



## Navigating Feedback in Higher Education: Insights from University Students in Turkiye

Kubra Karakaya Ozyer<sup>1</sup> 

Submitted: March 15, 2024; Accepted: November 18, 2024; Published Online: December 31, 2024

### Abstract

This study aims to explore university students' experiences and preferences of feedback (types and delivery methods) during their higher education. The research design incorporates a survey combining quantitative and qualitative data to examine university students' feedback experiences and satisfaction. Conducted on 105 students at a state university in Eskisehir, Turkiye, the study employs descriptive statistics and a descriptive analysis to analyze the data, ensuring an authentic representation of feedback practices in higher education. Findings reveal varied feedback delivery methods and types experienced by university students, with written and verbal feedback being prevalent. Despite the commonality of written feedback, a significant preference exists for verbal feedback, highlighting its effectiveness in personal, immediate communication. Video feedback, while innovative, is least received, indicating potential technological and faculty expertise barriers. Learning Management Systems (LMS) feedback, despite its prevalence, is not preferred by students, suggesting a need for more personalized feedback methods. Peer and self-feedback are moderately preferred, reflecting the value of diverse feedback types. However, the established presence of peer feedback does not necessarily translate to a strong preference, possibly due to concerns over peer evaluation pressure or credibility. The study also uncovers a strong preference for timely and immediate feedback, underscoring the importance of prompt responses in the educational experience. The study's implications suggest a need for educational strategies to prioritize student-centered approaches, integrating various feedback types to meet students' diverse needs and preferences effectively. The research underscores feedback's critical role in educational outcomes, advocating for ongoing adaptation in feedback strategies to ensure they are conducive to student growth and learning.

**Keywords:** Higher education, university students, feedback types, Academic Feedback Practices

### Introduction

As in all stages of life, the role of feedback in education is significantly substantial. Particularly during higher education, which is a crucial phase of professional development, learning is facilitated through feedback. Moreover, effective and timely provided feedback fosters the development of self-regulated learning skills, producing individuals who are adept at managing both professional and personal challenges they encounter (Pereira et al., 2016). This skill is immensely valuable in overcoming obstacles in their professional and personal lives (Boekaerts, 1999).

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Educational Science, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Eskisehir, Turkiye, ORCID 0000-0002-0208-7870, [kozyer@ogu.edu.tr](mailto:kozyer@ogu.edu.tr)

## Definition of Feedback and Importance

In the educational landscape, feedback is a fundamental element that provides insights into a learner's performance through educators, peers, or self-reflection, and plays a pivotal role in the teaching and learning ecosystem (McMillan, 2015). It is not only a tool for evaluating students but also a means of guiding them toward their learning objectives, offering direction for improvement (Poulos & Mahony, 2008). As emphasized by Hattie and Timperley (2007), the effectiveness of feedback lies in its ability to significantly influence academic achievement, though its impact depends on factors such as delivery, timing, and the nature of the feedback itself. Effective feedback, when delivered thoughtfully, can reduce ambiguity and eliminate alternative explanations, leading to deeper engagement with learning tasks (Brinko, 1993). It fosters critical thinking, self-regulation, and motivation, all of which are key to students' academic and personal development (Gronlund, 1998; Jonsson, 2013). Personalized feedback is particularly powerful, as it enhances the connection between instructor and learner and strengthens the educational experience (Brinko, 1993). Moreover, feedback is highly valued by students when it is consistent, transparent, and aligned with clear assessment criteria (Poulos & Mahony, 2008). Far from being merely evaluative, feedback enriches the learning process by making it more interactive, personalized, and effective in meeting educational objectives, ultimately supporting both academic success and personal growth within a supportive learning environment (Glazzard & Stones, 2019; McCarthy, 2017).

Feedback plays a crucial role in enhancing the education of university students by helping them identify their strengths and areas for improvement, thus improving both the teaching and learning processes (Brinko, 1993; Poulos & Mahony, 2008). Effective feedback provides university students with valuable information on how to improve their performance, which in turn boosts their motivation and learning outcomes (Poulos & Mahony, 2008). This is particularly important for first-year students, who often require more guidance due to the differences in expectations between school and university. By offering clear direction, feedback can ease the transition to university life (Cameron & Rideout, 2020; Poulos & Mahony, 2008). Moreover, it is essential that feedback aligns with students' expectations and is consistent with effective learning practices to maximize its impact (Poulos & Mahony, 2008). While students value feedback that focuses on the current assignment, they also appreciate feedback that can help them in future modules.

## Types of Feedback

In higher education, instructors utilize feedback by analyzing common examination errors or providing individualized assignment comments. The tone and mode of feedback can range from supportive to critical. Losada (1999) defines positive feedback as fostering support and appreciation, while negative feedback may convey criticism or sarcasm. Kluger and DeNisi (1996) assert the effectiveness of both types in learning, whereas Hattie and Timperley (2007) and Shute (2008) caution against overreliance on negative feedback due to its potential to diminish learner self-efficacy.

Grading, a common feedback form, often lacks comprehensive insights. Conversely, confirmatory feedback merely indicates performance alignment with criteria (Abaci & Ari, 2020). According to Nelson and Schunn (2009), constructive feedback aims to enhance student motivation by highlighting strengths and providing guidance for improvement. Corrective feedback directly presents correct answers (Schimmet, 1998, as cited in Şahin, 2015), while explanatory feedback elucidates the reasoning behind incorrect and correct responses, fostering deeper understanding.

This comprehensive exploration of feedback types underscores its integral role in the educational landscape, emphasizing the need for a nuanced approach that balances positive reinforcement with constructive and corrective measures to foster an environment conducive to learning and development.

## Feedback Delivery Methods

In education, feedback is crucial for student development, manifesting in various forms such as verbal, written, digital, gestural, and through peer and self-assessments. Each modality serves distinct aspects of the learning experience.

Written feedback, a prevalent method, ranges from simple annotations to comprehensive commentaries and rubric-based evaluations. Its durability and detail allow students to revisit and reflect on their work (Nelson & Schunn, 2009). Traditionally favored for its direct communication between educator and student, written feedback provides a precise reference for academic improvement (Malecka et al., 2022).

Verbal feedback, involving oral performance evaluations, occurs naturally in student-teacher and peer interactions (Yang et al., 2006). It excels in conveying nuanced tones and intentions, offering immediate clarification and fostering an engaging learning environment.

Technological advancements have introduced visual and digital feedback channels. Video feedback, for instance, enables nuanced explanations, particularly beneficial for digital assignments. Learning management systems (LMS) facilitate comprehensive tracking of student progress, offering both formative and summative evaluations.

Peer feedback introduces an interactive dimension, enhancing collaborative learning and critical evaluation skills (Topping, 1998). Self-assessment promotes introspection and self-regulation, deepening the learning experience (Boud, 1995).

Each feedback method brings unique benefits to the educational process. Written feedback serves as a durable reference point for students, whereas verbal feedback can more effectively convey tone and immediacy. However, challenges exist, such as the potential for misinterpretation in written feedback and the need for cultural sensitivity in interpreting non-verbal cues. The digitalization of feedback offers a swift and adaptable avenue for personalized feedback, incorporating multimedia elements and interactive platforms to augment the efficacy and accessibility of feedback.

## The Impact of Feedback on Student Achievement

The effect of feedback on student achievement in education is significant and multifaceted, serving as a key lever for enhancing learning outcomes. Feedback, when effectively implemented, can substantially improve student performance by clarifying expectations, providing a roadmap for improvement, and increasing motivation and engagement. Research has consistently shown that feedback has a positive impact on learning, particularly when it is specific, timely, and actionable, enabling students to understand their progress and areas for development. Hattie and Timperley (2007) highlight the importance of feedback in promoting student achievement, emphasizing its role in guiding effective teaching and learning strategies. Shute (2008) further underscores the potential of feedback to enhance learning by providing information that helps students correct misconceptions and build on their knowledge. Moreover, studies by Black and Wiliam (1998), Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006), and Kluger and DeNisi (1996) demonstrate the crucial role of feedback in formative assessment, suggesting that feedback significantly influences students' learning processes and outcomes by fostering a deeper understanding and engagement with the subject matter. These findings collectively affirm the transformative power of feedback in educational settings, marking it as an essential component of effective pedagogy.

## Types of Feedback That Students Find Effective

In the educational landscape, the conveyance of feedback to students is pivotal for their learning and development. This feedback can take various forms, including verbal, written, and digital methods, as well as through gestures, peer and self-assessments. Each modality caters to different aspects of the educational experience, enriching the learning process through diverse means of communication.

Written feedback, widely adopted by educators, hinges on the use of textual comments. This feedback may vary from simple annotations, like punctuation marks on assignments, to more comprehensive strategies such as detailed comments or the application of rubrics to unify evaluation standards. Its durability and precision are highly appreciated, offering students a valuable resource for referencing and fostering future enhancements (Nelson & Schunn, 2009). Students particularly find typed, legible, and easily readable written comments to be exceptionally beneficial (Hepplestone & Chikwa, 2014). Research by Sequeira et al. (2024) highlights the primary benefits of written feedback as its ease of access, the convenience and reusability of its format, and its ability to provide explicit guidance on areas for improvement. Additionally, a study by Bijami et al. (2016) discovered a significant positive correlation between teachers' written feedback and student performance, emphasizing its effectiveness in educational settings ( $r = 0.117$ ,  $p = .015$ ).

According to Gibbs and Simpson (2004), feedback is predominantly delivered in written or verbal forms, yet students don't always grasp the intended message of written feedback. A specific challenge associated with written feedback, especially when it's handwritten, is its potential illegibility, making it difficult for students to understand (Scott et al., 2011). This leads to a scenario where students find verbal (audio) feedback to be interpreted and applied in ways that are both different and more meaningful compared to written feedback. Verbal feedback entails the direct oral communication of performance assessments, such as a teacher providing immediate correction to a student's answer. This approach excels in its ability to express subtle tones and intentions clearly, offering instant explanations and nurturing an interactive and engaging learning atmosphere.

The advent of technology has expanded the horizons of feedback through visual and digital channels. Video feedback, for instance, allows educators to offer nuanced, visual explanations that can be especially beneficial for reviewing performances or assignments that are digital in nature, such as research papers. Screen recording tools facilitate a detailed walkthrough of strengths and weaknesses, potentially offering more impactful insights. In a study by Sequeira et al. (2024), university students identified six key benefits of video feedback through interviews. These advantages include its personalized nature, the ability to deliver a high level of detail with point-by-point explanations, an enhanced understanding of academic performance on specific assignments, its usefulness for future projects, the user-friendly and accessible format, and its role in creating a more personal connection between students and educators. This feedback method stands out for its ability to cater directly to individual learning needs while fostering a more engaged and connected educational experience.

Digital feedback mechanisms, including learning management systems (LMS), offer a platform for tracking student performance over time, providing both formative and summative evaluations. These systems allow for a comprehensive view of a student's progress, facilitating tailored feedback that addresses both process and outcome (Eitemüller et al., 2023). Students have expressed a preference for electronic feedback for several reasons: it allows them to revisit feedback throughout their study program, it is often concise and straightforward, and it is clearly documented for easy reference (Budge, 2011). However, some limitations about electronic feedback have been noted, including a perceived lack of personal touch, the brevity of narrative feedback, and a preference for verbal feedback due to its capacity to provide detailed explanations and clarify points more effectively. This contrast highlights the need for a balanced approach to feedback that leverages the benefits of digital platforms while ensuring the feedback remains personal, detailed, and directly relevant to each student's learning needs.

Peer feedback introduces an interactive dimension to the learning process, enabling students to critique each other's work. This not only enhances collaborative learning but also hones critical evaluation skills, as noted by [Topping \(1998\)](#). Similarly, self-assessment drives learners to reflect on their own efforts by comparing them against predefined criteria, enhancing self-regulation and enriching the educational experience ([Boud, 1995](#)). Conversely, research indicates a strong preference among L2 writing students for teacher feedback, especially for improving writing accuracy. [Lee \(1997\)](#) observes that students are eager for teacher feedback on their writing, believing it aids their learning and depend on it for correcting errors. [Ferris and Roberts \(2001\)](#) argue that addressing writing errors is essential in any writing course. Further, [Birenbaum \(2007\)](#) emphasizes the importance of understanding student preferences in language acquisition, suggesting that knowing what hinders or facilitates learning can influence these preferences and ultimately, the learning outcomes.

Each feedback method brings unique benefits to the educational process. Written feedback serves as a durable reference point for students, whereas verbal feedback can more effectively convey tone and immediacy. However, challenges exist, such as the potential for misinterpretation in written feedback and the need for cultural sensitivity in interpreting non-verbal cues. The digitalization of feedback offers a swift and adaptable avenue for personalized feedback, incorporating multimedia elements and interactive platforms to augment the efficacy and accessibility of feedback.

### **Feedback Practices and Preferences in Turkish Higher Education**

A review of feedback practices within higher education programs in Türkiye reveals a significant focus on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction (e.g., [Kılıçkaya, 2022](#); [Kır, 2020](#); [Kivi et al., 2021](#); [Ölmezer-Öztürk, 2019](#)). For instance, [Ölmezer-Öztürk's \(2019\)](#) study, conducted with EFL instructors at a state university, highlights that educators tend to prioritize the minimization of errors in students' work, while students themselves expect their teachers to primarily address grammatical mistakes. This reflects the emphasis placed on accuracy and explicit grammar teaching. However, aspects such as writing mechanics, punctuation, content organization, and style are often deprioritized, suggesting that certain dimensions of student development may receive less attention.

Research on pre-service teachers in Turkey further indicates a preference for metalinguistic feedback and recasts in second language teaching, demonstrating a focus on providing explanations of grammar rules and their contextual usage ([Kılıçkaya, 2022](#)). In the realm of oral corrective feedback (OCF), practices in the Turkish EFL context vary considerably among instructors and often appear inconsistent with their stated beliefs ([Ölmezer-Öztürk, 2019](#)). These variations point to an incomplete understanding of how teachers' knowledge of OCF is translated into practice, especially across instructors with diverse educational backgrounds ([Kır, 2020](#)).

Beyond the EFL context, other fields in Turkish higher education show different feedback trends. For instance, [Ülper \(2011\)](#) found that university students prefer face-to-face and oral feedback on their draft texts, particularly from their instructors or peers. Similarly, [Erişen \(1997\)](#) observed a discrepancy between instructors' and students' perceptions of feedback practices. While instructors reported consistently providing positive feedback and corrections, students noted that only a subset of faculty regularly engaged in these behaviors. Both groups, however, agreed that corrective feedback was less commonly provided by instructors.

This body of literature suggests a need for further exploration of feedback types and their reception by students in non-language teaching disciplines in Turkey. The predominance of studies in the EFL domain has left gaps in understanding how feedback is practiced and perceived in other areas of higher education, where different pedagogical and disciplinary contexts may demand varied approaches to feedback.



### **Significance of the Research**

The role of feedback in higher education is not only central to student learning and development but also to the broader improvement of educational practices. Despite its recognized importance, significant discrepancies persist between how students and academics perceive and engage with feedback. These differences often center on the purpose, delivery, and utility of feedback, with students frequently expressing dissatisfaction regarding the types and quality of feedback they receive. Research by [Mulliner and Tucker \(2017\)](#) suggests that students often view feedback as insufficiently detailed, lacking in clarity, or disconnected from their learning needs. Moreover, students may not always understand or act upon the feedback provided, indicating a potential gap between the intent of instructors and the actual impact of feedback on student learning outcomes.

This study is significant in that it seeks to bridge this gap by investigating both the types of feedback students encounter and their perceptions of its effectiveness. Given that feedback plays a crucial role in shaping academic achievement, identifying these perceptions can illuminate areas where current practices may fall short of supporting student success. By focusing on student experiences, this research addresses a critical aspect of higher education: aligning feedback practices with the needs and expectations of learners. The findings from this study could inform instructional strategies, helping educators to tailor feedback in ways that enhance student understanding, engagement, and motivation.

Additionally, the study holds importance in its potential to influence curriculum design and teaching methodologies. Understanding how students prefer to receive feedback and which types are most effective for their learning can provide valuable insights for educational institutions aiming to improve their feedback mechanisms. This is particularly relevant in the context of growing student diversity in higher education, where individualized and responsive feedback can support varied learning styles and academic needs. By addressing these challenges, the study not only contributes to the theoretical understanding of feedback but also offers practical solutions for enhancing the educational experience in higher education.

Lastly, this research contributes to a broader body of literature examining the role of feedback in formative assessment, particularly within the context of higher education in Turkey. While much of the existing literature has focused on feedback in language education, this study extends the exploration to a more general academic context, offering insights into how feedback practices are experienced across a range of disciplines. As such, it provides a foundation for further research into feedback practices in non-language teaching fields and highlights the importance of developing feedback systems that are responsive to student needs, ultimately fostering deeper learning and academic success.

By exploring the nuances of feedback in higher education, this study has the potential to inform both theory and practice, driving improvements in educational feedback systems and contributing to the ongoing evolution of effective teaching and learning strategies.

### **Research Questions**

The primary goal of this study is to delve into the experiences and perspectives of university students regarding feedback within their higher education journey. In this context, the research addresses the following questions:

1. What types of feedback do university students encounter during their higher education, and how frequently are these feedback types received?
2. Among the feedback types experienced, which do students perceive as the most effective?

By answering these questions, the study aims to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of feedback dynamics in higher education, exploring how feedback practices can be optimized to meet the evolving needs and preferences of students.

## Research Method

### Design

In the present study, the objective is to identify the types of feedback encountered by university students throughout their higher education journey and to ascertain the characteristics of the feedback with which they are most satisfied. To achieve this, a survey research design incorporating both quantitative and qualitative data has been employed. Survey research is defined as a methodological approach that enables researchers to gather data from a predefined group of respondents (Creswell, 2012). This approach is designed to collect information about individuals' perceptions, thoughts, and behaviors through the administration of structured questionnaires or interviews. The choice of a survey research design for this study stems from its capacity to systematically collect and analyze data pertaining to the feedback experiences of university students without altering the existing conditions. By employing this non-intrusive approach, the research aims to provide an authentic representation of the current state of feedback practices within higher education.

### Participants

The research was conducted on 105 university students at a state university located in Eskişehir, Türkiye. Participants were selected using a convenience sampling method, which involves choosing individuals who are most accessible to the researcher (Creswell, 2012). This approach was deemed suitable for the study's objectives, facilitating the efficient collection of data within the constraints of time and resources.

The demographic distribution of the participants, including gender and academic year level, is presented in Table 1, utilizing frequencies (counts) and percentages to provide a clear overview of the sample composition.

Table 1.  
Characteristics of Participants

Characteristics		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	76	72.4
	Male	29	27.6
Grade Level	Year 1	1	0.95
	Year 2	83	79.0
	Year 3	15	14.3
	Year 4	5	4.76
	Year 5	1	0.95
Total		105	100

The Table 1 reveals a predominance of second-year students (79.0%) in the sample, indicating a higher participation rate from this group. The gender distribution shows a larger representation of female students (72.4%) compared to male students (27.6%), reflecting the demographic composition of the participants in this study.

## **Instruments**

In this study, data collection was carried out using a survey instrument developed by the researcher to gather both qualitative and quantitative data. The survey was meticulously designed to ensure a comprehensive collection of feedback experiences among university students.

The survey instrument is divided into distinct sections, each serving a specific purpose in the data collection process. The initial section of the survey focused on collecting demographic information of the participants, including gender and academic year level. This part was carefully constructed to avoid any questions that could potentially reveal personal identifiers of the respondents, thereby ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.

Following the demographic information, the subsequent section of the survey delved into the core objective of the research: exploring the types of feedback mechanisms students encountered throughout their higher education experience and the frequency of these encounters. Participants were queried on a range of feedback modalities they received, including but not limited to written feedback, verbal feedback, video feedback, and feedback through learning management systems. Additionally, the survey sought to understand the frequency of various feedback types, such as positive, negative, explanatory, constructive, and corrective feedback, providing a holistic view of the feedback landscape within the educational setting.

The final part of the survey presented an open-ended question, asking participants to describe their most valued and effective feedback experience during their higher education journey. This qualitative component aimed to capture the depth and nuances of student perceptions regarding feedback, allowing for richer insights into the impact of feedback practices on student learning and satisfaction.

The survey was digitalized and hosted on Google Forms, a decision that facilitated ease of distribution and accessibility for participants. The online dissemination of the survey enabled a wider reach, allowing students from the specified university to participate in the study at their convenience.

The instrument was first presented to a measurement and evaluation expert and adjustments were made after the feedback received. Then, a pilot study was conducted with three university students and the sections that were not understood or missing were questioned. The students stated that the measurement tool was understandable and adequate.

## **Data Analysis Procedures**

In the analysis of the quantitative data collected from the survey, descriptive statistics were employed to elucidate the distribution and frequency of feedback types encountered by university students. For the purpose of these descriptive analyses, frequencies and percentages were calculated, utilizing the Jamovi 2.3.28 software program for statistical computation.

For the qualitative data within the study, a thorough descriptive analysis was conducted manually. Descriptive analysis in this context is a methodological approach aimed at systematically organizing and summarizing the qualitative responses to provide meaningful insights into the participants' feedback experiences. Initially, the qualitative data were meticulously prepared, involving the removal of responses from participants who provided inaccurate or incomplete answers, ensuring the integrity of the data set.

Subsequently, the process for qualitative data analysis as outlined by [Creswell \(2012\)](#) was followed. The researcher commenced by immersing themselves in the data, an essential step aimed at gaining a comprehensive understanding of the participants' perspectives. This was achieved through an exhaustive reading of all responses, a practice that ensures a deep familiarity with the content and nuances of the data.



This preliminary engagement with the data set the stage for a more structured analysis, where responses were categorized and themes were identified. The qualitative analysis aimed to capture the depth of the students' experiences and perceptions regarding feedback, highlighting the complexities and variations in their responses. Through this meticulous process, the study endeavors to uncover the underlying patterns and thematic elements within the qualitative data, contributing to a richer and more nuanced understanding of feedback practices in higher education.

### Ethics

The research was conducted within the framework of the Declaration of Helsinki (Williams, 2008). Participants were voluntary and all were informed in advance and their consent was obtained.

## Findings

### Delivery Methods and Types of Feedback Experienced by University Students

Findings reveal the methods and types of feedback experienced by university students. This study aimed to uncover the feedback modalities and types received by university students throughout their higher education journey. Survey results presented in Table 2 indicate a variety of feedback experiences.

Table 2.

The Frequency of University Students Experiencing Feedback Delivery Methods in Their Courses

Feedback Delivery Methods	Every Course	In most courses	In a few courses	None in Any Course
Written Feedback	7 (6.6%)	34 (32.08%)	51 (48.11%)	14 (13.21%)
Verbal Feedback	9 (8.49%)	39 (36.79%)	56 (52.83%)	2 (1.89%)
Feedback with Video	0 (%)	3 (2.91%)	42 (40.78%)	58 (56.31%)
Feedback with Learning Management Systems (such as Canvas)	14 (13.21%)	38 (35.85%)	42 (39.62%)	12 (11.32%)
Peer Feedback	10 (9.52%)	27 (25.71%)	56 (53.33%)	12 (11.43%)
Self-Feedback	38 (35.85%)	35 (33.02%)	28 (26.42%)	5 (4.72%)
Feedback to the Class/Group	7 (6.6%)	38 (35.85%)	55 (51.89%)	6 (5.66%)
Individual (One-on-One) Feedback	20 (19.05%)	31 (29.52%)	48 (45.71%)	6 (5.71%)

Table 2 presents comprehensive data on the frequency with which higher education students experience various types of feedback and their delivery methods. Written feedback emerges as a common communication tool between instructors and students, with nearly half of the surveyed students (48.11%) receiving written feedback in 'a few courses'. Additionally, 32% of participants reported receiving written feedback in 'most courses', indicating its frequent use by academics particularly in the context of evaluating student performance and enhancing the learning process. This suggests that academic written communication remains central to the educational experience.

Verbal feedback is similarly widespread, with 52.83% of students receiving it in 'a few courses' and 36.79% in 'most courses'. These findings highlight the continued effectiveness of verbal feedback in facilitating interactions between instructors and university students, potentially preferred over written feedback in situations requiring immediate and direct communication.

Feedback via video, however, presents a notable finding: a significant majority of students (56.31%) reported never receiving feedback through video. This may indicate that video-based feedback is not yet a common practice in higher education, possibly due to limitations in technological infrastructure and resources.

Feedback provided through Learning Management Systems (LMS) is received by 39.62% of students in 'a few courses' and 35.85% in 'most courses'. These data suggest an increasing utilization of digital platforms and LMS tools in the feedback process, likely accelerated by the shift to online education following the COVID-19 pandemic and the February 6 earthquake. With the rise of remote and hybrid learning models, the use of such platforms for feedback is expected to grow.

Peer feedback is highlighted as a crucial aspect of the learning process, with a majority of students (53.33%) receiving this form of feedback in several courses. Additionally, 25.71% of respondents indicate receiving peer feedback in most courses. These findings suggest that while fully developed collaborative learning environments are not yet widespread in higher education, there are ongoing efforts to establish and enhance them.

Self-feedback is notably prevalent, with 35.85% of students engaging in this reflective practice in every course and an additional 33.02% in most courses. This high incidence (69.87% combined) suggests a strong emphasis on self-assessment and personal development within the higher education curriculum. The ability for students to critically evaluate their own work and progress is crucial for lifelong learning and autonomy.

Classroom or group feedback is experienced by 51.89% of students in several courses, underlining the prevalence of collective feedback practices. Furthermore, 35.85% of participants report receiving this type of feedback in most of their courses. On the other hand, individual (one-on-one) feedback remains a pivotal component, with 45.71% of students receiving it in a few courses and 29.52% in most courses. This personalized method facilitates direct and tailored feedback from instructors, addressing each student's unique needs and progression. These results may indicate instructors' tendencies to provide feedback in a group setting, which could stem from challenges such as large class sizes or the extensive teaching loads faced by faculty members.

The study also inquired about the types of feedback university students encounter in their courses. The responses to this question are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3.  
The Frequency of University Students Experiencing Feedback Types in Their Courses

Feedback Types	Every Course	In most courses	In a few courses	None in Any Course
Positive Feedback	5 (4.72%)	43 (40.57%)	53 (50.0%)	5 (4.72%)
Negative Feedback	0 (0%)	16 (15.09%)	69 (65.09%)	21 (19.81%)
Confirmatory Feedback	11 (10.38%)	49 (46.23%)	38 (35.85%)	8 (7.55%)
Feedback by Giving Points (Grade)	48 (45.28%)	33 (31.13%)	18 (16.98%)	7 (6.6%)
Constructive Feedback	6 (5.77%)	38 (36.54%)	46 (44.23%)	14 (13.46%)
Corrective Feedback	10 (9.43%)	37 (34.91%)	56 (52.83%)	3 (2.83%)
Explanatory Feedback	13 (12.26%)	27 (25.47%)	63 (59.43%)	3 (2.83%)

Positive Feedback is received with moderate frequency, with the majority of students (50%) encountering it in a few courses and a substantial portion (40.57%) in most courses. This suggests a general inclination

towards reinforcing students' achievements and encouraging aspects of their work, yet it also indicates that such feedback is not universally applied across all courses.

On the other hand, negative Feedback, which can be crucial for identifying areas of improvement, is less frequently reported, with a significant majority (65.09%) receiving it only in a few courses and a notable portion (19.81%) not receiving it at all. This might reflect a cautious approach by educators to avoid discouraging students, or it could signify a preference for more constructive forms of critique.

Confirmatory Feedback, which validates students' accurate understandings or skills, is notably prevalent, with a significant proportion of students (56.61%) receiving it in most or all courses. This feedback type plays a crucial role in reinforcing learning and assuring students of their knowledge and abilities. However, its frequent use may have unintended negative implications for the learning process. The primary limitation of confirmatory feedback lies in its focus on what is already understood or performed well, without addressing the underlying reasons for students' shortcomings or providing guidance on how to overcome these deficiencies. Consequently, for students eager to enhance their learning and development, confirmatory feedback alone may offer limited opportunities for growth. This underscores the need for a balanced feedback approach that not only acknowledges correct understanding but also critically addresses areas of improvement, thereby fostering a more comprehensive learning experience.

Feedback through Points or Grades emerges as the most frequently encountered method, with a significant 76.41% of students experiencing this form of feedback in most or all of their courses. This highlights the enduring significance of grades as a foundational element of academic evaluation. The motivational effects of grading on students and its contributions to the learning process are perennially debated topics in educational research. When used in isolation, the impact of grading on both a student's academic progression and self-regulation skills is minimal. This underscores the necessity for a more nuanced feedback strategy that transcends mere grading to include detailed, constructive feedback that can genuinely foster student growth and learning.

University students have reported encountering constructive feedback in several of their courses (44.23%), while approximately 6% indicate receiving this type of feedback in every course. This situation may suggest that instructors are not frequently engaging in feedback practices designed to encourage and boost student morale.

The analysis of the frequency of corrective and explanatory feedback types reveals parallel findings. Corrective feedback has been received by 52.83% of students in 'a few courses', and only 9.43% report receiving it in 'every course'. This type of feedback facilitates students in correcting mistakes and enhancing their learning processes. However, it appears that instructors may not frequently prioritize this form of feedback. Explanatory feedback, on the other hand, aids students in understanding the reasons behind incorrect responses. Upon reviewing the findings, it is evident that a majority of participants (59.43%) received explanatory feedback in a few courses, indicating that instructors may not dedicate sufficient time to helping students recognize their weaknesses and strengths.

### **University Students' Preferred Feedback Delivery Methods and Feedback Types**

The second part of the study asked participants about their favorite and most effective feedback methods through an open-ended question. The collected data underwent descriptive analysis, resulting in the generation of codes and a detailed listing of participant responses in Table 4.

Upon descriptive analysis of participants' statements, it was discovered that some participants referred to methods of feedback delivery, while others focused on types of feedback. Due to this distinction, the analysis results have been presented in two separate tables for clarity to the reader.

Table 4.  
Descriptive Analysis Results for University Students' Preferred Feedback Delivery Methods

Feedback Delivery Methods	Participant Codes
Written Feedback	P29, P64, P72, P77
Verbal Feedback	P29, P45, P64, P65, P72, P77, P78
Feedback with Video	P77
Feedback with Learning Management Systems (such as Canvas)	-
Peer Feedback	P6
Self Feedback	P31, P42
Feedback to the Class/Group	P19, P56, P79
Individual (One-on-One) Feedback	P4, P21, P51, P66, P78, P103

When examining the feedback delivery preferences of university students, a clear preference for more personal and face-to-face interactions emerges. For instance, participant P78 highlighted the value of individual and verbal feedback, stating, "My favorite was the one-on-one feedback. It was my professor speaking to me face to face." Similarly, P4 "In general, individual feedback is more effective. For example, in one lesson, our teacher was individually interested in me and helped me to see my mistakes by directly telling me what I was doing wrong." This comments underscores the significance of both individualized and oral feedback. Despite this, there are participants who have found written feedback to be effective as well. Participant 64 expressed a preference for both written and verbal feedback, indicating, "My favorites are written and verbal feedback...", thereby identifying written communication as one of their preferred feedback mechanisms. Two participants (P31, P42) consider self-assessment to be the most effective method in higher education, while another (P6) finds peer feedback particularly impactful. For example P42 "feedback through experience. I had to make a presentation in a lesson and it was the first time I was going to have an experience like lecturing, and after I made a presentation, I saw deficiencies in myself." P42 emphasized the importance of self-feedback. No participants favored feedback through Learning Management Systems (LMS), yet there is mention of one individual who found feedback via video to be effective.

This diverse array of feedback preferences among university students suggests a complex landscape where individual needs and the context of feedback significantly influence perceived effectiveness. The lack of preference for LMS feedback might indicate a desire for more personalized and interactive forms of communication, though the acknowledgment of video feedback's effectiveness by one participant suggests an openness to diverse feedback mediums. Overall, these insights emphasize the importance of adopting a multifaceted and flexible approach to providing feedback, ensuring it meets the diverse needs and preferences of students in higher education settings.

The descriptive analysis findings of the study, which detail the types of feedback preferred by participants, are outlined in Table 5.

The findings in Table 5 demonstrate that explanatory feedback is the most preferred type of feedback among university students. For instance, participant P36 stated, "When exams related to the day's lesson are conducted and I ask about my mistakes, receiving a detailed explanation helps me improve. Feedback on assignments increases my motivation for the course, and getting answers to questions that arise during the lesson helps me recognize my errors." P11 explains the importance of explanatory feedback: "Explanatory feedback was my favorite type because I have no question marks left in my mind, everything is expressed clearly, and new ideas come to me such as what I can do more in that area. Therefore, I think it is a type that opens horizons, inspires different ideas, corrects mistakes and prevents possible mistakes in the future."

This highlights how detailed feedback positively affects both a student’s performance in class and their motivation. Similarly, P41 believes that feedback explaining why an answer is incorrect and suggesting how it could be corrected is most effective, indicating a preference for feedback that helps students understand their mistakes and how to improve.

Table 5.  
Descriptive Analysis Results for University Students' Preferred Feedback Types

<b>Feedback Types</b>	<b>Participants' codes</b>
Positive Feedback	P12, P14, P30, P75, P76, P80, P87, P88, P90, P98
Negative Feedback	-
Confirmatory Feedback	P4, P73, P90, P98
Feedback by Giving Points (Grade)	P52, P85, P100
Constructive Feedback	P1, P8, P37, P51, P54
Corrective Feedback	P7, P23, P25, P44, P51, P60, P71, P82, P88, P93,
Explanatory Feedback	P8, P11, P13, P33, P34, P36, P37, P40, P41, P43, P51, P55, P61, P62, P63, P67, P68, P89
No preferred feedback	P46, P86, P91, P92, P104
Instant Feedback	P1, P19, P36, P48, P60, P79, P95, P98, P105

Corrective feedback is another highly favored type of feedback. It involves the instructor indicating whether an answer is right or wrong and facilitating the correction of mistakes. P7, one of the ten participants who favored this type of feedback, said, "The teacher indicating whether my answer was correct or incorrect and then helping me understand how it could be improved was very helpful." P60 about corrective feedback "...the most frequent feedback was a lot of feedback by correcting and telling me where it was wrong. But even this was so effective that I got ideas about where the mistake was and how it should be for the next idea, the next study". These participant reflections suggest that corrective feedback not only aids in rectifying mistakes but also promotes deeper learning and the ability to apply feedback in future tasks, making it a valuable instructional strategy.

Positive feedback, where instructors commend, appreciate, or affirm students, is also among the preferred types of feedback. P30 mentioned, "My engagement in a course, which started with the teacher’s praise in a subject I had no interest in and continued until the end of the year," showing how positive reinforcement from instructors can motivate students. P87 underlined that expressions of appreciation made her happy with the statement “When I got a high grade in a difficult course, my teacher gave me positive feedback by congratulating me and thanking me.” In contrast to positive feedback, none of the students preferred negative feedback. This result shows that they think that the type of negative feedback they occasionally encounter is not useful for them.

Constructive feedback, which politely critiques and helps students identify their shortcomings without discouragement, has also been highlighted as a preferred feedback type. P8 stated “My most effective feedback experience was the detailed and constructive feedback from the lecturer during a seminar presentation. This feedback inspired me to improve my presentation and study more in-depth on related topics” for constructive feedback.

While these feedback types are prevalent, a small number of students also find feedback that simply identifies right or wrong answers effective. Only four participants stated that they preferred confirmatory feedback. One of them, P98, said, “I was happy that the teacher discovered all the things I was wrong and right about me and sent me an e-mail and responded to my e-mails plus he used emoji.” Additionally, three participants (P52, P85, P100) mentioned that feedback provided through points or grades was impactful.

All three participants stated that sharing “scores”, “score ranking” and “written exam results” was an effective feedback method for them.

Beyond these preferences, the desire for immediate and timely feedback was evident. Nine participants believed that feedback given during teaching and in real-time was more effective. For example, P56 stated, "Teachers conducting quizzes to gauge students' engagement with the material without deterring them from the lesson."

This analysis underscores the diverse feedback preferences among university students, highlighting the importance of detailed, corrective, positive, and timely feedback in enhancing learning experiences.

## Discussion

### Discussion on feedback delivery methods

In the discussion of the comparative analysis between the feedback delivery methods exposed to university students and their preferred methods, this study finds notable alignment with existing literature while also offering unique insights. The findings reveal a significant preference for verbal feedback among students, which is consistent with their reported experiences. Specifically, a vast majority of students' experience verbal feedback, and it emerges as the most preferred feedback method, highlighting its importance in both prevalence and student preference. Supporting these findings, [Blair et al. \(2013\)](#) conducted a study on second-year university students, finding that while 85% of students received verbal feedback, only 49% believed it to be effective in enhancing learning. Similarly, [Glazzard and Stones \(2019\)](#) observed that students at a university in England preferred verbal to written feedback. These studies underline the preference and perceived value of verbal feedback in educational settings, suggesting a critical examination of feedback methods to enhance learning outcomes. The preference for verbal feedback indicates the value of direct, personalized communication in facilitating understanding and engagement with feedback. Educators are encouraged to integrate verbal feedback into their practice, ensuring that it is constructive and tailored to individual student needs to maximize its effectiveness in promoting learning and academic achievement.

The findings of this study indicate a distinct gap between the frequency of written feedback received by students and their preference for it. Despite over 80% of students experiencing written feedback, as shown in Table 2, only a minority considers it their favored method of feedback. This observation is consistent with literature findings, where studies have underscored the prevalent use of written feedback in educational settings while simultaneously pointing out its limitations in meeting student preferences and needs. [Blair et al. \(2013\)](#), [Ferguson \(2011\)](#), and [Sequeira et al. \(2024\)](#) support the prevalence of written feedback in higher education, with [Sequeira et al. \(2024\)](#) reporting that 51.8% of university students in Australia received written comments on their work. Interestingly, despite the high occurrence, only 61.5% of these students preferred written feedback, citing its utility in identifying areas for improvement. However, the same study highlighted challenges with written feedback, including its potential insufficiency in detailing and the occasional difficulty students face in understanding the comments provided. This led to the recommendation for a combined approach of verbal and written feedback to enhance clarity and effectiveness. Similarly, [Malecka et al. \(2022\)](#) emphasized that written comments on assignments have been a traditional and popular feedback form, pointing to its established role in educational feedback systems. Despite its popularity among educators, the discrepancy in student preference suggests a critical need for revisiting the approach to written feedback. This gap underscores the importance of not just providing feedback but ensuring it is meaningful, engaging, and tailored to individual student needs to truly resonate and facilitate learning. The current study suggests educators need to rethink the delivery of written feedback, making it more personalized, understandable, and directly relevant to the students' areas of improvement. Incorporating elements of verbal feedback or engaging in follow-up discussions could



enhance the utility and perception of written feedback, bridging the gap between its prevalence and student preference. This approach could foster a more effective feedback culture, emphasizing the importance of feedback as a tool for engagement and improvement rather than merely an evaluative mechanism.

When analyzing the responses from participants holistically, it was determined that a combination of written and verbal feedback is preferred by several participants (P29, P64, P72, P77). This preference suggests that integrating both forms of feedback can mitigate the limitations inherent in each method individually, thereby creating a more enduring and interactive feedback experience.

The findings from this study indicate that feedback through video, despite its technological and innovative appeal, is the least received method according to Table 2, with only one student in Table 4 expressing a preference for it. This suggests a limited appeal of video feedback among students, contrasting with the potential benefits it may offer. Supporting this observation, [Sequeira et al. \(2024\)](#) found that 33.7% of university students received audio or video comments, with 32.7% preferring video feedback. The qualitative data from their study highlighted the advantages of video feedback, such as personalization, detail, clarity, accessibility, and the ability to apply insights to future performances. However, they also noted limitations due to technical issues such as dependency on internet access and poor audio quality, which could detract from its effectiveness. The limited preference for video feedback among students might stem from unfamiliarity with this feedback type or from the technical challenges and the potential lack of faculty expertise in creating high-quality video feedback. This scenario underscores the notion that, while video feedback presents an innovative approach to student engagement and personalized learning, it may not align with student preferences or needs as effectively as traditional feedback methods like written or verbal comments. These findings imply a need for educational institutions to consider the accessibility and usability of technology-based feedback methods. Training for educators on how to effectively produce and deliver video feedback could enhance its appeal and effectiveness. Additionally, addressing technical barriers and promoting familiarity with video feedback among students could increase its utility as a feedback tool. Nonetheless, this suggests that educators should maintain a diverse feedback approach that includes traditional methods while exploring innovative techniques like video feedback, ensuring they meet the diverse needs and preferences of their students.

Interestingly, feedback through Learning Management Systems (LMS) is common as per Table 2, yet it is not preferred by any students in Table 4. This could reflect a mismatch between the method's implementation and students' needs or preferences, warranting further investigation into its efficacy and approach. Given that students do not prefer feedback through Learning Management Systems despite its common use, it is important to explore potential reasons for this mismatch in order to improve the effectiveness and acceptance of LMS-based feedback systems. Various factors could contribute to this mismatch between the implementation of feedback through Learning Management Systems and students' preferences ([Winstone et al., 2021](#)). These factors may include a lack of user-friendliness in the LMS interface, inadequate training or support for students to navigate the system, and a perceived disconnect between the feedback provided and students' learning goals or needs ([Winstone et al., 2017](#)).

Our findings indicate a moderate preference for peer and self-feedback among university students, suggesting an appreciation for the diversity of feedback types and the value of multiple perspectives in the learning process. However, the established presence of peer feedback does not necessarily translate to a strong preference, possibly due to concerns regarding the pressure of peer evaluation or the credibility of assessments from peers. This observation is supported by [Stone \(2019\)](#), who found that university students tend to view instructor feedback as superior to peer feedback, highlighting concerns about the limitations of peer evaluations. Conversely, research by [Kusumaningrum et al. \(2019\)](#) demonstrates the positive impact of peer feedback on students' writing performance when provided in various formats, such as in-class and small group sessions. [Mulliner and Tucker \(2017\)](#) further underscore the ambivalence towards peer feedback, noting that none of their respondents favored receiving or providing feedback through peer

evaluation or discussion. These divergent findings underscore the complexity of peer and self-feedback mechanisms, suggesting that while they offer valuable insights and learning opportunities, their effectiveness may be contingent on the context of their application and the students' perception of their value and credibility. This complexity calls for a nuanced approach to incorporating peer and self-feedback into educational practices, emphasizing the need for clear guidelines, training, and support to maximize their benefits and mitigate potential drawbacks.

Group feedback emerges as one of the preferred feedback mechanisms in higher education, according to research data. The majority of participants reported receiving group(class-wide) feedback in several courses. However, when examining university students' preferences, it appears that this method is not highly sought after. The literature corroborates these findings, suggesting that while group feedback is recognized and utilized within educational settings, its appeal among students may be limited. [Mulliner and Tucker \(2017\)](#) underscore this perspective by noting that none of the respondents in their study expressed a preference for receiving or providing feedback through peer evaluation or discussions within peer groups. The reasons for the low preference for feedback as a group in the current study could be concerns about the relevance and personalization of feedback received in this manner may diminish its perceived value.

The study's findings highlight the pivotal role of individual (one-on-one) feedback within the educational landscape, demonstrating both its extensive reception among students and its esteemed value. This form of feedback, characterized by its personalized and direct nature, underscores the critical importance of tailoring feedback to meet individual students' learning needs and objectives. Supporting this observation, the literature reflects a consensus on the value of personalized feedback. Studies by [Ferguson \(2011\)](#), and [Koenka and Anderman \(2019\)](#) reiterate the significance of direct, individualized feedback in enhancing the educational experience, aligning closely with the findings of this study. Such feedback is not only pivotal in addressing the specific challenges and achievements of each student but also in making the learning process more engaging and meaningful.

### **Discussion on Feedback Types**

The comparison between the frequency of feedback types experienced by university students (Table 3) and their preferred feedback types (Table 5) offers a nuanced understanding of students' feedback experiences and preferences within the educational context. This analysis is pivotal for tailoring educational practices to meet students' needs effectively.

Positive feedback is almost universally experienced by students and is widely favored, underscoring its significant potential to enhance student motivation and engagement. Qualitative data from participants corroborate this finding, indicating a clear preference among university students for expressions of praise, encouragement, and appreciation. Conversely, despite the broad exposure to negative feedback, it does not emerge as a preferred feedback type, suggesting that educators need to tread carefully to avoid potential detrimental effects on student motivation. Supporting these findings, [Hyland and Hyland \(2001\)](#) suggest that feedback combining both positive and negative elements tends to be more effective, provided that the positive feedback is emphasized to increase the likelihood of students accepting and acting upon the negative feedback. This approach not only acknowledges students' efforts and achievements but also guides them towards improvement in a manner that is motivating rather than discouraging. The implications of these findings are significant for teaching and learning strategies. They highlight the necessity of incorporating positive feedback within educational feedback practices to foster a supportive and motivating learning environment. Educators are encouraged to focus on strengths and achievements as a foundation for addressing areas of improvement, thereby enhancing student receptivity and engagement with the feedback. This approach not only supports student motivation but also contributes to a more positive and productive educational experience, emphasizing the need for feedback strategies that prioritize encouragement and constructive guidance.

Feedback through the allocation of points has emerged as a common type of feedback encountered by university students, with a significant portion, totaling 76.41%, reporting receiving this form of feedback in most or all of their classes. This method of feedback, characterized by the assignment of numerical values to student work, reflects a prevalent approach within the educational system to assess and communicate academic performance. The findings align with existing literature, corroborating the widespread use of point-based feedback in higher education settings. For instance, [Sequeira et al. \(2024\)](#) provide evidence supporting the prevalence of this feedback type, highlighting its role in the evaluative processes within universities. In the current study, when examining those who prefer feedback through points, only three participants mentioned the effectiveness of this feedback type. While a few students acknowledged its importance, the broader academic literature suggests nuanced perspectives on point-based feedback. Studies indicate that students often do not receive feedback when high marks are awarded, underscoring the need for "feeding forward" with grade justifications ([Weaver, 2006](#); [Alamis, 2010](#); [Budge, 2011](#); [Perera et al., 2008](#)). This highlights the importance of providing feedback that not only acknowledges current performance but also guides future improvements, regardless of the student's academic capability ([Weaver, 2006](#)). Conversely, some studies present opposing views. For instance, research by [Mulliner and Tucker \(2017\)](#) shows that 55% of students agreed with the statement that they are "more interested in the grade than qualitative feedback." This divergence in findings underscores a complex relationship between quantitative grades and qualitative feedback from the perspective of student preferences. These findings imply a critical need for a balanced feedback approach that integrates both qualitative and quantitative elements. While point-based feedback provides a clear and objective measure of performance, complementing it with qualitative feedback can offer deeper insights into how students can improve. This combined approach ensures that students are not only aware of their academic standing through grades but also understand the underlying reasons for their scores and receive guidance on enhancing their learning. Educators should strive to provide comprehensive feedback that addresses both the immediate need for grade information and the long-term developmental needs of students, fostering a more holistic educational experience.

The study's findings reveal that while confirmatory and constructive feedback are widely experienced by students, only a small fraction specifically identifies these feedback types as their favorites. This suggests a nuanced perception of feedback among students, where the presence of feedback is appreciated, but preferences for specific types vary. The data align with existing research indicating that students show a preference for a balanced mix of positive and constructive feedback on their academic work. This preference is supported across a breadth of studies ([Alamis, 2010](#); [Atmaca, 2016](#); [Bourgault et al., 2013](#); [Çakir et al., 2016](#); [Chokwe, 2015](#); [Dawson et al., 2018](#)). These findings highlight the importance students place on receiving feedback that not only affirms their current achievements but also guides their future learning and development.

Explanatory feedback stands out as one of the most experienced and also the most preferred types of feedback. Similarly, corrective feedback, widely experienced and preferred by a significant number of students. Supporting these observations, [Alharbi \(2020\)](#) identifies direct written corrective feedback as the most effective and preferred method for enhancing students' writing skills, indicating a broader recognition of its value in academic settings. Similarly, [Glazzard and Stone \(2019\)](#) highlight that participants value feedback that is both detailed and personalized, underscoring the importance of feedback that addresses individual learning needs and promotes a deeper understanding of subject matter. These findings suggest that feedback strategies in higher education should prioritize clarity, specificity, and personalization. By providing explanatory and corrective feedback, educators can cater to students' desires for comprehensive, detailed guidance that not only highlights areas of improvement but also facilitates a clear path towards academic enhancement.

An unexpected finding of this study is the strong preference among participants for timely and immediate feedback. Nine university students emphasized the importance of receiving quick and timely responses to their performances (assignments, exams, etc.), indicating a significant value placed on the immediacy of feedback in their educational experience.

This preference is supported by existing research, which argues that feedback's utility is heavily contingent upon its timeliness (Weaver, 2006). Denton et al. (2008) suggest that delayed feedback becomes irrelevant for students as they often move on from the specific learning activity or content by the time they receive it. Immediate feedback is thus highlighted as a key factor in educational effectiveness, underscoring the need for prompt responses to facilitate the learning process. Similarly, research by Mulliner and Tucker (2017) found that a vast majority of students (95%) consider it crucial that feedback is returned as swiftly as possible. Studies by Pokorny and Pickford (2010), Poulos and Mahony (2008), and Hounsell et al. (2008) also report student issues with the lack of timely feedback. These findings underscore the critical role of timely feedback in enhancing student learning and satisfaction. The emphasis on prompt feedback reflects students' desire for immediate insights into their academic performance, allowing them to make necessary adjustments and improvements in real-time. For educators, this underscores the necessity to prioritize the efficiency of feedback delivery as a key component of effective teaching and learning strategies.

This discussion underscores the multifaceted nature of feedback preferences among university students, highlighting the importance of a balanced approach that incorporates a variety of feedback types. Educators are encouraged to consider these preferences when designing feedback mechanisms, ensuring they provide not only corrective and evaluative feedback but also motivational and explanatory feedback that supports student learning and development effectively.

### **Limitations and Future Studies**

This study, while providing insightful findings on the role and reception of feedback in higher education, has several limitations that warrant consideration. Firstly, the sample size, consisting of 105 university students from a single state university in Eskisehir, Turkiye, may limit the generalizability of the findings. The study's context and demographic constraints mean that the results may not be fully applicable to other educational settings, disciplines, or cultural backgrounds without further investigation.

Another limitation is the study's focus on the reception of feedback without an in-depth analysis of the quality of feedback provided. While the research identifies preferences for certain feedback types, it does not delve into how effectively this feedback is communicated and utilized to foster improvement.

One notable limitation of this study is the absence of data regarding the academic disciplines or departments in which the participating students are enrolled. This omission limits the ability to discern whether student feedback preferences and perceptions vary across different fields of study, which could be influenced by the nature of the subject matter, the teaching methodologies employed, and the types of assignments typically assessed. Academic disciplines have unique cultures and practices that could significantly impact how feedback is given, received, and valued by students. Future research could address this limitation by collecting and analyzing data on students' fields of study to explore how disciplinary affiliations influence feedback preferences and perceptions. Such studies could provide deeper insights into discipline-specific feedback practices and help educators tailor their feedback strategies more effectively to meet the diverse needs of students across different academic domains.

### **Acknowledgements**

None. No funding to declare.

### Conflict of Interest

Author has no conflict of interest to report.

### References

- Abacı, S., & Ari, F. (2020). The use of feedback in instruction. In K. Çağiltay & Y. Göktaş (Eds.), *Foundations of instructional technologies: Theories, research, and trends* (pp. 271–277). Pegem Akademi.
- Alamis, M. M. P. (2010). Evaluating students' reactions and responses to teachers' written feedback. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 5(1), 40-57.
- Alharbi, S. H. (2020). Efficacy of different types of written corrective feedback on EFL university students' writing quality. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(4), 217-226.
- Atmaca, Ç. (2016). Contrasting perceptions of students and teachers: Written corrective feedback. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(2), 166-182.
- Bijami, M., Pandian, A., & Singh, M. K. M. (2016). The relationship between teacher's written feedback and students' writing performance: A sociocultural perspective. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 4(1), 59-66.
- Birenbaum, M. (2007). Assessment and instruction preferences and their relationship with test anxiety and learning strategies. *Higher Education*, 53(6), 749-768. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-005-4843-4>.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>.
- Blair, A., Curtis, S., Goodwin, M., & Shields, S. (2013). What feedback do students want? *Politics*, 33(1), 66-79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9256.2012.01446.x>.
- Boekaerts, M. (1999). Self-regulated learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 31, 445-551. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355\(99\)00014-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(99)00014-2).
- Boud, D. (1995). Assessment and learning: Contradictory or complementary? In P. Knight (Ed.), *Assessment for Learning in Higher Education* (pp. 35-48). Kogan Page.
- Bourgault, A. M., Mundy, C., & Joshua, T. (2013). Comparison of audio vs. written feedback on clinical assignments of nursing students. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 34(1), 43-46.
- Brinko, K. T. (1993). *The practice of giving feedback to improve teaching* (world). <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00221546.1993.11778449>
- Budge, K. (2011). A desire for the personal: Student perceptions of electronic feedback. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(3), 342-349.
- Cameron, R. B., & Rideout, C. A. (2020). 'It's been a challenge finding new ways to learn': first-year students' perceptions of adapting to learning in a university environment. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(3), 668–682. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1783525>
- Chokwe, J. M. (2015). Students' and tutors' perceptions of feedback on academic essays in an open and distance learning context. *Open Praxis*, 7(1), 39-56.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson.
- Çakır, R., Korkmaz, Ö., Bacanak, A., & Arslan, A. M. (2018). An exploration of the relationship between students' preferences for formative feedback and self-regulated learning skills. *MOJES: Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(4), 14-30.
- Dawson, P., Henderson, M., Mahoney, P., Phillips, M., Ryan, T., Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2019). What makes for effective feedback: Staff and student perspectives. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(1), 25-36.



- Denton, P., Madden, J., Roberts, M., & Rowe, P. (2008). Students' response to traditional and computer-assisted formative feedback: A comparative case study. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(3), 486-500.
- Eitemüller, C., Trauten, F., Striwe, M., et al. (2023). Digitalization of multistep chemistry exercises with automated formative feedback. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 32, 453-467. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-023-10043-2>.
- Erişen, Y. (1997). The degree to which instructors perform feedback and correction behaviors. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 9(9), 45-62.
- Ferguson, P. (2011). Student perceptions of quality feedback in teacher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(1), 51-62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903197883>.
- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161-184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X).
- Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2004). Does your assessment support your students' learning? *Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 1(1), 1-30.
- Glazzard, J., & Stones, S. (2019). Student perceptions of feedback in higher education. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.18.11.3>.
- Gronlund, N. E. (1998). *Assessment of student achievement*. Allyn & Bacon Publishing.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>.
- Hepplestone, S., & Chikwa, G. (2014). Understanding how students process and use feedback to support their learning. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 8(1), 41-53.
- Hounsell, D., McCune, V., Hounsell, J., & Litjens, J. (2008). The quality of guidance and feedback to students. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 27(1), 55-67.
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 185-212.
- Jonsson, A. (2013). Facilitating productive use of feedback in higher education. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14, 63-76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787412467125>.
- Kılıçkaya, F. (2022). Pre-service language teachers' online written corrective feedback preferences and timing of feedback in computer-supported L2 grammar instruction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(1-2), 62-87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1668811>
- Kir, P. (2020). Exploring the relationship between the beliefs and practices of instructors about oral corrective feedback in EFL classes: A case study from Turkey, *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 202. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1250587>
- Kivi, P. J., Hernández, R. M., Flores, J. L. E., Garay, J. P. P., & Fuster-Guillén, D. (2021). The correlation between cognitive styles and written corrective feedback preferences among Iranian and Turkish EFL learners. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*, 16(2), 669-685. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i2.5643>
- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 254-284. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254>.
- Koenka, A. C., & Anderman, E. M. (2019). Personalized feedback as a strategy for improving motivation and performance among middle school students. *Middle School Journal*, 50(5), 15-22.
- Kusumaningrum, S. R., Cahyono, B. Y., & Prayogo, J. A. (2019). The effect of different types of peer feedback provision on EFL students' writing performance. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 213-224.
- Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for teaching. *System*, 25(4), 465-477. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(97\)00045-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00045-6).
- Losada, M. (1999). The complex dynamics of high performance teams. *Mathematical and Computer Modeling*, 30(9-10), 179-192.



- Malecka, B., Boud, D., Tai, J., & Ajjawi, R. (2022). Navigating feedback practices across learning contexts: Implications for feedback literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(8), 1330-1344.
- McCarthy, J. (2017). Enhancing feedback in higher education: Students' attitudes towards online and in-class formative assessment feedback models. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 18, 127-141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417707615>.
- McGrath, A. L., Taylor, A., & Pychyl, T. A. (2011). Writing helpful feedback: The influence of feedback type on students' perceptions and writing performance. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 2(2).
- McMillan, J. H. (2015). *Classroom assessment: Principles and practices for effective standards-based instruction*. Eđitim Yayınevi.
- Mulliner, E., & Tucker, M. (2017). Feedback on feedback practice: Perceptions of students and academics. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(2), 266-288.
- Nelson, M. M., & Schunn, C. D. (2009). The nature of feedback: How different types of peer feedback affect writing performance. *Instructional Science*, 37, 375-401.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>.
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, E. (2019). Beliefs and practices of Turkish EFL teachers regarding oral corrective feedback: A small-scale classroom research study. *The Language Learning Journal*, 47(2), 219–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1263360>
- Pereira, D., Flores, M. A., Simão, A. V., & Barros, A. (2016). Effectiveness and relevance of feedback in higher education: A study of undergraduate students. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 49, 7-14.
- Perera, J., Lee, N., Win, K., Perera, J., & Wijesuriya, L. (2008). Formative feedback to students: The mismatch between faculty perceptions and student expectations. *Medical Teacher*, 30(4), 395-399.
- Pokorny, H., & Pickford, P. (2010). Complexity cues and relationships: Student perceptions of feedback. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 11(1), 21-30.
- Poulos, A., & Mahony, M. J. (2008). Effectiveness of feedback: The students' perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(2), 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930601127869>
- Scott, J., Shields, C., Gardner, J., Hancock, A., & Nutt, A. (2011). Student engagement with feedback. *Bioscience Education*, 18(1), 1-9.
- Sequeira, A. R., Bruce, M., & Paull, M. (2024). Feedback format preferences of international post-graduate students in Australia: An exploratory mixed methods study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(2), 203-219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2199955>.
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153-189. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795>.
- Stone, S. L. (2019). Promoting English fluency through peer feedback and dialogue journals in an ESL college classroom. *Cal Poly Humboldt Theses and Projects*, 284. <https://digitalcommons.humboldt.edu/etd/284>.
- Şahin, M. (2015). Examination of pre-service teachers' opinions on the effectiveness of feedback applied in the learning and teaching process. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 15(1), 247–264.
- Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543068003249>.
- Ülper, H. (2011). Students' preferences regarding receiving feedback on their draft texts. *Mehmet Ákif Ersoy University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 1(22), 280–300.
- Weaver, M. R. (2006). Do students value feedback? Student perceptions of tutors' written responses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(3), 379-394.
- Williams, J. R. (2008). The Declaration of Helsinki and public health. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 86, 650-652.

- Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Rowntree, J., & Parker, M. (2017). 'It'd be useful, but I wouldn't use it': Barriers to university students' feedback seeking and recipience. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(11), 2026-2041. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1130032>.
- Winstone, N., Bourne, J., Medland, E., Niculescu, I., & Rees, R. (2021). "Check the grade log out": Students' engagement with feedback in learning management systems. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(4), 631-643. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1787331>.
- Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(3), 179-200.