

## Effect of Feedback Technique on the Development of Reading Comprehension in English Language at Secondary Level

\* Sardar Muhammad

\*\* Dr. Bushra Ahmad Khurram

\*\*\* Dr. Zahoor-ul-Haq

### Abstract



Teaching as a profession demands both skills and competence from teachers. The key purpose of the study was to find the effect of feedback techniques on students' achievement in reading comprehension skill at the secondary level. An experimental research design was employed, explicitly the most appropriate a pre-test post-test equivalent group design. Sixty male students from two sections (A and B) of Class 10 at (Government Higher Secondary School No 2, Gulbahar, Peshawar), were carefully chosen as the sample by administering a pre-test. Based on their pre-test scores, learners were similarly distributed in 02 groups of 30 each (Experimental & Control groups). Both groups were comparable in terms of ability. Within each group, students were further categorized as high achievers and low achievers based on their pre-test scores. The treatment of feedback technique was given to the Experimental Group whereas the control group acquired instructions through conventional teaching method over the course of 08 weeks. Two well trained teachers with nearly equal teaching experience and abilities delivered the lessons according to the pre-prepared lesson plans. After eight weeks, both groups underwent post testing. The results showed a significant effect of the feedback technique compared to conventional teaching method. Therefore, it is recommended that the feedback method is effective for teaching English but requires teacher expertise.

**Keywords:** Feedback Technique, Reading Comprehension, Second Language, Achievement

### Introduction

Feedback has been extensively studied in the field of education (Burke, 2010; Berger and Pope, 2011; Jarzowski et al. 2012; Lyster et al. 2013; Mory, 2004). Feedback refers to any information or guidance provided following the response of students (Lee, 2013). McGrath et al. (2011) states that feedback is a system that helps communicate to students about their performance or task. It can be referred to instructional feedback to students' works, coursework or achievements (Askew, 2000). Feedback is vital both in enhancing knowledge and skills, stimulating learning, and improving achievement (Narciss & Huth, 2004).

English language is perceived as a symbol of power and authority in Pakistan (Khurram, 2015) perhaps because it is strongly supported by Pakistan's language-in-education policy (Khurram 2009). Proficiency in English is often a requirement for admission to higher secondary schools, universities, competitive exams, and better employment opportunities (Mansoor et al. 2005). Despite the importance of English in Pakistan, it appears that without consistent and structured effort on the parts of teaching fraternity, students may struggle to acquire the social, cultural, and academic capital required for higher education and professional success (Jimenez & Rose, 2010).

Corrective feedback is an instructional approach in which teachers adapt their responses to students' efforts so as to help them improve and modify their learning output (El Tatawy, 2002). Corrective feedback includes error correction, negative feedback, or negotiated help. According to Long (2007) and Rahimpour (2010), productivity might be demonstrated in the shape of student understanding which is the correlation between feedback, collaboration, and attainment as: a) collaboration change makes information comprehensible, b) comprehensible information promotes

\* Ex Senior Instructor, RITE, Peshawar. Email: [sardarmuhammad228@gmail.com](mailto:sardarmuhammad228@gmail.com)

\*\* Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Karachi Sindh  
Email: [bushrakhurram@yahoo.com](mailto:bushrakhurram@yahoo.com)

\*\*\* Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Bacha Khan University Charsadda.  
Email. [zahoorulhaq@bkuc.edu.pk](mailto:zahoorulhaq@bkuc.edu.pk)

accomplishment, and participatory change promotes attainment. For language development both corrective feedback and learner uptake are considered effective processes (Long, 2007). Teachers must consider the following when giving corrective feedback: i) should students' mistakes be amended? ii) In that case, when it be corrected? iii) which of this ought to be corrected? iv) What is best way to correct it? v) by Whom it should be corrected? (ibid.)

Otavio (2010), a language researcher, discussed the right time to give corrective feedback in his ELT page and in another article published by mcser.org and highlighted the effectiveness of correcting errors. His papers indicate the positive effect of delayed feedback on fluency and accuracy. Another researcher proposed that it would be an effective strategy if corrective feedback was rescheduled until the end of the interaction. However, he explains that this may not be valid every time.

Liu (2008) claimed that teachers should not interrupt students during communication activities to correct errors because interruption may stress students and hinder their message. He suggests that 'mistakes' ought to be dealt with afterward the activity. That is to say, students' errors may be noted and then discussed with them once the class activities are finished. However, it is possible that students would not remember the situation where an error occurred. Despite that, delayed instructional feedback might help learner of a target language by building confidence to rectify one's own mistakes which in fact is more useful than merely highlighting the error (ibid.).

Firwana (2010) deliberate the influence of EFL tutors' views regarding oral mistakes on pupils' attitude, their choices of error correction strategies. Teachers must ensure to understand when to deliver corrective feedback. With respect to this, the educator must be familiar with the students' attitudes towards feedback, as well as the utility and practicality of corrective feedback to be able to apply feedback successfully and effectively. Likewise, teachers should decide whether to provide immediate or delayed corrective feedback so as to maximize its effectiveness. Cohen et al. (cited by Pierson, 2005) indicate that the following criteria influence the effectiveness of corrective feedback: i) student is physically prepared for rectification with sufficient information of the relevant arrangement; ii) he has adequate duration to process and internalize the correction; iii) Corrective feedback is documented in a notebook by the learner; and iv) it is verified by the learner with a language teacher or a proficient speaker.

### **Theoretical Basis of Feedback**

According to Lobato (2004) theories and studies of feedback date back nearly 100 years and ascended from early behaviorist perspective that emphasized behavior change. Within this perspective, constructive feedback was considered "positive reinforcement", while negative feedback was viewed as "punishment". Together, reinforcement and punishment, were believed to influence learning; consequently, feedback was hypothesized to be valuable (ibid.). Though, a key limitation of this perspective is that the process of feedback is conceptualized as largely passive. Recent interpretations argue that feedback plays a pivotal role in developmental learning processes (Li, 2010). Feedback may activate learning, but it can disrupt the learning process if designed or delivered poorly.

Hattie and Timperley (2007) reported that a meta-analysis of research on feedback revealed an average effect size of 0.41. This indicates that clusters receiving feedback on average advance their specific control clusters by 0.41 standard deviation—the equal of touching after the 50th to the 66th percentile on a standardized test. Despite this result, researchers have found it difficult to determine the reason behind effectiveness of certain types of feedback over others, even after more than a century of research (Margolis, 2010; Burke, 2010; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Other investigations have focused on identifying the key characteristics of effective feedback (Morrow, 2006; Johnston, 2004).

Modern educational theorists challenge traditional behaviorist stimulus–response account of learning that are based on stimulus-response associations (Hollan, 2008). Recent feedback research emphasizes the learner's active role in the process of learning (Carless, 2022). Studies also investigate the type of feedback provided and the context in which it is delivered (Ajjawi et al., 2022). Increasingly, researchers recognize that feedback must correspond with the perceptions of the learner, which are shaped by prior knowledge, skills and motivation (Fyfe & Rittle-Johnson, 2016). In other words, learners must construct meaning that requires regulation of one's own cognitive processes, known as self-regulation.

Winne and Baker (2013) contended that both external feedback (e.g., instructor feedback) and internal feedback (e.g., learners' self-evaluation) shape learning. Together, these feedback processes support self-regulation by enabling learners identify learning needs, plan strategies and maintain effort. What needs to be emphasized is that instructor feedback is not meant to dictate learning goals or focus. Instead, it compliments learners' self-regulation processes by helping them understand their current standing relative to learning goals or focus and determine subsequent next steps.

Hattie (2009) studied these mechanisms, along with many others, to develop a comprehensive model of feedback that emphasizes its role in learning. His analysis employed the lens of formative assessment questions - Where and how am I going? Where to next? – which he referred to as “feedback queries”. This framework identifies four levels of feedback: (1) feedback regarding the task (e.g., feedback regarding the accuracy of the answers or guidance on obtaining more information), (2) feedback regarding the processing of the tasks (e.g., feedback about what strategies were used or could be used), (3) feedback about self-regulation (e.g., feedback about evaluation of students by themselves), and (4) feedback regarding student as an individual (e.g., statements about whether the learner is "good" or "smart"). The level at which the learners attend to feedback significantly affects its effectiveness. The most beneficial feedback is regarding the characteristics of the task and procedures employed to complete it. Feedback addressing learners' abilities or goals for self-regulation may be effective when it is presented in a way that helps students realize that success results from effort and strategic engagement. In contrast, remarks such as "Good girl!" does not make students focus on learning or understanding. Hence, feedback can either advance learning or become an uncertain element that disrupts it.

### **Purpose of feedback**

The core goal of feedback is to enhance learners' knowledge, skills, comprehension or general abilities (e.g., problem-solving) (Masantiah et al., 2020). To achieve this end, different kinds of feedback can be used, such as, response specific, goal oriented, instantly delivered, delayed and others (Jaehnig & Miller, 2007). There are various formats of feedback that perform different function, but the primary aim of feedback is to make learner reflect on questions such as: What can I do? What can I not do? How does my work compare with that of my peers? What can I do to improve? The purpose of these questions is to help learners reorganize, reassess, refine and plan strategies to attain one's goal. The purpose of feedback is to keep learners on track and to help learners reach the targeted level of learning, as research indicates that good feedback is targeted, precise and timely (Hattie and Timperley, 2003).

### **Reading Comprehension**

Mikulecky (2008) considers reading as one of the most important communicative skills in an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) context. It is essential for students to become proficient in the written form of English and to develop richer vocabulary, and reading plays a vital role in this process (Hasan et al., 2023). Reading is a complex system of higher order cognitive processes, involving various types of thinking, including evaluating, judging, conceptualizing, reasoning and working-out a problem (Iqbal et al., 2023). Other researchers contend that reading is a psycholinguistic activity in which the reader reconstructs the meaning encoded by the writer, highlighting the complex functioning of the human mind. Furthermore, the researchers have highlighted that reading incorporates knowledge from various fields of study such as education, sociology, theoretic and adapted linguistic and psychology. Reading is process of understanding the content of the written material (Price et al.2010). The three basic models of reading comprehension are the Bottom-Up, Top-Down, and Interactive models.

According to Grabe and Stoller (2014), readers engage with texts for various purposes and they employ reading strategies to meet their reading goals. A reader may scan for specific information such as a phone number in a telephone directory, skim for grasping the general idea of the text, or engage in close reading for detailed understanding (Khurram, 2023). To comprehend the content efficiently, readers may employ various other reading strategies as well including making predictions, activating prior knowledge, recognizing key information, making inferences, or guessing meaning of unfamiliar words from context (Khurram, 2017). Since readers need to ‘orchestrate’ the use of various strategies during reading (Khurram, 2015), reading to learn in both academic and professional setting is a complex skill to acquire. Put differently, what makes reading a demanding skill to learn is the fact that it requires identifying main and supporting ideas, understanding text structure, connecting new

information with existing knowledge, critical evaluation of the given information and so on (Khurram, 2020). It seems pertinent to mention here that during reading for enjoyment readers may give a quick read or may read for extended periods to fully experience the narrative (Grabe & Stoller, 2014).

### **Extensive Reading**

Extensive reading is a well-established method for teaching reading as a second or foreign language. It has been used as a language learning approach over more than fifty years. Ponniah (2006) was the pioneer of the term 'extensive reading'. According to him, extensive reading involves reading substantial amount of text at a fast pace, with an emphasis on understanding meaning over focusing on linguistic elements. Day and Bamford (2002) also defined extensive reading along similar lines. Harmer (2007) further emphasizes that involves reading longer texts to achieve global understanding, rather than detailed analysis. Accordingly, the main goal of extensive reading is to promote authentic reading purposes such as reading for pleasure and information.

Renandya, and Jacobs (2002) further explain that 'extensive reading' is a process of teaching or learning a language that entails reading (a) large quantities of texts; (b) for global or general comprehension; (c) for the purpose of personal enjoyment; (d) in a personalized manner, allowing learners to select texts according to their preference, (e) and the books – often graded readers - are not subjected to detailed classroom analysis. As a teaching strategy, extensive reading encourages positive reading habits and develop vocabulary and language structure knowledge.

In this study, thirty students in the experimental group were instructed in reading comprehension skills using the technique of corrective feedback. Since in the annual secondary-level board examination papers, reading comprehension is a core question and requires effective feedback and text comprehension, systematic planning was undertaken to develop reading comprehension skills of students. The post-test results showed that the scores of the treated (experimental) and untreated (control) groups differed significantly. In comparison to the control group, the experimental group received a better score.

### **Achievement in School**

Indicators of students' achievement in school

Learner commitment is one of the most well-recognized predictor of achievement (Wilkins, 2016). When learners are actively engaged in learning, they demonstrate better academic performance as well as enhanced social outcome (Khurram, 2018). Effective instructional practices that promote learner engagement include role modeling appropriate academic and social conduct, giving opportunities for students to react to course material, and offering academic and behavioral feedback. The proverb '*Nothing succeeds like success*' highlights how achievement reinforces further effort.

There are various types of indicators of students' achievement, including cognitive development, emotional development, social development and skills development. Additional indicators include change in behavior, good friends/peers relationship, aptitude development, abstract and verbal aptitude, numeric ability, spatial relationship, mechanic reasoning, manual dexterity, students belief about their abilities, confident, interest, attention, understanding, increase effort/hard work challenging, intrinsic motivation, learning oriented and strong requisite for success. The extent to which a learner strives for accomplishment is called his or her need for Achievement (Mc Clellandetal, 2012).

### **Statement of the problem**

Acquiring proficiency in language, especially in reading comprehension, is essential for both academic success and efficient communication as English language learning is important for all students if they want to lead. Therefore, in this context different studies were conducted on various feedback techniques. Nonetheless, there is a paucity of data regarding the efficacy and implementation of feedback strategies in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistani public schools, particularly with regard to reading comprehension. The feedback technique and its effect, for the development of reading comprehension in English language at secondary level in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa was the focus of the researchers' investigation as limited literature is available in this area of study.

### **Research objectives:**

- a. to examine the effect of feedback techniques on the secondary school students reading comprehension achievement.
- b. to study the effect of feedback learning techniques on the low achiever learner's achievement in reading comprehension skill.

- c. to analyses the effect of feedback learning techniques on the high achiever learner's achievement in reading comprehension skill.

**Hypotheses:**

Null hypotheses were tested for this study.

**Significance of the Study**

As mentioned earlier, there is a scarcity of study on the feedback techniques in teaching English language skills, particularly reading comprehension. In this regard, this study aims to open new avenues for novice researchers. Moreover, the study is expected to be beneficial for teachers, administrators, planners, curriculum developers and learners in the field of education in the long run.

**Methodology**

**Research Design**

To determine whether an intervention has any effect, pre-test post-test designs are used to evaluate a variable both before and after the intervention. According to Bachman & O'Brien, although these designs are useful for examining interventions, they may be prone to biases and must be diligently devised and put into action (2019). A (pre-test) (post-test) matched group research design was used in this investigation. Using the pair random sample technique, participants were chosen at random. Subsequently, they were assigned to either an experimental group, which received corrective feedback, or a control group, without any feedback strategy. Many previous studies have frequently used this research design to investigate whether corrective feedback strategy has any influence on language learning (Farzaneh & Tahriri, 2021). To examine the impact of the intervention, both control and experimental groups received a pre-test and post-test before and after the intervention. The pre-test assessed students' vocabulary knowledge prior to the intervention, while the post-test measured their reading comprehension development after the implementation of corrective feedback strategy.

**Population**

For the current study, the population consisted 433,405 students of Grade-X in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (EMIS, 2023).

**Sample**

Following the analysis of pre-test scores, a sample of 60 male students from sections "A" and "B" of class 10<sup>th</sup>, at (government shaheed Ahmad Elahi, technical higher secondary school, gulbahar No. 02, Peshawar) were included in this study. To ensure equal representation in both experimental and control groups, pair random sampling technique was used to assign students to both groups each consisted of 30 students. Students in the both groups were subsequently classified into high and low performing categories bases on their mean score results. Thus, two equivalent groups were constituted having almost equal average scores.

**Research instrument**

Two teacher made tests were developed by the researchers. These tests were used to evaluate how the students constituting the sample performed. Each test consisted of 50 reading comprehension items. These lessons were taught to the students for the purpose of the research. To develop the test items, the researchers thoroughly studied the relevant literature, reference books and visited IELTS and TOEFL websites. Furthermore, the test was designed collaboratively with coauthors, foreign language experts and educators, and were duly vetted to ensure their validity for Grade-X students.

**Pilot-testing Results**

A pilot study with 45 students at Government higher secondary school, Gulbahar, Peshawar was conducted. After evaluating results of the pilot test and response of the participants, the researcher made some adjustments to the items of the test. Particularly, in section A, question numbers 1 and 3 were found to be overly simplistic, while question numbers 31 and 32 (section D) were perceived to be challenging. Similarly, modifications were made to question number 11, 12, 13, 18 (section B). New questions were added in Section C in place of questions 27, 28, and 29. Additionally, question numbers 45, 47, and 48 (section D), were considered inappropriate for the test and were thus removed.

**Validity**

It is crucial to verify the validity before administration of the test. To achieve this, the researchers collaborated with experienced researchers and language experts to ensure the content validity of the instrument. Items of the test were chosen diligently from Grade-X English textbook. Furthermore, subject specialists and language experts reviewed the instrument and established its validity.

**Reliability**

Split Half approach, which divided the test items into odd and even groups, was used to evaluate the pilot test's dependability. The ones classified as even were designated as Test-B, while the ones classified as odd as Test-A. On May 19, 2022, sixty 10th graders from (Government Higher Secondary School No. 2, Gulbahar in Peshawar City) were included in this test. To determine the overall reliability, Pearson's "r" formula was utilized, yielding a value of 0.99, indicating reliability that is almost perfect. For research studies, the reliability coefficient for tests should be 0.70 or higher as per Frankel and Wallen's (2003) guidelines. Therefore, the test was desirable owing to its high reliability coefficient.

**Procedure of the study**

For the present study, the researcher ensured similar parameters for both groups such as time duration, the timings of the class, the length of the treatment, course material, and qualifications of the teachers. The instructor of control group was 46 years old and his experience in teaching was 21 years while 45 years old instructor having 20 years of experience in teaching had taught to experimental group. Both instructors were colleagues in that institution (government Higher Secondary school, Gulbahar No. 2, Peshawar) and held same designation (CT). Instructor had given instructions to the students in experimental through "corrective feedback techniques," whereas the control group received instruction via conventional methods. The intervention spanned for 08 weeks, comprised of 06 sessions per week and each session lasting 35 minutes.

**Treatment**

For this study, Two English instructors were assigned to instruct Grade-X students participating in this study employing both traditional and feedback-based learning methods. The teacher who was assigned with the responsibility to teach control group continued teaching through conventional teaching methodologies in the selected uniform lessons from the textbook of English for the both groups. Whereas the instructor who was the assigned with the responsibility to teach experimental group, underwent 03 days training prior to treatment on the provision of written corrective feedback, especially for the experimental group which was given the treatment was closely monitored and supervised. Both the teachers served as research assistants in this study. Corrective feedback was provided daily to the experimental group from October 1, 2022, to November 30, 2022 constituted 02 months period. Upon the completion of intervention, both the experimental and control groups were assessed through a posttest in order to find the effectiveness of feedback learning techniques in enhancing reading comprehension in English language. The post test scores of both groups were then compared and analyzed.

**Data Analysis**

Using the t-test for independent samples, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences application was used to evaluate the data gathered during this research investigation

**Results**

**Table 1. Comparison of Experimental and Control Groups in Reading Comprehension on Pretest Score**

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Df	t-table value	t-calculated value
Experimental	30	23.8566	5.56785	1.02018	58	1.671	.164
Control	30	23.1230	5.51775	.99117			

*\*Not Significant level of significance (0.05)*

Table 1 shows that the calculated t-value was lower than critical t value at 0.05 level of significance on pretest score. Consequently, the null hypothesis was accepted indicating there was no statistically significant difference between the groups. The results confirmed that both groups were comparable with respect to achievement in English reading comprehension and possessed similar levels of the targeted language skill i.e. reading comprehension before the intervention.

**Table 2. Comparison of Experimental High Achievers and Control Group High Achievers in Reading Comprehension on Pretest Score**

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t-table value	t-calculated value
Exp. high achievers	19	5.4211	1.42657	.32728	32	1.697	0.041
Control high achievers	15	5.4000	1.54919	.40000			

*\*Not Significant level of significance (0.05)*

## Effect of Feedback Technique on the Development of Reading.....Muhammad, Khurram & Haq

Table 2 shows that the calculated t-value was lower than critical t value at 0.05 level of significance on pretest score. Consequently, the null hypothesis was accepted indicating there was no statistically significant difference between the high performing students of experimental and control groups. The results confirmed that both groups were comparable with respect to achievement in English reading comprehension and possessed similar levels of the targeted language skill i.e. reading comprehension before the intervention.

**Table 3. Comparison of Experimental Group Low Achievers and Control Group Low Achievers in Reading Comprehension on Pretest Score**

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Df	t- table value	t-calculated value
Read							
Exp. low achiever pre-test	11	3.3636	1.56670	.47238	24	1.711	0.200
Reading comprehension low achiever control group pre-test	15	3.4667	1.06010	.27372			

\*Not significant

Significance

Table 3 shows that the calculated t-value was lower than critical t value at 0.05 level of significance on pretest score. Consequently, the null hypothesis was accepted indicating there was no statistically significant difference between the low performing students of experimental and control groups. The results confirmed that both groups were comparable with respect to achievement in English reading comprehension and possessed similar levels of the targeted language skill i.e. reading comprehension before the intervention.

**Table 4. Comparison of Experimental and Control Groups in Reading Comprehension on Posttest Score**

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Df	t-table value	t-calculated value
Experimental	30	39.300	5.96628	1.08929	58	1.671	10.450
Control	30	22.300	6.61842	1.20835			

\* Significant

Significance level = 0.05

Table 4 shows that the calculated t-value was higher than critical t value at 0.05 level of significance on post-test score. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating there was statistically significant difference between the groups. Thus, the results confirmed that experimental group exceeded with respect to achievement in English reading comprehension than control group on post-test results. It shows that feedback method was more effective than routine method.

**Table 5. Comparison of Experimental Low Achievers and Control Group Low Achievers in Reading Comprehension On Posttest Score**

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t-table value	c-calculated value
high achievers Exp.	17	8.7059	.68599	.16638	30	1.697	9.067
high achievers control post	15	5.6667	1.17514	.30342			

\*Significant

Significance level = 0.05

Table 5 shows that the calculated t-value was higher than critical t value at 0.05 level of significance on post-test scores. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating there was statistically significant difference between the high performing students of Experimental and control groups. Thus, the results confirmed that experimental group exceeded with respect to achievement in English reading comprehension than control group on post-test results. It shows that feedback method was more effective than routine method.

**Table 6. Comparison of Experimental Group High Achievers and Control Group High Achievers in Reading Comprehension on Posttest Score**

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t-table value	t-calculated value
Reading comprehension Exp. low achievers post-test	13	7.0000	1.29099	.35806	26	1.706	8.357
Reading comprehension control low achievers post-test	15	3.4000	.98561	.25448			

\*Significant

Significance level = 0.05

Table 6 shows that the calculated t-value was higher than critical t value at 0.05 level of significance on post-test scores. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating there was statistically significant difference between the low performing students of Experimental and control groups. Thus, the results confirmed that experimental group exceeded with respect to achievement in English reading comprehension than control group on post-test results. It shows that feedback method was more effective than routine method.

### Discussion

The results of this study revealed that the reading comprehension of the students was alike on pretest scores before the initiation of the experiment, indicating there was no statistically significant difference between the groups at 0.05 level of significance. The results confirmed that both groups were comparable with respect to achievement in English reading comprehension and possessed similar levels of the targeted language skill i.e. reading comprehension before the intervention.

However, the post-test conducted after the intervention revealed a significant improvement in performance among the experimental group in contrast to the control group, rejecting the null hypothesis. Thus, the feedback strategy was found to be effective in enhancing reading comprehension. Similarly, in reading comprehension, Low achievers and high achievers of the experimental group outperformed the control group of low achievers and high achievers, taught through traditional method of teaching English. The results of the study align with previous studies of Hattie and Temperley (2008); Lyster and Ranta (1997) “feedback is the consequence of performance. Further, the findings of the study are consistent with the studies conducted by Shabani and Shams (2021) and also with the study of Xiang and Chen (2021), that verifies its usefulness of corrective feedback in learning vocabulary. Shabani and Shams discovered that Iranian EFL learners showed a preference for feedback written by their peers rather than feedback provided by their teachers. Xiang and Chen (2021) states in their research study where they noted a preference among learners for explicit correction and clarification requests. Thus, the present study supports previous research studies on feedback in language teaching, emphasizing the values of incorporating such techniques into language teaching practices to enhance language competence.

### Conclusion:

On the basis of the results of the study, it was determined that students in feedback-based learning method showed significant dominance in learning reading comprehension over students learning reading comprehension through traditional /conventional language method. Further, feedback-based learning methods demonstrate greater efficacy for teaching English as a foreign language in comparison to conventional language teaching especially in the context of low achievers because feedback-based learning method provides more opportunities to students in reading comprehension. Similarly, high achiever students who were taught through feedback-based learning performed better than students who were taught through conventional language teaching methods in reading comprehension on post-test.

### Recommendations

This study concluded that feedback-based learning strategy was effective in improving student’s reading comprehension. Owing to the findings of the current study, it is recommended that to enhance the reading comprehension skills of students, teachers should use the feedback technique in the classroom as per need and demand. It is also suggested that teachers must be adequately trained to utilize it in the language lessons properly where it might be useful.

### References:

- Ajjawi, R., Kent, F., Broadbent, J., Tai, J. H. M., Bearman, M., and Boud, D. (2022). Feedback that works: A realist review of feedback interventions for written tasks. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47 (7), 1343-1356.
- Attali, Y., and Powers, D. (2010). Immediate feedback and opportunity to revise answers to open ended questions. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 70 (1): 22-35.
- Benoit, W. L., and Holbert, R. L. (2008). Empirical intersections in communication research: Replication, multiple quantitative methods, and bridging the quantitative–qualitative divide. *Journal of Communication*. 58: 615-628.
- Berger, J., and Pope, D. G. (2011). Can losing lead to winning? *Management Science*. 57(5): 817–827.

- Black, P., and Wiliam, D. (2003). "In Praise of Educational Research: Formative Assessment". *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(5): 623-637.
- Burke, D. (2010). The reception of feedback by students, in *Giving Students Effective Written Feedback*, 69-123. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill & Open University Press.
- Carless, D. (2022). From teacher transmission of information to student feedback literacy: Activating the learner role in feedback processes. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 23(2), 143-153.
- Day, R. R., and Bamford, J. (2002). Top ten principles for teaching extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 14: 136-1.
- El Tatawy, M. (2002). Corrective feedback in second language acquisition. *Working papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 1-19.
- EMIS. (2016). Annual Statistical Report of Government Schools, Elementary and Secondary Education Department, Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.
- Farooq, R. A. (2001). *Understanding Research in Education*. Rawalpindi; University of Arid Agriculture.
- Firwana, S. S. S. (2010). *Impact of Palestinian EFL teachers' attitudes toward oral errors on their students' attitudes and choice of error treatment strategies* (Doctoral dissertation, Boston College).
- Fyfe, E. R., & Rittle-Johnson, B. (2016). Feedback both helps and hinders learning: The causal role of prior knowledge. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 108(1), 82.
- Grabe, W., and Stoller, F. (2014). Teaching reading for academic purposes. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. Brinton and M. Snow (Eds.) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed.) (pp. 189-205). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Hasan, Z., Khurram, B. A. and Iqbal, A. (2023). An Impact of Explicit Teaching of Reading Strategies on the Reading Motivation of Pakistani ESL Learners. *Sir Syed Journal of Education and Social Research*, 6, (2), 126-137.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning – a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London: Routledge.
- Hattie, J. (2003). Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence? *Paper presented at the Australian Council for Educational Research Annual Conference on Building Teacher Quality*. Melbourne, Australia
- Hattie, J., and Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1): 81-112.
- Hollan, P. C. (2008). Cognitive versus stimulus-response theories of learning. *Learning & behavior*, 36(3), 227-241.
- Iqbal, A., Khurram, B. A. and Hasan, Z. (2023). Impact of Strategy Based Reading Instructions on Reading Anxiety of University Level ESL Students of Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Educational Research*, 6, (2), 575-587.
- Jaehnig, W., & Miller, M. L. (2007). Feedback types in programmed instruction: A systematic review. *The psychological record*, 57(2), 219-232.
- Jiménez, R., & Rose, B. (2010). Knowing how to know: Building meaningful relationships through instruction that meets the needs of students learning English. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(5), 403-412.
- Khurram, B. A. (2023). The Impact of Metacognitive Instruction on ESL University Level Students' Awareness and Use of Reading Strategies. *SAGE Open*. April-June 2023, 1-13.
- Khurram, B. A. (2020). The Impact of Metacognitive Instruction on Pakistani University Level ESL Students' Regulation of the Reading Strategies. *ELF Annual Research Journal*, 22, 1-26.
- Khurram, B. A. (2018). Promoting learner engagement in a large university level ESL class in Pakistan. In H. Kuchah and F. Shamim (eds) *International Perspectives on Teaching English in Difficult Circumstances* (pp. 73-88). United Kingdom: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Khurram, B. A. (2017). The Reading Strategies of Skilled Pakistani University Level Students. *ELF Annual Research Journal*, 19, 79-95.
- Khurram, B. A. (2015). *Promoting metacognition of reading strategies in a higher education context in Pakistan* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick).
- Khurram, B. A. (2009) Hegemony, Discrimination and Inequality in Language-in Education Policy of Pakistan. *SPELT Quarterly*, 13 (4), 1-12.

- Lee, I. (2013). Research into practice: Written corrective feedback. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 108-119.
- Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language learning*, 60(2), 309-365
- Liem, A. D., Lau, S., and Nie, Y. (2008). The role of self-efficacy, task value, and achievement goal in predicting learning strategies, task disengagement, peer relationship and achievement outcome. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*. 33: 486–512.
- Long, M. (2007). *Problem in SLA*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language teaching*, 46(1), 1-40.
- MacMahon, M. K. C. 'Sweet, Henry (1845–1912)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36385>, accessed 29 May 2016].
- Margolis, D.P. (2010). Handling oral error in feedback in language classrooms. *Minne WITESOL Journal*.
- Masantiah, C., Pasiphol, S., & Tangdhanakanond, K. (2020). Student and feedback: Which type of feedback is preferable? *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 41(2), 269-274.
- Wilkins, S., Butt, M. M., Kratochvil, D., & Balakrishnan, M. S. (2016). The effects of social identification and organizational identification on student commitment, achievement and satisfaction in higher education. *Studies in higher education*, 41(12), 2232-2252.