Journal of Theoretical Educational Science, 14(2), 79-92, April 2021
Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi, 14(2), 79-92, Nisan 2021
[Online]: http://dergipark.org.tr/akukeg
DOI number: https://doi.org/10.30831/akukeg.752214

Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions about the Efficacy of Various Types of Feedback on Micro-Teaching Activities*

Hizmet Öncesi Öğretmen Adaylarının Farklı Geribildirim Türleri Hakkındaki Algıları

Nur YİĞİTOĞLU-APTOULA*

Received: 12 June 2020 **Research Article** **Accepted:** 24 February 2021

ABSTRACT: This research study investigates pre-service teachers' perceptions regarding the efficacy of the feedback on their micro-teaching activities. During a 16-week semester, nine pre-service teachers were observed and their micro-teaching activities were video-recorded. After their micro-teaching activities, they were asked to reflect on their own perceptions about the feedback they received on their micro-teachings. In addition, after each micro-teaching, they were asked to participate in an interview and a focus group interview regarding their perceptions about the different types of feedback. Findings suggest that pre-service teachers considered teacher trainer feedback as the most influential one in their development as teachers in the long run. They also stated that they changed their teaching immediately when they themselves realized a mistake. Findings also suggested that while they expected feedback about processing of the task from their peers, they expected feedback about self-regulation from their teacher trainer.

Keywords: Pre-service teachers, feedback, micro-teaching activities, perceptions.

ÖZ: Bu araştırma, hizmet öncesi öğretmenlerin eğitimlerinde kullanılan farklı geribildirim yöntemleri hakkındaki algılarını incelemektedir. 16 haftalık bir dönem boyunca dokuz İngilizce öğretmen adayının mikro-öğretim yöntemleri gözlenlenmiş ve bu mikro-öğretim yöntemleri kaydedilmiştir. Katılımcıların mikro-öğretim aktivitelerinin ardından aldıkları farklı geri bildirimler hakkında bireysel ve grup olarak röportajlar yapılmıştır. Sonuçlar, hizmet öncesi öğretmenlerin uzun vadede öğretmen eğiticisinden gelen geri bildirileri en etkili bulsalar da, kendilerine yaptıkları geribildirimleri sürecinde fark ettikleri hataları hemen düzeltme yoluna gittiklerini göstermiştir. Sonuçlar ayrıca hizmet öncesi öğretmenlerin akranlarından yapılan öğretimin işlenmesi ile ilgili geri bildirim beklerken, öğretmen eğiticisinden kendilerini ne yönde düzeltmeleri gerektiği yönünde geri bildirim beklediklerini göstermiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Hizmet öncesi öğretmenler, geri bildirim, mikro-öğretim aktiviteleri, algı.

* Asst. Prof. Dr., Bogazici University, İstanbul, Turkey, nur.yigitoglu@boun.edu.tr; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9039-6672

Citation Information
Yiğitoğlu-Aptoula, N. (2021). Pre-service teachers' perceptions about the efficacy of various types of feedback on micro-teaching activities. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi [Journal of Theoretical Educational Science]*, *14*(2), 79-92.

ISSN: 1308-1659

> *So active, creative, and important is the role of recipients in the feedback process that it is striking how in educational and managerial settings, there is little to no formal training in the art of seeking and receiving feedback. In contrast, some degree of training in the art of giving feedback is routinely given to teachers, supervisors and managers. This bias toward senders and away from recipients is reflected in scientific literature, too. Compared to that on senders, a good deal or less research attention has been paid to what recipients can do to maximize benefits of feedback* (Sutton, Hornsey, & Douglas, 2012, p. 339).

Introduction

Practice teaching and its assessment have long been recognized as a vital component of pre-service teacher education programs and have been documented by numerous researchers (e.g. Buitink, 2009; Butler & Cuenca, 2012). Although most of the research on teaching component of pre-service teacher education programs has focused on understanding practicum experiences of pre-service teachers (e.g. Eröz-Tuğa, 2012; Johnson, 1996), pre-service teachers' micro-teaching experiences before their practicum experiences seem to be receiving considerably less attention. The influence of school experience on pre-service teachers' beliefs (e.g. Gao & Benson, 2012; Johnson, 1996; Ng, Nicholas, & Williams, 2010; Seymen, 2012; Rozelle & Wilson, 2012) and their reported concerns for practicum (e.g. Çelik, 2008; D'Rozario & Wong, 1996; Paker, 2011; Preece, 1979) have also been investigated. At the same time, a growing number of teacher education research-specialists report that the teaching component in teacher education programs has been described as an important contributor for novice teachers' perceptions of their preparedness and efficacy in the classroom (Faez & Valeo, 2012). In addition, recent work underlined the importance of digital video-based feedback environments on pre-service teachers' feedback competence to further our understanding of pre-service teacher learning in teaching practicums (e.g. Kleinknecht, & Gröschner, 2016; Prilop, Weber, & Kleinknecht, 2020)

While all of these studies have contributed to our understanding of the importance of school-based experience in preparing the pre-service teachers in pre-service teacher education programs, very few, if any, has focused specifically on pre-service teachers' perceptions and understanding of different types of feedback before their school-based practicum experiences during their pre-service teacher education programs. This understanding can provide us with practice-based approach to give feedback from various agents (i.e. self, peer, and teacher trainer) and in different phrases of their pre-service teacher education (e.g. before, during, and if possible, after their school experience). Such an approach can both improve the overall quality of pre-service teacher education programs and influence pre-service teachers' perceptions of their preparedness for the teaching profession and self-efficacy as pre-service teachers. In an attempt to address this gap in research literature and the need in pre-service teacher programs, this research study investigates pre-service teachers' perceptions about the efficacy of different types of feedback they receive from different agents.

Literature Review

Practicum has been a controversial term to define because many researchers studying pre-service teachers' school-based experience differ in the way they define, view and study this concept. Gebhard suggests that the term practicum "involves supervised teaching, experience with systematic observation, and gaining familiarity

with a particular teaching context" (2009, p. 250). As practicum is pre-service teachers' first teaching experience during their pre-service teacher education, it is central to provide them with necessary support and feedback during their practicum experience. It is also equally important to focus on their needs before their practicum experience, equip them with necessary skills, provide them with efficient feedback, and consequently, to better prepare them for their practicum experiences. Johnson (1996) underlines the importance of investigating "how pre-service teachers conceptualize their initial teaching experiences, and what impact these experiences have on their professional development as teachers" (p. 30). As such, pre-service teachers' practices even before their practicum experiences may change their perceptions and understandings about the profession and influence their developing identities as pre-service teachers.

Micro-teaching activities before the practicum is one of the most common practices to provide pre-service teachers with necessary pedagogical tools and resources to help them learn to teach before their actual teaching practices in the profession. Legutke and Ditfurth define micro-teaching as an approach "in which student teachers act as L2 school learners while each student takes his or her turn as teacher" (2009, p. 213). This is particularly important for pre-service teacher candidates because the very act of interchanging roles may raise their awareness of teaching and learning situations alike. Wahba (1999) suggested four stages of micro-teaching activities, namely the briefing stage, the teaching stage, the analysis and discussion stage and the re-teaching stage. The briefing stage refers to the period in which the trainees are informed about the context and the content of their micro-teaching. In the teaching stage, the trainee micro-teaches a lesson and it is, if possible, audio- or video-recorded. In the analysis and discussion stage, the micro-lesson is evaluated and the trainee is given some feedback. In the final re-teaching stage, the trainee is expected to teach the lesson based on the comments received in the analysis and discussion stage. The analysis and discussion stage is very crucial because, if effective feedback is provided, it may lead to changes in practices and thus result in learning gains.

The present study investigates what the relative value is of different types of feedback on micro-teaching activities from the recipient's (i.e. pre-service teachers') perspective. Feedback, according to Hattie and Timperley (2007), is defined as "information provided by an agent (e.g. teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding" (p. 81). Hattie and Timperley (2007) offer a model of feedback that identifies the focus of feedback in four levels, namely, feedback about the task, feedback about the processing of the task, feedback about self-regulation, and feedback about the self as a person. Feedback about the task refers to feedback that is related to how well the completion of the task is achieved. This kind of feedback, therefore, is very task-specific. Feedback about the processing of the task concerns the learning processes required for the completion of the task. This kind of feedback may provide learners with alternative options and thus reduce the complexity and cognitive load of the task. Feedback about self-regulation is related to feedback promoting student autonomy and self-control. Feedback at this level helps the students develop skills in self-evaluation. Feedback about the self as a person is particularly significant in classroom environments because it is typically present in the personal positive feedback (i.e. praise) about students. Although this kind of feedback is

delivered quite frequently in the classroom environments, it "has too little value to result in learning gains" (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p. 96). As such, each feedback works at four different levels: task level, process level, self-regulation level, and self-level. In addition to these levels, Hattie and Timperley (2007) suggest that teachers aim to provide learners with three important feedback questions: (1) Where am I going, (2) How am I going, (3)Where to next? The first question (i.e. feed up part) concerns with the communication of the goals of the lesson. The second question (i.e. feedback part) relates to the notion of progress being made toward the goal. The third question (i.e. feed forward dimension) highlights the activities that need to be undertaken to make better progress.

Education contexts in general and teacher education contexts in particular aim to provide learners with appropriate feedback through different assessment mechanisms; but, in most cases, the process "takes on the forms of new instruction, rather than informing the student solely about the correctness" (Kulhavy, 1977, p. 212). In the context of teacher education, this may stem from a possible lack of understanding of the place of feedback in the continuum of correction and teaching. Most effective feedback, however, is reported as the one that transfers the student from task to processing and then to the regulation phase (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Teacher educators and student-teachers, in contrast, may be focused more on providing and receiving the best type of feedback than on the advantages of giving and receiving feedback focused at different levels for different teaching and learning circumstances.

Previous literature has informed us about the importance of feedback preparing the pre-service teachers. However, very few, if any, studies focused on an understanding of feedback on micro-teaching activities in which pre-service teachers engage before their practicum experiences. In order to increase efficacy of the feedback provided to pre-service teachers, it seems important to investigate feedback practices on micro-teaching activities and influences of such feedback on their initial teaching practices even before their practicum experiences. As indicated by Hattie and Timperley (2007), feedback "is one of the most powerful influences on learning, too rarely occurs, and needs to be more fully researched by qualitatively and quantitatively investigating how feedback works in the classroom and learning process" (p. 104). In an attempt to address this issue in research literature and provide pedagogical suggestions for the area of teacher education, this study investigates the possible influences of having simultaneous multiple feedback types on pre-service teachers' micro-teaching practices by focusing on pre-service teachers' perceptions about different kinds of feedback on their micro-teaching activities. In view of the literature background provided above, the present study aims to address the following questions:

1. What do pre-service teachers expect from their peers and teacher trainer when they receive feedback on their micro-teaching activities during their pre-service teacher education programs?

2. When pre-service teachers receive feedback from multiple sources, in what areas do they agree and disagree with different agents?

Method

The research adopts a qualitative research methodology to investigate the influence of different types of feedback on micro-teaching activities in pre-service teacher education.

Context of the Study and Participants

Participants in the study included nine pre-service teachers in an English Language Teaching Program at a Northern Cyprus campus of a highly reputable Turkish university. The university is one of Turkey's most competitive universities and the medium of instruction is English. This university, according to The Times Higher Education World Reputation Rankings 2014, which is followed by universities and institutes all over the world, has been ranked in the top 80 as the only Turkish university. At the time the present study was conducted, it was placed among the top 100 universities of the world, ranking in the 71-80 band. In addition, according to UK based Times Higher Education (THE) World University Rankings 2014-2015, the university was ranked 85th in the top 400 universities list.

Teaching English as a Foreign Language program in this university aims to expand and refine pre-service teachers' knowledge of English and equips them with the means and resources to assist their students in learning English. In this program, pre-service teachers learn the practices in the planning, teaching and evaluating of second language instruction and are given the opportunity to observe how these practices are implemented in local schools. Before this practicum component of the curriculum, pre-service teachers are required to take a course called "Teaching Language Skills" which concentrates on building language awareness and teaching skills through a detailed study of techniques used in and stages of teaching reading, writing, speaking, vocabulary and grammar to language learners at various ages and language proficiency levels. Student teachers design individual micro-teaching activities focusing on the integration of the language skills above with adherence to principles of lesson planning and techniques of the specific skills for a variety of proficiency levels.

The participants were nine pre-service teachers taking this "Teaching Language Skills" class on their third year of their pre-service teacher education. The class consisted of nine students, and all of them agreed to participate in the present study. The researcher was the teacher trainer for this class. The data were collected in the naturalistic setting of a pre-service teacher education classroom, and the pre-service teachers were informed about this research after their final grades were entered. The researcher wanted to ensure that their decision regarding giving their consent about their data would not bias their overall grades for the course. The participants are referred here as P1, P2, etc. Six pre-service teachers were female and three of the participants were male. Their ages ranged between 21 and 31.

Data Collection

During one 16-week semester, as a part of their course work, the pre-service teacher participants were asked to prepare and present six micro-teaching lessons on different skills, including teaching receptive skills (e.g. reading and listening), productive skills (e.g. writing and speaking) as well as grammar and vocabulary. Although the students submitted a two-hour long lesson plan, they were asked to

present 15-20 minutes of those lesson plans. Before the micro-teaching activities, the participants were asked to submit their lesson plans and their rationale. During their micro-teaching, the pre-service teacher participants were observed and their micro-teaching activities were video-recorded. In addition, during their micro-teaching, the teacher trainer and their peers filled out the teacher trainer feedback form and peer feedback forms. After the micro-teaching activities, the pre-service teachers were asked to first watch their micro-teaching videos, complete a self-assessment form, and finally write reflections focusing not only on their micro-teaching experiences but also on their perceptions about different types of feedback they received on their micro-teachings (e.g. feedback from self, peer and teacher trainer). These written reflections were complemented with semi-structured individual interviews and group interviews to get a better insight on their perceptions regarding the efficacy of different types of feedback.

Pre-service teachers' perceptions regarding the efficacy of feedback on their micro-teaching practices were elicited through interviews. For the interview component of the research, pre-service teachers were asked to participate in one individual interview and one focus group interview regarding their perceptions about different types of feedback on each of their micro-teachings. These text-based interviews were semi-structured and aimed to tap into their thoughts about different types of feedback from different agents on their micro-teachings and to help them further reflect on their written reflections in an oral form. During the focus group interviews, they were asked to comment on their perceptions regarding the efficacy of feedback by different agents. Each interview lasted for approximately one hour. Both individual and focus group interviews were voice-recorded and transcribed.

During the interviews, which were conducted after each micro-teaching, the participants were asked to comment on the teacher trainer and peer response feedback sheets. In addition, they were also asked to comment on their own feedback on self-assessment forms regarding their view about the possible influences of such feedback on their own developments as future teachers.

Data Analysis

Interview data analysis for the present research began immediately after the first pre-service teacher interviews were conducted. The interview data were analyzed based on Grounded Theory and adopting a qualitative content analysis approach and Data analysis was also aided by a computer program called Atlas.ti. with the help of this qualitative analysis program, both the transcriptions of the interview data and the textual data (i.e. feedback) were organized and coded according to emergent categories.

When listing theoretical and methodological influences on the analysis of interviews, Roulston (2014) provides five options: Hermeneutic influences, phenomenological influences, Grounded Theory influences, ethnographic influences, and narrative influences. The present study adopts Grounded Theory in the data analysis. Grounded Theory was first put forward by Glaser and Strauss (1967), and it has been adopted by many qualitative researchers since then. Grounded Theory "provides rigorous but flexible guidelines that begin with openly exploring and analyzing inductive data and leads to developing a theory grounded in data" (Thornberg & Charmaz, 2014, p. 153). For any study following Grounded Theory, coding is crucial. Coding, according to Charmaz (2006), includes "naming segments of data with a label

that simultaneously categorizes, summarizes and accounts for each piece of data" (p. 43). Roulston (2014) explains that open coding is "a process of associating a conceptual label with a section on transcript that conveys an idea about the topical features of the talk" (p. 303). Following these principles, the data were initially open-coded. After the initial coding, the most frequent and significant codes guided the focused coding stage.

Following the principles of Grounded Theory, the data analysis adopted thematic content analysis. Qualitative content analysis, as Schreier (2014) writes, "is concerned with describing meaning in context" (p. 174). It also requires creating initial categories and themes from the data through constant comparison within each participant and across the participants, which helps to describe the categories within each case and to identify the similarities and differences across the cases. The interview data in the present study were analyzed employing thematic content analysis to get a better insight on the perspectives of the participant pre-service teachers. To employ this approach in content analysis, anticipated and unanticipated emerging categories from the coded data were summarized in a chart to see commonalities and differences between the pre-service teachers' perceptions of feedback though various agents.

In addition to the interview data, instructional materials the pre-service teachers used (e.g. lesson plans and rationales) and their own self-evaluations on their micro-teachings were analyzed. The feedback they received on their teaching in the teacher trainer form and peer form was analyzed and coded. The feedback data were coded based on the framework suggested by Hattie and Timperley (2007).

Atlas.ti coding software was used during the coding stage. In order to ensure investigator triangulation, the data were coded by two experienced researchers who were trained for coding. After the data were coded by each coder, the code sets and codes were compared. Coding disagreements for each code were resolved through joint review of data and discussion.

Ethical Procedures

All procedures performed in this study involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional research committee. Before the research started, the researcher applied the institutional ethics committee for ethical approval. The ethical committee approval date is February 21, 2014 and the number of their approval document is 28620816/103. After obtaining the approval from the ethics committee, the researcher started the data collection. Pre-service teachers who agreed to participate in the study were given consent forms. In order to keep the confidentiality of participants, pseudonyms were assigned to all participants after the data collection.

Findings

Pre-service Teachers' Expectations from the Feedback They Received on Their Micro-Teaching Activities

Results indicated that when receiving feedback on their micro-teaching practices, pre-service teachers expected different types of feedback from each agent. They stated that while they expected to see what they missed and/or negative comments in the feedback they received from their peers, they seemed to pay extra attention to the suggestions and/or positive comments made by the teacher trainer. Commenting and

reflecting on their expectations from different agents, they showed self-regulation over the learning process. In other words, they wanted to see their own strengths and weaknesses in the feedback provided to them by different agents and ways to improve them. More specifically, the results indicated that pre-service teachers expected more feedback about the processing of the task from their peers while they expected more feedback about self-regulation from their teacher trainer. For instance, P5, when reflecting on a micro-teaching activity, underlined that she wanted her peers "to notice and comment on my grammar mistakes" (P5, Interview 3). Later in the semester, in one of the group interviews she voiced the same issue in the following way: "If my peers tell me that I have grammar mistakes, I can be more careful. I made some mistakes and they can notice them" (P5, Group interview 2).

Similarly, P3 commented on the negative comments she received from her peers as follows: "Experience is a good thing. I do not regret it because I had 'bad' comments. Instead, I pay attention to them even more" (P3, Interview 2). Similarly, P5, when reflecting on her perceptions regarding different feedback she received for her final micro-teaching, she commented that peer feedback did not contain any criticism, so she could not find anything to reflect on. She mostly received feedback about task level, and not much feedback about processing of the task and feedback about self-regulation. She explained her perspective in the following way: "I looked at my peers' feedback, like this one on the task level only, generally they wrote good things, so I could not find anything to reflect on to see if I can change my teaching" (P5, Interview 6). P1 also talked about the importance of criticism in the peer feedback he received throughout the semester and noted that he paid attention to the negative criticisms he received in the peer feedback. He explained this issue in the following way: "I tried to pay attention to the negative or the less effective parts mentioned in the peer feedback. I know I did it correctly, but I want to see what I need to do for the next step" (P1, Interview 6).

Some pre-service teachers stated that they perceived peer feedback as a way to improve their deficiencies in their teaching practices. P8, for example, underlined that he did not know what to do next if there was no criticism in the peer feedback. In contrast, if his peers made some criticisms in the feedback, he thought that they cared for him. He clarified his point in the following way: "I like it when my peers made constructive criticisms on my teaching because then it seems that they really tried to help me to improve my downsides" (P8, Interview 5). P1 also underlined the importance of the specifics of the negative comments he received from his peers. In one of the group interviews, he voiced his preference in the following way: "I want detailed comments from my peers. Especially negative ones… Because in those comments, they say specific things to you" (P1, Group interview 2).

While pre-service teachers expected some criticisms in the feedback they received from their peers, they explained that, in the teacher trainer feedback, they hoped for more suggestions and positive comments. This seems to indicate that they look for more feedback on self-regulation from their teacher trainer. P6, for instance, in the teacher trainer feedback on one of the micro-teaching activities, received feedback on modelling the activity. He later reflected on the aspects that he paid attention to in the teacher trainer feedback in the following way: "I pay attention to suggestions part more in teacher trainer feedback. It was about modelling the activity. I should have modelled the activity in addition to my instructions." (P6, Interview 2). Similarly, P2

commented on one instance in which she received feedback on preparing handouts for an activity she presented. She commented on that feedback as follows: "This time teacher trainer evaluation was effective. The teacher trainer provided some tips that we could not provide in peer feedback. In her feedback, I like to see suggestions for future teaching like the preparing handout example, for instance" (P2, Interview 2). P1, also, when reflecting on the teacher trainer feedback she received throughout the semester, noted the importance of receiving positive feedback from her teacher trainer for her development as a pre-service teacher. She explained this point in the following way: "I paid more attention to the positive comments that were provided in the feedback from the teacher trainer. I thought keeping those parts would lead my own development as a teacher" (P1, Interview 6).

In sum, it seems that pre-service teachers may have different expectations from the feedback they received from their peers and teacher trainer. They tend to focus more on the weaker parts of their teaching in the peer feedback whereas they hope for suggestions for future teaching in the teacher trainer feedback.

(Dis)agreement areas found in the feedback

When the pre-service teachers reflected on the feedback they received from their peers and teacher trainer, they commented on some agreement and disagreement areas. Table 1 below presents the agreement areas found in the peer and teacher trainer feedback along with the number of instances and percentages found in each type of feedback.

Table 1

Agreement Areas Found in the Feedback Pre-service Teachers Received on Their Micro-Teaching Activities

Agreement areas found in the feedback	The number of instances/percentages found in peer feedback	The number of instances/percentages found in teacher trainer feedback
Feedback about the task	41 (33%)	94 (58%)
Feedback about the processing of the task	42 (34%)	42 (26%)
Feedback about self-regulation	19 (15%)	26 (16 %)
Feedback about self as a person	27 (18%)	0 (0%)
Total	125 (100%)	162 (100%)

As can be seen from the table, while pre-service teachers agreed with their teacher trainer most of the time when they received feedback about the task, they seemed to agree with their peers when they receive feedback on the processing of the task and feedback about self as a person. While the pre-service teachers seemed to agree with their peers and teacher trainer in different areas, the data also showed some areas of disagreement found in the feedback they received on their micro-teaching activities. Table 2 below illustrates the disagreement areas found in the feedback pre-service teachers received on their micro-teaching activities along with the number and percentages found in peer and teacher trainer feedback.

Table 2

Disagreement Areas Found in the Feedback Pre-service Teachers Received on Their Micro-Teaching Activities

Disagreement areas found in the feedback	The number of instances/percentages found in peer feedback	The number of instances/percentages found in teacher trainer feedback
Feedback about the task	85 (64%)	2 (11%)
Feedback about the completion of the task	13 (10%)	10 (56%)
Feedback about self-regulation	16 (12%)	2 (11%)
Feedback about self as a person	19 (14%)	2 (22%)
Total	133 (100%)	18 (100%)

As can be seen from the table, while the pre-service teachers disagreed with their peers 64% of the time when they received feedback on the task, there were only two instances in which they expressed disagreement with their teacher trainer. For the feedback on the completion of the task, however, they showed disagreement with their teacher trainer 56% of the time whereas they disagreed with their peers 10% of the time they received feedback on the activities they presented. In general, the total number of instances they disagreed with their peers is 133, whereas they disagreed with their teacher trainer only in 18 instances.

These two tables illustrate the agreement and disagreement areas found in the feedback pre-service teachers received on their micro-teaching activities along with the number and percentages found in peer and teacher trainer feedback. It is important to note that pre-service teachers seemed to agree with their teacher trainer (N=162) more than they agreed with their peers (N=125) regarding the feedback they received from these agents. They seemed to disagree, however, with their peers (N=133) more than they disagreed with their teacher trainer (N=18). As far as the areas are concerned, the biggest difference between the agreement and disagreement areas found in the teacher trainer feedback and peer feedback was on feedback about the task. That is, pre-service teachers agreed with their teacher trainer 94 instances of the time they received feedback on the task, but they only disagreed with their teacher trainer only in two instances on this topic. They seemed to disagree with their peers on feedback about the task more than they agreed with their peers on this type of feedback.

In sum, the results indicate that pre-service teachers perceived the importance of multiple sources of feedback from different agents, and expected different feedback types from different agents and, maybe because of these expectations, there were some discrepancies found in the feedback data. These discrepancies may be related to the quantity of the feedback they received instead of the specificity of the feedback they received. It seems that the participant pre-service teachers expected feedback from multiple sources and thus filtered different types of feedback they received. Although most of the pre-service teachers commented on the efficacy of multiple sources of feedback, this seems to be in line with what Hattie and Timperley underlined in their seminal work on feedback (2007). Some pre-service teachers also talked about the filtering process they underwent in these feedback types. This seems to suggest that in

order to enhance the efficacy of feedback and support the learning environment, instead of multiple sources of feedback, it should be that those sources of feedback should provide feedback of a particular type (level) as it is these types of feedback that are the most effective in supporting improvement.

Discussion and Conclusion

The present study investigates what the relative value is of different types of feedback from the recipient's perspective. Using interview data, the study reported that although pre-service teachers considered teacher trainer feedback as the most influential one in their development as teachers in the long run, they stated that they changed their teaching immediately when they themselves realized a mistake and reflected on those in self-evaluations and reflections. Findings also suggested that they expected feedback about processing of the task from their peers and feedback about self-regulation from their teacher trainer.

Giving and receiving feedback on teaching is crucial for the development of pre-service teachers. Although the focus of the present study is on pre-service teachers, the findings could potentially have broader relevance, to any teachers, both pre- and in-service, who get formative feedback on a sample of their teaching. It seems that getting feedback from multiple mechanisms was perceived as a beneficial and enriching experience by the participants in this study. Teacher educators and pre- and in-service teachers, however, may be too focused on providing and receiving the one best type of feedback and not on the advantages of having simultaneous multiple feedback types and mechanisms. In order to increase the efficacy of the feedback, as suggested by Hattie and Timperley (2007), it seems important to train teachers on the advantages of focusing on the different types of levels (e.g. task, process, self-regulation, and self) to enhance learning and improve their teaching by integrating them.

In addition to training teachers on the advantages of feedback types and the ways to integrate such feedback on their teaching, it is also important to underline the implementation of feedback for learning. As Lee (2007) notes, mainly referring to teacher feedback in writing classrooms, teachers should implement the use of feedback for formative purposes. This may be also true for the use of feedback in the area of second language teacher education. Teacher trainers may want to emphasize the value of seeing post-observation feedback as a pedagogical tool to promote teacher learning rather than as a tool to assess teacher learning.

It seems also equally important to research the recipient's perspective on the feedback they receive and also to communicate the needs and expectations between the sender and the recipient before and during the feedback sessions. As Copland (2009) suggested, post-observation feedback may result in tension in initial teacher training, as was the case with some pre-service teacher participants in the present study. Receiving multiple simultaneous feedback on a sample of their teaching, they selected and integrated some points to consider from the feedback they received from different agents. This may also help to promote the sense of being part of an observation rather than an object of observation, as suggested by Freeman (1982).

Moreover, training the recipient in how to digest the feedback seems crucial for teacher educators who use micro-teaching. In this study, for instance, some pre-service teacher participants did not know what to do with the feedback initially and then their

comprehension, understanding and appreciation of the feedback changed over the course of the semester. As they participated in the activities, the agreement areas increased towards the end of the semester. Like the recipients who eventually got better at receiving feedback, the peers also improved their feedback giving skills towards the end of the semester.

Teacher trainers may also want to investigate the value of encouraging pre- and in-service teachers to reflect on different types of feedback they receive on their teaching. Especially in the initial years, novice teachers may be reactive towards the feedback they receive from their teacher trainers. With the help of such a reflective practice on feedback types at different levels, novice teachers may be more proactive towards the feedback and, possibly, they may develop a sense of appreciation for the value of observed lessons.

Finally, caution has to be sounded regarding the limitations of the study. It is important to point out that the findings reported here are constrained in that they focused on nine pre-service teachers in one institution over a single semester. As Yuan and Lee (2014) indicated, pre-service teachers change as they start teaching in the practicum. In addition, future research studies could integrate case studies and narrative studies to tap into pre-service teachers' cognitions. Future ethnographic research should take a more longitudinal approach to focus on pre-service teachers changing beliefs about different types of feedback they receive on their teaching practices.

References

Buitink, J. (2009). What and how do student teachers learn during school-based teacher education? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(1), 118-127. https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.07.009

Butler, B. M., & Cuenca, A. (2012). Conceptualizing the roles of mentors during student teaching. *Action in Teacher Education, 34*, 296-308. https://www.doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2012.717012

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory*. London: Sage.

Copland, F. (2009). Causes of tension in post-observation feedback in pre-service teacher training: an alternative view. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(3), 466-472. https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.06.001

Çelik, M. (2008). Pre-service EFL teachers' reported concerns and stress for practicum in Turkey. *Education and Science, 33*(150), 97-109.

D'Rozario, V., & Wong, A. F. (1996, November). A study of practicum-related stresses in a sample of first year student teachers in Singapore. In *annual conference of the Singapore Educational Research Association and Australian Association for Research in Education, Singapore* (pp. 25-29).

Eröz-Tuğa, B. (2012). Reflective feedback sessions using video recordings. *ELT Journal, 67*(2), 175-183. https://www.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs081

Faez, F., & Valeo, A. (2012). TESOL teacher education: Novice teachers' perceptions of their preparedness and efficacy in the classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(3), 450-471. https://www.doi.org/10.1002/tesq.37

Freeman, D. (1982). Observing teachers: Three approaches to in-service training and development. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*(1), 21-28. https://www.doi.org/10.2307/3586560

Gao, X. S., & Benson, P. (2012). "Unruly pupils" in pre-service English language teachers' teaching practicum experiences. Journal of Education for Teaching: International *Research and Pedagogy, 38*(2), 127-140. https://www.doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2012.656440

Gebhard, J. G. (2009). The practicum. In A. Burns and J. C. Richards (Eds), *The Cambridge Guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 250-258). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New York: Aldine de Gruyder.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81-112. https://www.doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Johnson, K. E. (1996). The vision versus the reality: The tensions of the TESOL Practicum. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 30-49). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kleinknecht, M., & Gröschner, A. (2016). Fostering preservice teachers' noticing with structured video feedback: Results of an online- and video-based intervention study. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 59*, 45–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.05.020

Kulhavy, R. W. (1977). Feedback in written instruction. *Review of Educational Research, 47*(1), 211-232.

Lee, I. (2007). Feedback in Hong Kong secondary writing classrooms: Assessment for learning and assessment of learning. *Assessing Writing, 12*(3), 180-198. https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2008.02.003

Legutke, M. K., & Ditfurt, M. S. (2009). School-based experience. In A. Burns and J. C. Richards (Eds), *The Cambridge Guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 209-217). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ng, W., Nicholas, H., & Williams, A. (2010). School experience influences on pre-service teachers' evolving beliefs about effective teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(2), 278-289. https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.03.010

Paker, T. (2011). Student teacher anxiety related to the teaching practicum. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 42*, 207-224.

Preece, P. F. W. (1979). Student teacher anxiety and class-control problems on teaching practice: A cross-lagged panel analysis. *British Educational Research Journal, 5*(1), 13-19.

Prilop, C. N., Weber, K. E., & Kleinknecht, M (2020). Effects of digital video-based feedback environments on pre-service teachers' feedback competence. *Computers in Human Behavior, 102*, 120-131.

Roulston, R. (2014). Analysing interviews. In U. Flick (Ed.) *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 297-313). London: Sage.

Rozelle, J. J., & Wilson, S. M. (2012). Opening the black box of field experiences: How cooperating teachers' beliefs and practices shape student teachers' beliefs and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(8), 1196-1205. https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.07.008

Schreier, M. (2014). Qualitative content analysis. In U. Flick (Ed.) *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 170-184). London: SAGE.

Seymen, S. (2012). Beliefs and expectations of student teachers' about their self and role as teacher during teaching practice course. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46*, 1042-1046. https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.245

Sutton, R. M., Hornsey, M. J., & Douglas, K. M. (2012). *Feedback: The communication of praise, criticism and advice*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Thornberg, R., & Charmaz, K. (2014). Grounded theory and theoretical coding. In U. Flick (Ed.) *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 153-170). London: Sage.

Wahba, E. (1999). Microteaching. *English Teaching Forum, 37*(4), 22-23. Retrieved June 2015, from http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/usia/E-USIA/forum/vols/vol37/no4/p23

Yuan, R., & Lee, I. (2014). Pre-service teachers' changing beliefs in the teaching practicum: Three cases in an EFL context. *System, 44*, 1-12.