

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DETAILED AND NON-DETAILED CONTINUOUS ASSESSMENT FEEDBACK STRATEGIES ON THE LETTER WRITING PERFORMANCE OF JSS II STUDENTS IN KADUNA STATE

¹Dr Halima Mohammed Lawal, ²Auwalu Sabo Ringim & ³Dr Hajara Yusuf Bayero
¹ & ²Department of Arts & Social Science Education, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Kaduna State, Nigeria

³Primary Education Department, Federal University of Education, Zaria, Kaduna State, Nigeria

Corresponding Author: lawalhalima02@gmail.com.

ARTICLE INFO

Article No.: 0491

Accepted Date: 31/07/2026

Published Date: 21/08/2026

Type: Research

ABSTRACT

This study was on the “Comparative Study of Detailed and Non-Detailed Continuous Assessment Feedback Strategies on the Letter Writing Performance of JSS2 Students in Kaduna State”. The study aimed to find out the effect of Detailed C.A feedback strategies on JSS II students’ academic performance in essay writing. The study adopted a quasi-experimental design in which the subjects were assigned to experimental and control groups. 161 JSS II students were randomly selected across two chosen schools to conduct this research as the target population of this study. 75 students from GJSS Gyellesu were assigned as the experimental group. While 86 students from GJSS Sabon Gari, Zaria as control group. The two groups were given a pre-test. Then treatment was carried out in which the experimental group was taught letter writing using Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy for six (6) weeks, while the control group was taught the same topics for three (3) weeks using Non- Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy as treatment. The longer duration for the Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy was necessary due to its multi-step nature which requires time for feedback delivery, students’ reflection, re-writing, follow-up, scores and general comment unlike the Non-Detailed C.A Feedback which involves only scores and general comment. At the end of the treatment, a post-test was given to the two groups. English Essay writing test was used as the instrument of this study. The data collected from the two groups were analysed using the SPSS package; descriptive statistics were employed to answer three research questions of the study, and an independent t-test was employed to test the null hypotheses at an $\alpha \leq 0.05$ level of significance. The research was based on Hattie & Timperly (2007) Feedback Model and Vygotsky (1978) Socio-cultural Theory. At the end of the study, findings showed that the English Letter writing performance of the experimental group was significantly higher than that of the control group after exposing the students to Detailed C.A Feedback treatment. This showed that Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy improved the students’ English essay writing performance in the aspects of expressions of ideas and mechanical accuracy. The study therefore recommends that Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy should be employed in teaching letter writing in English language so as to enhance students' writing skills and to improve their performance.

Keywords: Continuous Assessment, Detailed Feedback, Non-Detailed Feedback, Letter Writing and Performance

Introduction

Education in the 21st century has changed from “teach and test” to “teach, assess, feedback and improve”. Continuous Assessment is an ongoing evaluation process designed to monitor students’ learning during instruction. It is considered part of the transformation in education that the Nigerian government has introduced which is meant to replace the traditional approach that mainly focused on an examination system. The Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN, 1979) declared continuous assessment (C.A) for primary, secondary and tertiary schools. Continuous assessment was introduced into the education system to be used in determining students’ performance and to also help close the gap between students' current performance and the desired performance for better improvement in learning. It constitutes a significant proportion of individual performance from the primary to the tertiary levels of education, according to the policy, section 4, item 3, and sub-item (h): Advancement and promotion from one class to another shall be based on continuous assessment. This indicates that grading and certification will be based on both continuous assessment and final examinations. Therefore, continuous assessment is no longer an option but the engine of learning. However, it is believed that students can only improve when feedback is given at the end of a classroom exercise homework/assignment or test.

Thus, the common assessment strategy used by most teachers in our schools has always been Non-Detailed C.A. Feedback which only gives a general brief comment or scores without identifying students’ errors and how to improve next time. It offers little or no guidance on how learners can correct certain gaps in the written work thereby leaving them to guess on how to correct specific mistakes. It thus limits itself to response in form of grades, percentage, checkmark or the generic remarks like “Good”, “fairly good”, and poorly written” etc, without clear explanations (Neupane & Hu, 2021). Even though it takes very little time to assign and record grades, it is considered as less effective for deep learning. This has thus prompted the present study to find out whether Detailed Continuous Assessment Feedback Strategy will help to improve students’ performance better than Non-Detailed Continuous Assessment Feedback Strategy in letter writing. According to Zhang & Hyland (2022), Detailed Feedback helps students to clarify thought: students are able to identify their mistakes, error patterns and make active decisions to rectify them. Wataru & Ryo (2025) believes that Detailed Feedback triggers cognitive engagement which helps students to think about correct vocabularies, expressions and grammar in any task given. This is to say that Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy explains exactly what was done correctly and tries to point out the errors made and how to fix them in order to improve future work.

However, writing is one of the language skills students are often assessed in which is also considered as a productive skill. This is because it is a complex language activity that incorporates thought, processes, feelings and social interactions. Writing is one of the skills besides listening, speaking and reading in the English Language and it is uniquely powerful because it turns input to output. It is a conventional system of symbols or signs that represents the utterances of languages, and it involves composing, which implies the ability to tell or retell pieces of information or to transform information into text as in essay or letter writing. Klein (2013) states that writing is the ability to put pen on paper in order to express ideas through symbols; it means that when we write, we produce meaning with words. Also, Mohammed (2019) states that writing is a way of communicating messages that are rendered for many purposes; to express oneself, to provide information, to persuade, to create a literary work, and so on. Thus, it is expected that students should possess a level of writing skill that will help them express their complex thoughts for better performance. This study therefore focuses on how Detailed Continuous Assessment Feedback can help to improve students’ letter writing performance in English language because the ability to write well is pivotal to success in any academic context.

Statement of the Problem

It has been observed that students who are learning English as a second language are faced with a lot of difficulties in putting down structures of words and sentences into written form. It is also revealed in the JSCE Chief Examiner's Report (JSCE, 2024) that students encounter some problems in writing especially in the aspects of expression of ideas and mechanical accuracy as required by the examiners in essay writing. The examiner also stated that the problem with written English has always been candidates' wrong use of vocabulary, wrong construction of sentences, punctuation marks, and spelling errors. Students tend to make frequent errors in verb tense, word choice and punctuation and such gravity of errors fall under sentence structure, expression and mechanical accuracy (Icy, Na & Pauline, (2022). However, the major problem can be attributed to the inability of teachers to employ a well-balanced feedback strategy that will address both achievement and areas of improvement for students' to boost their writing skills and academic confidence. This has also contributed to the poor performance of Junior Secondary School Students in letter writing in English Language. Also, most studies on feedback strategy in Nigeria have treated "feedback" as a general concept but very few studies have compared the level of "detail" in continuous assessment feedback itself such as giving detailed comments, identifications of errors, students' reflection, re-writing of draft and follow-up before scores are awarded and general remarks given. The present study is therefore prompted to fill this gap by comparing the effects of two distinct levels of feedback within continuous assessment: Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy versus Non-Detailed C.A. Feedback strategy on JSS11 students' letter writing performance in Kaduna State.

Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to make a comparative study of detailed and non-detailed continuous assessment feedback strategies on the letter writing performance of JSS II students in Kaduna State. The specific objectives of the study are to:

1. To analyse the effect of Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy on the expression of ideas in letter writing of (JSS II) students in Kaduna State.
2. To examine the extent in which Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy contributes to the employment of appropriate mechanical accuracy in the letter writing of (JSS II) students in Kaduna State.
3. To find out the overall performance of Junior Secondary School (JSS II) students who were exposed to Detailed Continuous Assessment Feedback Strategy and those who were exposed to Non-Detailed Continuous Assessment Feedback Strategy in letter writing in Kaduna State.

Research Question

1. What is the effect of Detailed Continuous Assessment Feedback Strategy on the performance of JSS II students in the expression of ideas in letter writing?
2. How does Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy contribute to the development of mechanical accuracy used in the letter writing of (JSS II) students?
3. What is the overall letter writing performance of Junior Secondary School (JSS II) students who were exposed to Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy and those who were exposed to Non-Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy in Kaduna State?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses formulated for the study were tested for significance.

- H0₁: There is no significant difference between the performance of (JSS II) students that exposed to Detailed CA Feedback Strategy and those not exposed on expression of ideas in letter writing.
- H0₂: There is no significant difference between the performance of (JSS II) students that exposed to Detailed CA Feedback Strategy and those not exposed on the development of mechanical accuracy used in letter writing.

H0₃: There is no significant difference between the overall performance of (JSS II) students exposed to Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy and those who were exposed to Non-Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy in letter writing.

Literature Review

Concept of Detailed Continuous Assessment Feedback Strategy

Continuous Assessment Feedback is very vital in the 21st century teaching and learning for students' growth and real-time instructional adjustment. Oxford University Press (2022) defines continuous assessment as a practice of using assessment activities to gather evidence that will inform teaching and learning decisions. It is used to gather information about where the learner is, and tries to identify what their strengths and weaknesses are. Continuous assessment is also referred to as "assessment for learning, continuous evaluation or learner oriented assessment". Qmaster (2025) affirms that regular feedback is a cornerstone to continuous assessment because it allows students to make timely adjustments to their learning skills and performance on subsequent assignment. C.A. Feedback when provided at regular intervals helps in assessing the progress of learning and in taking corrective action accordingly. In fact, writing ability can be greatly improved by incorporating constructive criticism into the writing process. Thus, feedback is one of the most important factors in enhancing writing because it reveals mistakes, points out areas to work on and offers crucial insight for better performance (Majidova & Zilola, 2025).

However, the employment of continuous assessment and giving feedback during the learning process is not enough, the big question is; "How detailed is the feedback in order to make a difference in the students' performance?" This question therefore serves as an inspiration for the present study to delve into the Detailed C.A. Feedback strategy so as to find out its importance in the students' growth and academic performance. Detailed C.A. Feedback is an on-going, specific information given to students about their regular work. It is given quickly after a small quiz, project, or assignment and it points out to exact parts of the work that need to be fixed rather than just giving a raw score like the Non-Detailed C.A Feedback which tells the students whether they are right or wrong without explanation or guidance on how to improve. Detailed C.A. Feedback gives room for the teacher to identify errors and the students are expected to make corrections before a major test comes up. This helps to break learning into small pieces instead of a scary final examination. It also shows the teacher the aspects of the lesson that need to be re-taught (Tania & Andrea, 2023). Detailed C.A. Feedback is also called "elaborated feedback" in research. It goes beyond scoring but explains why an answer is right or wrong; it gives hints, examples and also guides for students to improve. Detailed C.A. Feedback is explanatory and it is most effective for students' lower prior knowledge. Thus, it encourages understanding, reflection and self-regulation. It is believed that when C. A. feedback is well detailed, it may lead to better summative performance. Megan (2021) affirms that feedback process gives students ownership over their success and therefore advises that students should be encouraged to write often even if it is writing short responses. Thus, the continuous and well detailed feedback cycle of improvement can help refine students' academic and letter writing skills over time. In fact, without a well detailed continuous assessment feedback, a teacher will just be teaching into the air.

Steps in Implementing Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy for Letter Writing

Letter writing is an essential language skills which every students is expected to be efficient in. It is an act of sharing messages, thought or information with others in written form. It can be a formal letter which is used for official work, business or school needs with polite tone and strict rules, informal letter for personal talks with friendly and warm tone, or semi-formal letter used for people you know but still needs to show respect like your teacher or acquaintances. However, there are essential features such as the content, organization, expression of ideas and mechanical accuracy that need to be taught to students for better writing

performance. According to Sweetland Center for Writing (n.d.), students writing performance can be enhanced if the following steps of Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy are implemented for letter writing:

1. Setting Goals &Criteria

- a. The teacher is expected to share expectations for the letter format whether it is formal, semi-formal or informal with address placement, paragraph structure and other important features of a letter before the writing process begins.
- b. Teacher gives a checklist on how the letter writing will be judged for students to know before the writing process.

2. Reviewing and Coding Draft

- a. After the teaching process, the students are given a topic to write on. Teacher collects the initial copy without assigning a final grade.
- b. Teacher marks the structural and mechanical mistakes by assigning codes; symbols such as 'p' for punctuation, 's' for spelling, 'f' for format and so on can be written on the students' scripts rather than re-writing the text for them.
- c. Prioritise major issues by giving comments that focuses on higher order concerns (major errors) before minor issues are addressed.
- d. Explain to the students on what to change or correct for clarity rather than giving vague notes.
- e. The teacher gives the students the opportunity to go through the corrected piece of their writing and reflect on it. Students are then encouraged to correct the errors identified and re-write a polished second draft.

The above steps are more aligned to the present study however, Eric (2024) added that learners' written work should address specific areas that need improvement rather than general comment such as "good work", "very poor", "needs to improve" etc. Also, learners should be given examples of correct usage and explanation of why a particular sentence, spelling or punctuation is incorrect. Leary (n.d.) emphasises that a better way of boosting learners' confidence and motivation through feedback is by balancing praise and critique; criticism should be constructive and it should start and end with acknowledging what the students have done well. Teachers should also combine written comment with oral explanations and there should be a comment bank to address common errors made by mistakes for clarity.

Theoretical Framework

This study anchors on two theories; Hattie &Timperly (2007) Feedback Model and Vygotsky (1978) Socio-cultural Theory. These two theories are very relevant to this study because Hattie &Timperley (2007) proposed that feedback must answer three major questions in order to be powerful and effective; Feed Up, Feed Back and Feed Forward. Here, Feed Up addresses the question 'Where am I going?' and clarifies the learning goals with success criteria. Feed Back is made to address the question; "Where am I now?" which provides information about progress and errors. While Feed Forward addresses the question; "How do I get there?" which provides guidance on what to do next in order to improve. In this context, the Feedback Model helps students to tell students what they are expected do, identifies their errors in their writing and suggest concrete steps for improvement. Conversely, Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy addresses this three steps in the teaching of letter writing too.

On the other hand, Vygotsky's Socio-Cultural Theory further supports this study as it posits that learning occurs through social interaction with More Knowledgeable Other (MKO) within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). The theory posits that feedback is the tool that a teacher uses to scaffold the students from what they can do alone to what they can do with the help of others. This is to say that if the teacher follows the teaching guides in the

teaching of letter writing step-by-step and students are not left alone with detailed feedback on their performance, it will move students from their current level to a higher level of competence.

The above explanations clearly shows that both theories are very much aligned with the present study because they both agree that detailed continuous assessment feedback will have a more significant positive effect on the letter writing performance of JSS11 students than non-detailed feedback.

Methodology

The research design adopted for this study was the quasi-experimental design; pretest and post-test, control and experimental group design. The main population of this research work comprises all the JSS 2 Junior Secondary Students of Kaduna State. There are six hundred and twenty-nine (629) Junior Secondary Schools in Kaduna State in the twelve (12) Zonal Education Offices with a total population of 60,014 JSS 11 students. However, JSS II students in Gyellesu (Zaria) and Sabon Gari LGAs are the target population of the study area from Zaria and Sabon Gari LGA. The two Junior Secondary Schools were randomly selected for the research study and one intact class was used for each school of the study in order to give pedagogical authenticity and to avoid disruption of the school's day-to-day activities. Participants were grouped into two: experimental and control groups which is in line with Krejcie and Morgan (1970). The sample size of the study consisted of 161 students (98 males and 63 females). The experimental group had 75 students (42 males and 33 females), while the control group had 86 students (46 males and 40 females). The instrument for data collection was letter writing test with specific focus on expression of ideas and mechanical accuracy. Marks were allocated according to NECO/WAEC marking guides (COEMA: Content, Organisation, Expression and Mechanical Accuracy). Descriptive statistic showing the mean and standard deviation was then employed to analyse the data while independent sample t-test was used to test each hypothesis.

Data Presentation

The mean score of the data obtained from experimental and control groups of English letter writing of students before and after treatment is presented in Table 1.

Answering of the Research Questions; the three research questions asked in section one was answered in this section. The research questions were shown using mean and standard deviations and the analysis were presented in Tables 1 to 3.

Research Question One: What is the effect of Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy on the performance of (JSS II) students in the expression of ideas in letter writing?

Table 1: Mean score for experimental and control group on expression of ideas in essay writing after treatment.

Groups	N	X	SD	Mean difference
Experimental group	75	12.24	1.68	
Control group	86	9.96	1.90	2.27

Table 1 contains the mean score on expression of ideas of experimental and control groups' letter writing. The table shows that experimental group has the mean of 12.24, while control group has a mean score of 9.96. The mean score difference between the two group is 2.27, which is in favour of the experimental group.

Research Question Two: How does Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy contributes to the development of mechanical accuracy used in letter writing of (JSS II) students?

Table 2: Mean score on mechanical accuracy of control and experimental groups letter writing after treatment.

Groups	N	X	SD	Mean difference
Experimental groups	75	10.84	1.97	5.61
Control group	86	5.22	1.34	

Table 2 shows the mean score of control and experimental groups in mechanical accuracy of letter writing after treatment. The table shows that the experimental group has the mean score of 10.84, while the control group has the mean score of 5.22. The mean difference between the two groups is 5.61 thus indicating that the experimental group outperformed the control group in the aspect of mechanical accuracy.

Research Question Three: What is the significant difference below the overall performance of (JSS II) students exposed to Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy and those who were exposed to Non-Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy in letter writing?

Table 3: Mean score on letter writing of experimental and control group after treatment.

Groups	N	X	SD	Mean Difference
Experimental group	75	40.66	3.56	13.22
Control group	86	27.44	3.36	

Table 3 shows the mean score of experimental and control groups on content of letter writing after the treatment. Table 5 indicates that the experimental group has a mean score of 40.66, while the control group has 27.44 the mean score of 27.44. The table shows a mean difference of 13.22 in favour of the experimental group. This answers the research question that there exists a significant difference between the performance of (JSS II) students exposed to Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy and those who were exposed to Non-Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy in letter writing.

Test of Null Hypotheses

Independent t-test at a probability of 0.05 was employed to test the three null hypotheses formulated for this study.

Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference between the performance of JSS II students on expression of ideas in JSS II students exposed to Detailed CA Feedback Strategy and those not exposed in letter writing.

Table 4: Independent Sample t-test on the Different in the Performance of Control and Experimental Groups on Expression.

Group	N	X	SD	Levene F	Sig.	Df	t-value	p-value	Cohen's d
Exp. Group	75	12.24	1.68						
				1.42	.235	159	7.97	.001	1.26
Control Group	86	9.96	1.90						

Table 4 shows that the Levene's test for equality of variance was not significant, $F(1,159) = .235$. Therefore, equal variance was assumed. The result further indicates that there was significant difference in the expression of ideas between the experimental group ($M = 12.24$, $SD = 1.68$) and the control group ($M = 9.96$, $SD = 1.90$), $t(159) = 7.97$, $p < .001$. The effect size was very large; Cohen's $d = 1.26$. Consequently, the null hypothesis one is rejected. The result further indicates that the JSS II students exposed to Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy performed better than those who were exposed to Non-Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy on the expression of ideas in letter writing.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference in the employment of correct mechanics in the letter writing performance of JSS II students exposed to Detailed CA Feedback Strategy and those exposed to Non-Detailed C.A. Feedback strategy.

Table 5: Independent sample t-test on the difference in the performance of control and experimental groups on mechanical accuracy of letter writing.

Group	N	X	SD	Levene F	Sig.	Df	t-value	p-value	Cohen's d
Exp. Group	75	10.84	1.97						
				8.76	.004	159	21.26	.001	3.36
Control Group	86	5.22	1.34						

Table 5 reveals that the Levene's test for equality of variance was significant, $F(1,159) = 8.76$, $p = .004$. Therefore equal variance was not assumed. The result therefore shows that there was a significant difference in the mechanical accuracy between the experimental group ($M = 10.84$, $SD = 1.97$) and the control group ($M = 5.22$, $SD = 1.34$), $t(159) = 21.26$, $p < .001$. Cohen's $d = 3.36$ showing that the effect of the size was very large. Therefore, the hypothesis which stated that there is no significant difference on the effect of Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy on the development of mechanical accuracy used in the letter writing of JSS II students is rejected. This implies that JSS11 students exposed to Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy significantly performed better than those who were not exposed to it

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference between the performance of (JSS II) students exposed to Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy and those who were exposed to Non-Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy in letter writing.

Table 6: Independent sample t test on the control and experimental students' letter writing after treatment.

Group	N	X	SD	Levene F	Sig.	Df	t-value	p-value	Cohen's d
Exp. Group	75	40.66	3.56						
				0.31	.578	159	24.16	.001	13.22
Control Group	86	20.44	3.36						

Table 6 reveals the result of the independent samples t-test conducted to test hypothesis three. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for equality of variance and Levene's test indicated that equal variances were assumed, $F(1,159) = 0.31$, $P = .578$. The means that there was a statistically significant difference in the overall letter writing scores of the experimental group ($M = 40.66$, $SD = 3.56$) and the control group ($M = 27.44$, $SD = 3.36$); $t(159) = 24.16$, $p < 0.001$, two tailed. Also the difference in the means is large with Cohen's $d = 3.82$. Based on this, hypothesis three (3) is rejected. This result therefore indicates that the overall letter writing performance of JSS11 students exposed to Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy was better than those exposed to Non-Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy.

Summary of the Findings

The study investigated the effect of Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy on students' academic performance in letter writing among upper basic students (JSS11) in Kaduna State. In order to achieve this, three research questions were formulated to find out how Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy has an effect on the students' performance. The following show the summary of findings:

1. In the aspect of expression of ideas for effective letter writing, there was a significant difference between the performance of the students exposed to Detailed C.A Feedback Strategy and those exposed Non-Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy.
2. There was a significant difference in the mechanical accuracy scores of the letter writing of students exposed to Detailed CA Feedback Strategy and those exposed to Non-Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy in Kaduna State.
3. There was a significant difference between the overall performance of the letter writing performance of students exposed to Detailed CA Feedback Strategy and those who were exposed to Non-Detailed CA Feedback Strategy.

Discussion of the Findings

The findings of the research revealed that the performance of students in terms of expression of ideas is better with exposure to Detailed Continuous Assessment Feedback Strategy. The Mean scores of the experimental and control group, respectively, show that the experimental group had a higher post-test mean score of 12.24 compared to that of the control group, which had a post-test mean score of 9.96. This shows a mean difference of 2.27 in favour of the experimental group. This results of this findings aligns with Lovise (2022) that CA Feedback

Strategy enhances students' marks and it helps to show good effect on the academic performance of students.

Secondly, the performance of students in the use of mechanical accuracy according to the result of study shows that experimental group has the mean score of 10.84 while control group has the mean score of 5.22. The mean difference between the two groups is 5.61, and this is in favour of the experimental group. This shows that detailed feedback is effective on students' performance. This concurs with Zhang & Hyland (2022) that Detailed Feedback Strategy helps students to clarify thought for better achievement.

Lastly, according to the findings of this study, the overall performance of the experimental group was better than the control group. The experimental group has a mean score of 40.66 while the control group has 27.44 mean score. Thus, the difference between the two mean scores reads 13.22 thereby showing a significant difference. Based on this findings, it is pertinent to note that the employment of Detailed CA Feedback Strategy is very effective in the overall performance of students who were exposed to it. This also aligns with Ismail (2015) that when teachers incorporate different assessment such as test, assignment, classwork and accurately give detailed feedback, students' writing skills will be greatly improved.

However, this study has its own limitations as it only covered JSS11 students' letter writing performance within Zaria, Kaduna State. Consequently, the findings cannot be generalized to all JSS11 students in Kaduna State or other states in Nigeria. Thus, the difference in the teachers' competence, context, and the school resources can also serve as possible factors that may affect the results of other similar studies.

More so, the duration of the intervention between the two groups may likely affect the outcome of the students' performance in letter writing. The experimental group was exposed to Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy for six weeks while the control group taught through Non-Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy had three weeks intervention. In addition, the steps and procedures used in the teaching of letter writing to each group differ: this can also create significant difference in the students' performance.

Conclusion

This study was carried out to find out the Comparative study of detailed continuous assessment feedback strategy and non-detailed CA feedback strategy on the letter writing performance among the JSS 2 students in Kaduna State. The treatment was effective as proved by the qualitative and quantitative data analysed in the study. The study found that the experimental group performed better than the control group in expressing ideas effectively and in the employment of correct mechanics for accuracy in their letter writing. This proved that Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy is effective; therefore, it should be adopted in order to improve students' letter writing skills together with other aspects of English language and for enhancing teaching and learning generally. Indeed, the implementation of Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy is a catalyst for the enhancement of good and efficient writing skills especially in the aspects of expression and mechanical accuracy amongst JSS11 students in Kaduna State. However, based on the fact that the present study only focused on letter writing performance amongst JSS11 students in Zaria, Kaduna State only, it is suggested that similar work that covers other aspects of essay writing in different levels of the secondary school from other parts of Kaduna state or Nigeria should be conducted in order to have a general perspective of the effect of Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy on students' academic performance. By so doing, it will help to fill the gap that this present study has left untouched.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are hereby made:

1. Feedback is the bridge between teaching and learning therefore, teachers should be encouraged to leverage on the benefits of the implementation of Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy for students' better performance in letter writing especially in the way they express their ideas with correct and relevant vocabularies/ words and sentence construction.
2. Teachers should adopt Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy in order to improve students' mechanical errors so as to enhance their writing skills for better academic performance in English language and other subject areas that employ English language as medium of instruction.
3. The ministry of education should organize workshops to train teachers on how to key into the implementation of Detailed C.A. Feedback Strategy for students to acquire efficient writing skills that will make them critical thinkers, better and globally competitive writers.

References

- Eric, G.B. (2024). 6 Strategies for Effective Writing Feedback in ELT. Updated 16 Jul, 2024 by Tesol International Association. www.tesol.org/blog/posts/6-strategies-effective-writing-feedback-in-elt/
- FGN (1979). National Policy on Education. MERDC Press Lagos.
- Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007),. The Power of Feedback. Review of Educational Research. American Educational Research Association (AERA). Washington D.C., USA. Vol. 77, Issue 1. Pages 81-112. DOI: 10.3102/003465430298487.
- Icy, L., Na L. & Pauline, M. (2022). Diagnostic Assessment of Written Accuracy: New Direction for Written Corrective Feedback in Secondary Writing Classroom. First Online on 25 May, 2022 from Springer Nature Link, pp 213-234. <https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-92>
- JSCE. (2024). Chief Examiner's Report in English. Retrieved Online on 30 July, 2026 from www.scribd.com/document/903731878/2024-Wassce-Chief-Examiners-Report-English-Language
- Klein, D. (2013). Writing Definition Descriptive Text, Online, <http://en.writing-definition-descriptive-text>. Access on May 18, 2013.
- Krejcie, R.V. and Morgan, D.W. (1970) Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30 (3), 607-610. DOI:10.1177/001316447003000308
- Leary, A. (n.d.). Giving Effective Feedback on Student Writing. Notre Dame Learning. University of Notre Dame. Retrieved July 25, 2026 from <https://learning.edu.resource-library/giving-effective-students-writing>
- Lovise, R. (2022). The difference between formative and summative assessment. Posted 24 June, 2022 from BlogleamsatchL.com.
- Majidova, S. & Zilola, R. (2025). The Role of Feedback in Developing English Writing Skills. Uploaded April, 2025 from Researchgate. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo/15183874
- Megan, R. (2021). Timely and effective feedback for students writing. April 20, 2021 in NGLC Reimagining Assessment. www.nextgenlearning.org/articles/timely-and-effective-feedback-for-students-writing
- Mohammad, N.R. (2019) The Prevalence and Remediation of Examination Malpractice in Jigawa State College of Education, Gumel Dogaro da kai (Self-reliance Journal of Vocational and Technical Education (I) P-196-215.
- Neupane, B. M. & Hu, G. (2021). Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, Taylor & Francis Online. Vol. 46 Issue 3 (2021), 403-423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602939/2020.1780562>
- Oxford University Press (2022). A Teacher's companion to continuous and formative assessment. <https://www.oup.es/assessment/>

- Qmaster, (2025). Unlocking the Potential: The Transformative Benefits of Continuous Assessment. Updated 7th August, 2025 <https://exam.mechcah.net/article/continuous-assesment-benefits>
- Sweetland Center for Writing (n.d.). Giving Feedback on Students' Writing. LSA College of Literature, Science and the Arts, University of Michigan. Retrieved July 28, 2026
- Tania, L. & Andrea, M. (2023). Continuous Assessment. Innovative Global Education. <https://www.innovativeglobaled.org/blog/the-what-and-why-of-continuous-assessment>
- Wataru, S. & Ryo, S. (2025). Cognitive & effective reactions to written corrective feedback, types of linguistics items & second language writing accuracy improvement: An exploratory study. Exploratory on L2 Writing Accuracy Journal. Pg 1-12. www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09658416
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in Society. Harvard University Press. United State of America, USA.
- Zhang, Z.V. & Hyland, K. (2022). Integrating various types of feedback in L2 writing instructions: Teachers' and students' perspectives. Online library, Wiley online. Pg 51. DOI: 10.1016/j.ase2921.100586.