John Webster. The teacher had been teaching this topic for the last two days. After a short review, she posed a question.

Teacher: The Duchess' decision to marry Antonio secretly shows her desire for autonomy and love. Can you think of a reason why she might have chosen to keep the marriage a secret?

Student: Because she was afraid of her brothers, and she was certainly not given her rights.

Teacher: Why was she afraid of her brothers?

Student: I think her brothers were powerful, mean, and strict. But why were they doing so much bad to her?

Teacher: That is a good question. Let's explore what happened next. After this, no other feedback was observed. Which means her preferences partially aligned with her practices, creating a gap between what is preferred and what is practiced?

Contrary to the previous views, Faculty D claimed that he gives feedback according to students' preferences, and his students mostly like oral feedback as they feel comfortable with it and do not get engaged with written one. He also mentioned that he gives feedback on cognitive, personal, and skill development of students. So, through classroom observations and document analysis, it was evident that he frequently gave oral feedback, which was mostly focused feedback, but he was practicing explicit and implicit feedback in the classroom as well. For instance, a student was giving a presentation, and he pronounced a word incorrectly, so the faculty corrected the word there and then. He was mostly focusing on the students' content, that what they are presenting, and how they are presenting. Another student from the same group mixed two different themes, so the faculty asked whether it was part of his topic or not. You really think you are presenting it correctly? This is how he was using implicit feedback, focusing on the content. However, he did not mention that he uses implicit feedback; rather, he described that he gives focused and explicit feedback. In addition, he said that marks are a form of feedback, but did not show any tests where he used marks as feedback. This leads to a discrepancy between feedback preferences and feedback practices of faculty at the university level. When a student could not explain his assigned presentation topic then the student apologized, and the teacher himself explained the topic for better understanding, which falls under the category of explicit feedback. At the end, he wrote down the feedback in his diary and then shared it with the students orally. He was sharing positive points and praising the students. Other than this, no other written feedback was observed. The researcher also observed him in an informal setting where he was encouraging his students and using positive words like good, excellent, and well done. This was the evidence that he motivates his students through encouragement.

Discussions

The findings of this study indicated that feedback serves as a vital component in the process of teaching and learning. Feedback is defined as a process whereby individuals provide responses concerning students' learning and achievements. This finding is aligned with the research studies of Jurs and Sphet (2020); Amjad and Awan (2020), which mentioned the feedback as an important part of teaching and learning through which a learner gets necessary information on their learning (Esterhazy, 2018). Another major finding of the study was that feedback brings improvement in a student's academic areas. For example, it facilitates their writing skills, communication skills, intellectual abilities, and analytical skills, parallel to the findings of Adrefiza et al. (2021) and Selvaraj et al. (2021), who stated that feedback enhances intellectual abilities and academic representation like writing skills (Adil, 2017). Furthermore, feedback indicates improvement and is an essential part of academic learning (Malik et al., 2023), which boosts learners' academic representation (Aprilia et al., 2023; Ali et al., 2023). Furthermore, this study showed that all the faculty members agreed that both the forms of feedback; written and oral, are important for enhancing students' learning outcome and all the faculty members expressed a preference for utilizing both forms of feedback, contingent upon the context and nature of the

task aligning with the results of Gul et al. (2016) which reported that written feedback holds same importance as verbal feedback and facilitate students learning for improvement. In addition, all the faculty members employed a variety of feedback types within the feedback forms, which included formal, informal, direct feedback, indirect feedback, focused feedback, general feedback, uncoded feedback, general comments, marks, and detailed feedback, individual or general collective feedback which could be provided in-person or through virtual platforms i.e., Whatsapp or Email lined up with the findings of Saeli and Cheng (2022) which found that technology can be used to provide feedback, like teachers employ Whatsapp and E-mail to provide feedback through audio and video. This study further revealed that general and collective feedback are mostly given when the whole class shows similar strengths and repeats the same mistake over and over again. Moreover, individual feedback is mostly given separately to students, so they could not feel embarrassed aligning with the findings of the study Somba et al. (2016), which declared that when students are provided with separate individual feedback, they feel safe as they do not have to be embarrassed in front of the whole class. Therefore, the faculty calls the individual students to their offices to give them feedback separately and informally. Moreover, this study further stated that faculty provides explicit feedback there and then, so the students may know their mistakes on the spot and do not get confused. And sometimes highlight the mistakes with a green or red pen to make the errors prominent, which is similar to the previous literature that faculty count marks and comments as a form of feedback, thus they find errors and correct them (Harnin, 2022). Additionally, verbal feedback was predominantly spontaneous, administered across various types of tasks, including oral presentations and written assignments, which is also supported by the study of Mepplebeck and Dunlope (2023) reported that oral feedback is a spontaneous reaction to students' achievements. In addition, the study also found that the faculty members particularly prioritized providing verbal feedback which focuses on students' presentations, evaluating aspects such as body language, eye contact, content quality, and overall confidence similar to the study of Shehzad and Irshad (2024) which claimed that faculty mostly uses oral corrective feedback as compare to written corrective feedback.. It was further observed that oral feedback was extended to written tasks, with a significant proportion of it being focused in nature; some instructors provided focused-explicit and focused-implicit oral feedback. In contrast, written feedback was primarily directed toward written academic tasks only, such as tests and assignments/and projects. Like oral feedback, the study also identified several types of written feedback, including focused feedback (both written and without rubrics), unfocused or general comments (e.g., "good", "excellent"), uncoded feedback, marks, detailed feedback, as well as explicit and implicit written feedback. The written feedback was categorized into three distinct types: general-explicit, focused-explicit, and focused-implicit feedback. Though all teachers practiced written and oral feedback with their various types, this study disclosed that some teachers' actual practices differed from their preferences and perceptions agreed with the study of Lee et al. (2016) which accounted that mostly teachers intended feedback gets deviated from actual feedback practices due to contextual factors or students need while the perception and preferences of some teachers aligned with their practices which agree with the findings Saeli and Cheng (2022) reported that teachers practices are parallel to their intended feedback.

Conclusion

In a nutshell, faculty perceives feedback as a reaction of an individual to the learners' performance or achievements. Faculty at the university considers and uses both forms of feedback, oral and written, with their various other types, i.e., explicit, implicit, focused, general, collective, comments, marks, and positive feedback. They mentioned it as an important part of the teaching and learning process. They claimed to provide written and oral feedback with various natures of feedback like implicit, explicit, focused, unfocused, detailed, comments, marks, and individual, collective, formal, and informal feedback. However, in actual feedback practices, it was observed that the faculty mostly practiced oral-focused feedback in the classroom. Though they practiced various other types of feedback but their practices reflect partially what they claimed. It is concluded that teachers' perceptions match with the previous literature. Moreover, some faculty practiced what they intended, but some faculty members' claims did not align with their practices.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study exploring the perceptions, practices, and preferences of faculty and students regarding feedback at the university level, the following recommendations are proposed: This current study found that there is a discrepancy between feedback perceptions and practices of some of the faculty members, so HEC should conduct feedback training sessions for the faculty so they would have the literacy of different types of feedback and know how to provide feedback accordingly. Document analysis revealed that some of the faculty members just underlined the incorrect portion of the students' work without providing explanations or specific comments. This practice may lead to confusion among students, particularly those who may not easily identify or understand the nature of their mistakes. As a result, such feedback does little to support students' learning or improvement. Therefore, it is recommended that instructors provide detailed, constructive, and explicit feedback using clear, specific, and accessible language. This approach not only clarifies the error but also guides students toward improvement, making feedback a more effective learning tool. Teachers should promote a reflective assessment system for their teaching pedagogies. A reflective assessment system encourages both teachers and students to engage in critical thinking about the teaching and learning process. For teachers, it provides an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of their instructional method and feedback strategies. For students, it fosters self-awareness about their learning progress and helps them internalize feedback. Promoting reflection enhances the feedback loop, making it more adaptive and learning more meaningful. Teachers should be aware of the effectiveness of the feedback they provide to their students to make teaching more effective.

References

Adel, D. (2016). Written corrective feedback effects on developing students' writing capacities: The case of second-year students of English at the University of Annaba–Algeria. *Journal of Social Studies and Research, University of Martyr Hama Lakhdar*, 22, 7–20.

- Ahmadi-Azad, S. (2014). The effect of coded and uncoded written corrective feedback types on Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(5), 1001–1008. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.5.1001-1008>
- Ali, H. V., Prasatyo, B. A., & Sari, F. (2023). Students' views of teacher's feedback in L2 writing class. *Dialectical Literature and Educational Journal*, 8(2), 58–62.
- Amjad, A. I., & Awan, A. G. (2020). The effect of feedback of students on teaching and learning: A critical and comprehensive analysis. *Global Journal of Management, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 6(4), 895-927. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5767-6229.895>.
- Andrade, C (2021). The Inconvenient Truth about Convenience and Purposive Samples. *Indian J Psychol Med*, 43(1), 86–88.
- Aprilia, C., Listyani, & Palupi, V. U. (2023). Teacher's written feedback in academic writing class: Students' perceptions. *Prominent: Journal of English Studies*, 6(2), 103–126. <https://doi.org/10.24176/pro.v6i2.10106>
- Aridah, A., Arnowardoyo, H., & Sarira, K. (2017). Teacher practices and students' preferences for written corrective feedback and their implications on writing instruction. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n1p1>.
- Armstrong, C. (2021). *Key methods used in qualitative document analysis*. OSF Preprints. <https://osf.io/ycbme>.
- Aspers, P., & Corte, U. (2019). What is qualitative in qualitative research? *Qualitative Sociology*, 42, 139–160. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-019-9413-7>.
- Baartman, L. K. J., & Quinlan, K. M. (2023). Assessment and feedback in higher education re imagined: using programmatic assessment to transform higher education. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2023.2283118>.
- Bashir, M., Kabir, M. R., & Rahman, I. (2016). The value and effectiveness of feedback in improving students' learning and professionalizing teaching in higher education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(16), 38-51.
- Berkant, H. G., Derer, N. B., & Derer, Ö. K. (2020). The effects of different types of written corrective feedback on students' texting mistakes. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 3(3), 174–187. <https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v3i3.3136>
- Boud, D., & Dawson, P. (2021). What feedback literate teachers do: An empirically-derived competency framework? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48(2), 158-171. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2021.1910928.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>.
- Budianto, S., Sulistyo, T., Widiastuti, O., Heriyawati, D. F., & Marhaban, S. (2020). Written corrective feedback across different levels of EFL students' academic writing proficiency: Outcomes and implications. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 7(2), 472-485. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i2.16569>.
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315-1325.

- Çubukçu, F., & Aksak, K. (2020). Corrective feedback preferences of primary school and university students. *Revista Arbitrada Interdisciplinaria de Ciencias de la Salud: Salud y Vida*, 4(7), 489-507. <https://doi.org/10.35381/r.k.v5i9.668>
- Esterhazy, R. (2018). What matters for productive feedback? Disciplinary practices and their relational dynamics. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1302–1314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463353>.
- Fonseca, J., Carvalho, C., Conboy, J., Valente, M. O., Gama, A. P., Salema, M. H., & Fiúza, E. (2015). Changing teachers' feedback practices: A workshop challenge. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(8), 59-82. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2015v40n8.4>
- Gaikwad, V. (2021). English language learners' response to written corrective feedback. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies (IJELR)*, 8(1), 64-79. doi: 10.33329/ijelr.8.1.64.
- 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 (1), 1-14.
- Gul, R. B., Tharani, A., Lakhani, A., Rizvi, N. F., & Ali, S. K. (2016). Teachers' perceptions and practices of written feedback in higher education. *Journal of Education*, 40(2), 12-25. doi: 10.1234/jed40.2.12
- Harnin, K. N., Padmadewi, N. N., Sulistia Dewi, N. L. P. E., & Suwastini, N. K. A. (2022). Teachers' perception and practices on giving feedback on students' work during online learning. *JISAE (Journal of Indonesian Student Assessment and Evaluation)*, 8(1). doi.org/10.21009.
- HosseiniZade, S. S., Fazilatfar, A. M., & Jabbari, A. A. (2024). Growth mindset EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *Scientific Quarterly Journal of Language Horizons*, 8(2), 99–124.
- Hussein, B. A. E., & Ali, H. I. H. (2014). Rationalizing oral corrective feedback in Sudanese EFL classrooms. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(3), 217–223. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.3p.217>.
- Jamshed, S. (2014). Qualitative research method-interviewing and observation. *Journal of Basic and Clinical Pharmacy*, 5(4), 87–88.
- Jurs, P., & Špehte, E. (2020, May 22–23). *The value and topicality of feedback in improving the learning process*. In Society. Integration. Education: *Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference*, 3, 244–252. University of Liepāja, Latvia.
- Jurs, P., & Špehte, E. (2020, May 22–23). *The value and topicality of feedback in improving the learning process*. In Society. Integration. Education: **Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference**, 3, 244–252. University of Liepāja, Latvia.
- Lee, H. H., Leong, A. P., & Song, G. (2017). Investigating teacher perceptions of feedback. *ELT Journal*, 71(1), 60-68. doi:10.1093/elt/ccw047.
- Lyste.R. Saito, R. and Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 46, 1-40 doi: 10. 1017/S0261444`812000365.
- Malik, A., Kiran, F., & Farooq, F. (2021). Feedback: Different concepts and practices in a culturally different environment - Faculty perceptions. *Pakistan Armed Forces Medical Journal*, 71(2), 655-662.

- Mannan, S. (2020). Best practices of Semi-structured interview method. *Chittagong Port Authority*, 1-12.
- Mapplebeck, A., & Dunlop, L. (2019). Oral interactions in secondary science classrooms: A grounded approach to identifying oral feedback types and practices. *Research in Science Education*, 51(2), 957–982. doi: 10.1007/s11165-019-9843-y.
- Mapplebeck, A., & Dunlop, L. (2019). Oral interactions in secondary science classrooms: A grounded approach to identifying oral feedback types and practices. *Research in Science Education*, 51(2), 957–982. doi: 10.1007/s11165-019-9843-y.
- Morris, R., Perry, T., & Wardle, L. (2021). Formative assessment and feedback for learning in higher education: A systematic review. *Review of Education*, 9(3), 32-92.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3292>.
- Muhammad, S., Nadeem, M., Hussain, S., & Qahar, A. (2023). Comparison of the Impact of Oral and Written Feedback on the Students' Academic Achievement. *International Research Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 4(3), 375-384. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.10500287.
- Qureshi, H. H., Khalil, S. M., & Nisa, Z. U. (2023). Critical Discourse Analysis of ESL Teachers' Oral Feedback Practices. *Global Language Review*, 8 (1), 194-203.
[https://doi.org/10.31703/glr.2023\(VIII-I\).19](https://doi.org/10.31703/glr.2023(VIII-I).19)
- Rovagnati, V., Pitt, E., & Winstone, N. (2022). Feedback cultures, histories and literacies: international postgraduate students' experiences. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(3), 347-359. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2021.1916431.
- Sabio, C. A. (2023). Recast and explicit corrective feedback among language teachers and learners. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 7, 682–691.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7750452>.
- Saeli, H., & Cheng, A. (2022). Teachers' perceptions about feedback and their feedback practices: Are they in line? *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 2-21.
<https://doi.org/10.5070/L423152449>
- Samaduzzaman, M., Farhana, N., & Mou, M. (2014). Exploring the advantages and disadvantages of qualitative data collection methods. *Research Journal of Social Science & Management*, 3(11), 159–168.
- Sawaluddin, S., & Tajuddin, A. J. A. (2017). Oral corrective feedback: Teacher's selection in actual practices. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(5), 74-85. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v7-i5/2976>
- Seker, M., & Dincer, A. (2014). An insight to students' perceptions on teacher feedback in second language writing classes. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 73-83.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n2p73>
- Selvaraj, A. M., Azman, H., & Wahi, W. (2021). Teachers' feedback practice and students' academic achievement: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(1), 308-322. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.1.17>
- Shahzadi, A., & Irshad, S. (2022). Perception of Corrective Feedback in Pakistani ESL Universities Classroom. *Global Language Review*, 7(2), 395-417. [https://doi.org/10.31703/glr.2022\(VII-II\).33](https://doi.org/10.31703/glr.2022(VII-II).33)

- Sia, D., & Cheung, Y. L. (2017). Written corrective feedback in writing instruction: A qualitative synthesis of recent research. *Issues in Language Studies*, 6(1), 61–80.
<https://doi.org/10.33736/ils.478.2017>.
- Smritirekha. (2019). Observation as a tool for collecting data. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research*, 8(5), 48-12-3/7. <https://www.ijmer.in>
- Somba, A., Obura, G., Itevete, B., Njuguna, M., Wandera, N., Mulwa, J., & Omukabe, N. (2016). The use of feedback to engage and empower students to self-regulate their own learning. *Mara Research Journal of Humanity & Social Sciences*, 1(1), 1–12.
- Tümen-Akyıldız, S., & Ahmed, K. H. (2021). An overview of qualitative research and focus group discussion. *Journal of Academic Research in Education*, 7(1), 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.17985/ijare.866762>.
- Wei, W., & Cao, Y. (2020). Written corrective feedback strategies employed by university English lecturers: A teacher cognition perspective. *SAGE Open*, 10(3), 1-12.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020934886>
- Wicaksono, W. P. (2017). Types and frequencies of written corrective feedbacks in adult ESL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Studies*, 3(2), 60-67.
- Williams, A. (2024). Delivering effective student feedback in higher education: An evaluation of the challenges and best practice. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*, 10(2), 473-501. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.3404>.
- Williams, A. (2024). Delivering effective student feedback in higher education: An evaluation of the challenges and best practice. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*, 10(2), 473-501. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.3404>.
- Salimi, A., & Valizadeh, M. (2014). *The effect of coded and uncoded written corrective feedback on the accuracy of learners' writing in pre-intermediate level*. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(2), 16–23. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.2p.16>