The Effects of Post-Observational Reflective Feedback Modes on Teaching Beliefs: Peer vs. Teacher-Mediated Feedback

İlknur Yüksel
Anadolu University, Turkey
iyuksel79@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this study was to investigate whether the pre-service teachers' language teaching beliefs changed as a result of two different post-observational reflective feedback modes; teacher mediated and peer feedback, during their teaching practice. For each post-observational feedback mode, two groups of eight Turkish pre-service language teachers attending to the final year at English Language Teaching Department at Anadolu University, totally 16 pre-service teachers participated in the study. The qualitative and quantitative data was collected at the beginning and end of the different feedback treatments from each group. The results indicated that the feedback modes on pre-service teachers' teaching practice could influence their beliefs about teaching. Peer feedback had a potential to change the teachers' beliefs through critical reflection skills that were fostered as a result of collaboration within the peer group.

Keywords: Peer-feedback; reflective feedback; teacher training

Introduction

In recent years, teachers' thought processes; cognition, has become a major research area in teacher education. Particularly, the research on the effects of teachers' beliefs on their pedagogical practice has been mostly focused on the teacher effectiveness. Several researchers have drawn attention to the role of the teachers' beliefs to help teachers integrate their experiential and theoretical knowledge and orient them to teaching practice. Thus the concept of teaching beliefs has become significant for the teacher education programs to help pre-service teachers develop their thinking skills and classroom practice (Doyle, 1997; Andrews, 2003). In that sense, the most crucial phase that embodies pre-service teachers' teaching beliefs can be accepted as the teaching practice, besides the methodology courses at university. Teaching practice, in which pre-service teachers are required to have work-experience at school settings, allows pre-service teachers to try teaching and learning strategies and experience first-hand teaching in the real-life classroom context. Thus, during teaching practice, pre-service teachers are assigned to a university supervisor, who supervises on lesson plan preparation and other teaching stages, observes their teaching practice and gives feedback (Cook, et al. 2001). In this process, the observation of pre-service teachers in their classrooms is an essential component of teacher preparation and evaluation.

In these practices, pre-service teachers spend their time observing the school and class environment, besides experiencing a model before their own teaching (Kari, 2000). Smith and Lev-Ari (2005)

highlighted the significance of the teaching practice that learning about teaching is possible in the theoretical courses but the knowledge of teaching, professional content knowledge can only be acquired by active engagement in teaching.

After teaching practice at schools, pre-service teachers receive feedback from university supervisors on their lesson plans, teaching practice and other components of teaching profession in post-observation sessions. The role of feedback and interaction with the supervisors in these post-observation sessions are also crucial for pre-service teachers' development (Hyland & Lo, 2006). However, in these post-observation sessions, the university supervisor is usually a dominant figure while pre-service teachers are the passive listeners. Instead of reflecting on their own teaching or the feedback they get, they just listen and agree on the supervisors' opinions (Kari, 2000; Gebhard & Oprandy, 1999).

Nonetheless, it has been widely agreed in literature that the feedback, which the pre-service teachers receive during the observation and in the post-observation sessions about their practices in the classroom, should be reflective in nature that could promote auto-assessment, self-regulation and reflective practice that can be used throughout their careers (Pajares, 1992; Peacock, 2001). The reflective practice is defined as "the cognitive processes and an open perspective that involves deliberate pause to examine beliefs, goals and practices in order to gain new or deeper understanding that leads action to improve the lives of students" (Orland-Barak, 2005; p.27). Thus, reflection serves as bridge between theory and practice, with aim to integrate beliefs and images, theoretical knowledge and classroom experience, on both personal and collective level. By analyzing existing constructions, negotiating conflicting perspectives and resolving conflicts into new, better constructions are the processes of reflection. As Yost et al (2000) stated that the teacher education programs have a commitment to developing refection, namely critical reflection skills. In this way, the beliefs that pre-service teachers bring with them to the teacher education program could be addressed and developed.

Considering the role of reflection in teaching practice in terms of its effects on pre-service teachers' beliefs and hence practices, it could be posited that reflection is an effective way to change the teachers' beliefs positively. Any blocking beliefs or contradictions between beliefs and practices could be removed through effective reflection on their actions. (Richards & Lockhart, 1996)

Particularly, to trigger reflection in teacher education, especially during teaching practice, the post-observation feedback sessions given by either peers or supervisors could be intensified. Feedback during teaching practice is a term used to describe the external information given to the pre-service teachers after a teaching session has been observed. Feedback is generally intended to either confirm or change the pre-service teachers' knowledge, skill and beliefs. Reflection on the other hand is "internal feedback quest for information" (Butler & Winne, 1995). In this context, reflective feedback is a kind of feedback which promotes internal questioning on pre-service teachers' practices and which encourages them to reconstruct their beliefs in accordance with their practices and suggestions (Orland-Barak, 2005; Richards & Lockhart, 1996; McEnemy et al (1997). Moreover, it promotes reflection as a part of dialogue between the giver, either supervisor or peer, and the receiver of feedback. Both parties involve in observing, thinking, reporting, and responding. In that sense, reflective feedback is descriptive rather than judgmental. It should be emphasized that reflective feedback requires a supportive, confidential relationship built on trust, honesty.

As one of the parties in this feedback process, supervisors are the teachers in the university, who observes the pre-service teachers' practices and organizes post-observation sessions to give feedback to the pre-service teachers. In detail, the supervisor's role is defined as helping pre-service teachers to

probe and discover their awareness and understanding of what activities are effective for specific topics and for specific groups of learners. (Hyland & Lo, 2006)

The supervisors are considered very strong and effective figure in the pathways of pre-service teachers to become a teacher. As Sinclair et. al. (2005) emphasized many pre-service teachers imitate their supervising teachers' attitudes and teaching practices, rather than critically reflecting on their observations and experiences at schools. Moreover, there is a consensus that supervisors should be able to create functional learning and teaching environments to allow pre-service teachers to relate relevant educational theory to actual practice so that pre-service teachers are to be prepared for the complexities of teaching. To attain this, supervisors should discuss teaching practices and dilemmas with pre-service teachers in meaningful and non-threatening ways. When these environments and conditions are provided, pre-service teachers could develop repertoire of effective teaching practices. (Sanders et al, 2005; Hyland & Lo, 2006)

The findings of Hyland and Lo's (2006) study also confirmed the impact of supervisor's feedback on the pre-service teachers. In their study, the post-observation interaction between six ESL (English as a Second Language) pre-service teachers and their supervisors were examined. It was concluded that the supervisor's approaches to giving feedback were influenced by a number of factors including their beliefs about the aim of feedback, their perceptions of the roles as supervisors as well as attitudes toward the students. About the pre-service teachers' views on their experience, it was strikingly obtained that they were aware of and accepted their supervisor's dominant role in the feedback process, but they felt they benefited more from discussions in which they had chance to explain their views and perceptions of their teaching. The participants preferred the supervisor's to be constructive and reflective in a supportive and non-threatening way.

Thus, the one of the main aims of teacher education programs and the supervisors should be to promote reflective thinking among pre-service teachers, rather than dictating or criticizing, particularly in the feedback session on the students' teaching practices. In that context, the supervisor's guidance to the pre-service teacher such as giving feedback and observation should be based on reflection.

At first glance, peer feedback might seem paradoxical since feedback in teaching practice is normally associated with the relationship between pre-service teachers and the university supervisor or mentors at schools. However, there has been a recent shift in the literature to reconceptualize mentoring as much more of collaborative or collegial relationship rather than the supervisor or mentor feedback. (Cornu, 2005) As the application of such feedback types, professional communities, in which teachers provide support and challenge for one another to learn new practices and to change old assumptions, beliefs and practices.

For pre-service teachers, the classroom experience and a day to day interaction with colleagues has the potential to particular relationships among beliefs and principles. (Richards et. al., 2001) The peer feedback, interaction with colleagues, serves to provide participating teachers with a sense of support and companionship as well as the opportunity to give and receive technical feedback. The reciprocal nature of peer feedback fosters communication and trust, serving to alleviate isolation and burnout (Forbes, 2004; p. 221)

Forbes (2004) investigated the effectiveness of a reflective model of peer feedback in the professional growth of teachers. The results underlined the fact that peer feedback is a strong support mechanism through which they developed confidence in risk taking and experienced professional growth. As Cornu (2005) denoted on the contrary of authority and dominant role of supervisors in traditional

feedback type, the peer feedback has an advantage of providing a collaborative relationship based on partnership where neither of the participants holds a position of power over others.

Thus, the effects of reflective feedback modes in teaching practice on pre-service teachers' beliefs need further investigation. Post-observational feedback modes, namely teacher-mediated and peer feedback are widely accepted as contributory factor in teacher development (Andrews, 2003). Particularly, it has been largely agreed that the post-observational feedback modes influence the teacher's beliefs (Doyle, 1997; Andrews, 2003). Considering the fact that teacher's beliefs are the predictors of their further teacher practice in the classroom and teachers' beliefs are the central constructs that could inform about how teachers conceptualize their work and how they integrate theoretical knowledge into teaching practices (e.g. Richards, et al. 2001), it should be claimed that the post-observational feedback modes have crucial role in teacher development, and it needs further investigation from different perspectives in order to grasp its significance and contributions to teacher development.

Aim of the Study

The aim of this study was to investigate whether the pre-service teachers' language teaching beliefs changed as a result of two post-observational feedback modes; reflective teacher mediated and peer feedback in their teaching practice. Applying teacher-mediated and peer feedback, which are reflective in nature, this study aimed to determine how the pre-service teachers' beliefs change and how the pre-service teachers reflect on these feedback modes. On this purpose, the following research questions were addressed;

1. What kind of beliefs about language teaching do Turkish ELT pre-service teachers have at the beginning study?
2. Do language teaching beliefs change within and between different reflective feedback groups; teacher-mediated and peer feedback?
3. How do the pre-service teachers perceive these different reflective feedback modes?

Method

Research Design

In this study, a triangulation mixed method was adapted combining both qualitative and quantitative research methods. In detail, triangulation mixed method design is to combine the advantages of each form of data; that is, quantitative data provides for generalizability while qualitative data offers information about the context and setting (Creswell, 2005). In this sense, with this design, it is possible to collect different but complementary data on the same topic (Cresswell &Plano Clark, 2007) to gain better insights of the research topic.

In this context, for quantitative data of the study, language teaching belief inventory was conducted at the beginning and end of the study in order to detect the participants' perceptions on the two-mode feedback treatments and change in their belief systems. Then, to gain deeper insight of the quantitative data, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the participants as for qualitative data.

Participants

In this study, for each post-observational reflective feedback mode, two feedback groups; namely teacher mediated feedback group and peer feedback group, were formed with eight pre-service

teachers at each. Totally 16 pre-service teachers attending to the final year at English Language Teaching Department at Anadolu University, participated in the study.

Beside the pre-service teachers, the author also participated to the study with the role of participative researcher since she carried out the treatments in the teacher-mediated feedback group. She worked as a research assistant she was study doctorate education at the same department of the participants. She carried out different teaching practices courses for three years. During the study, for the sake of objectivity and trustworthiness of the data, she tried not to influence the participants for the favor of the study, yet she observed the context and process of the study carefully during the treatments.

Post-observation Feedback Sessions: Teacher-mediated vs. Peer Feedback

During teaching practice, the pre-service teachers at the English Language Teaching Department, at Faculty of Education, Anadolu University have methodology courses on teaching language skills at the last year of their education in addition to the methodology courses they got throughout their education. Then, they are assigned to the state schools as student teachers for the requirement of compulsory teaching practice, they are required to observe teachers at schools and then do micro teaching for 20 minutes firstly; then macro-teaching for full-time class hour. Before their teaching practice, they prepare lesson plan and after reviewing them with their university supervisors, they perform their pre-planned lessons. The supervisors regularly observe the pre-service teachers' teaching practice and discuss their performances at post-observation feedback sessions.

In this study, the selected participants were involved in the same teaching practice process. However, different treatments were applied for the post-observational session as teacher-mediated and peer feedback treatments. These different feedback treatments lasted for eight weeks in the spring term of 2006-2007 academic year. In detail, the participants in teacher-mediated feedback group received feedback from the supervisor. The feedback was given through reflective techniques. In these reflective feedback sessions, the supervisor used questions to probe pre-service teachers' teaching practices, asking them to think aloud and analyze strengths and weaknesses of the lesson. It was considered that through such treatment, the supervisor could evaluate the teachers' beliefs, thinking and decision-making processes in relation to what has been observed (Cook et al., 2001) Thus, the researcher, as a supervisor, applied teacher-mediated reflective supervisions in pre and post-observation sessions. Each session was videotaped.

On the other hand, the participants in peer feedback group received feedback from their friends, who observed their teaching practices in the classroom. After introduction phase, the participants were asked to meet each week for feedback session. The researcher did not participate in these sessions as supervisor, but each feedback session was again videotaped for data analysis. Before peer feedback treatments, the participants were trained on how to give reflective feedback to their peers and how to reflect on their own teaching practice at introduction phases at the first week. Then, in the following weeks, the researcher did not interrupt the peer feedback sessions.

Instruments

The participants were given the Beliefs about Foreign Language Education Instrument (BAFLEI) (Baldini, 2003) to determine their language teaching beliefs. This instrument contained 15 statements oriented to reflect beliefs about content knowledge, teacher curricular activities, and learner activities. The participants were asked to state their agreement to the statement on a five point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1) on this scale. Before adapting the scale in the present study, the scale was reviewed by three field experts for its construct validity for Turkish

context, in addition to the reliability and validity studies conducted by Baldini (2003) during the development of the scale, which reported it as reliable and valid. Once the experts agreed on the scale, it was administered to the participants as pre and post test in the study in order to determine any changes in the students' beliefs in language teaching occurred as a result of teaching practices and different feedback modes on their practices.

Then, in-depth interviews were conducted with all participants at the end of the study to support and probe the obtained findings also address the participants' perception on the different feedback modes.

Data Analysis

The quantitative data of the study collected from the pre and post applications of the Beliefs about Foreign Language Education Instrument. To find out and discuss the participants' language teaching beliefs, descriptive statistics involving mean, standard deviation values and percentages were obtained. For between and within group comparisons, paired and independent t-test was employed as parametric to detect any change in these beliefs as a result of feedback treatments.

Furthermore, the qualitative data gathered through interviews were analyzed with content analysis method within Mayring's framework (2000) as the researcher and an expert assigned code after examining the whole transcripts independently to determine the participants' foregrounded perceptions regarding the treatments and feedback modes. Then these codes were gathered under categories. Then, the determined codes and categories were compared. The number of agreements and disagreements between the raters was identified and the inter reliability of the data of this study was calculated as .91 using Miles and Huberman's formula (Reliability = number of agreements / (total number of agreements + disagreements). (1994; p.64). Thus, the analysis could be accepted as reliable.

<div align="center">

Results

</div>

After the quantitative and qualitative data analysis, the findings were presented in this section with reference to the research questions respectively. Thus, firstly the findings of the teaching belief inventory (BAFLEI) are presented for each group to discuss the participants' language teaching beliefs and any changes in these beliefs as effects of feedback treatments, then, the findings of qualitative analysis of interview data were presented to reveal the participants' perceptions on these feedback modes.

The Teaching Beliefs of the Pre-service Teachers at Different Feedback Groups

In order to define the participants' teaching beliefs and determine whether the different feedback modes changed the participants' teaching beliefs or not, the teaching belief instrument was applied to two different feedback groups as pre and post tests. Then, the collected data was analyzed through descriptive statistics and the obtained findings were presented in the following:

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics on Teaching Beliefs

Teaching Beliefs		Peer Feedback Group (n=8)	Teacher-mediated Feedback Group (n=8)
Pre-test	Mean	2.57	2.62
	SD	.55	1.06
Post-test	Mean	2.16	2.87
	SD	.24	.48

As Table 1 indicates, the peer feedback group got 2.57 mean value for pre-test while the teacher-mediated feedback group had 2.62. In other words, it can be stated that before the different feedback treatments, the two feedback groups had more or less the same teaching beliefs; notwithstanding the teacher mediated feedback group seemed to have more teaching beliefs than the peer feedback group as they agreed with more statements on the scale. They agreed on more than half of the statements on language teaching in the instrument. The standard values for the teacher-mediated feedback group for the pre-test yet showed that there were many individual differences in the responses to the statements in the test.

After the treatment, when the teaching belief test was repeated as a post test, it was found that there were differences in the mean scores of the feedback groups. In detail, the peer feedback group's mean value got decreased to 2.16 while the teacher-mediated feedback group's mean increased to 2.87. This can be interpreted that the pre-service teachers in the teacher-mediated feedback group agreed more statements in the belief inventory while the peer feedback group believed in less statements. When the difference between the pre and post test results of the peer feedback group was examined through paired t-test, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference since *t=2.39, df=7* and *P=.048<.05.* So, it could be claimed that the peer feedback group's beliefs about teaching language changed as a result of their feedback type they got during the study. On the other hand, when the teacher-mediated feedback group's results of pre and post teaching belief inventory were detected through paired t-test again for any statistical significance, it was obtained for teacher-mediated group, there was no significant difference between the pre and post tests since *P=.52>.05.* In other words, it could be claimed that the feedback type, namely teacher-mediated feedback, did not change the participants' teaching beliefs while peer feedback got influence on their teaching beliefs.

Moreover, the results indicating the differences and change in the peer feedback groups' teaching beliefs while no change in teacher-mediated groups' beliefs, lead to in depth analyses to investigate whether there was any significant difference between two groups in terms of teaching beliefs. In other words, to find out whether feedback type caused the changes or not, two groups' pre and post tests were compared employing independent t-test.

Table 2. Difference between Peer and Teacher-mediated Feedback Group
in terms of Teaching Beliefs

Teaching Beliefs		Mean	SD	Independent t-test		
				T	df	p
Pre test	Peer Group	2.16	,24	-3.65	14	.90
	Teacher Group	2,87	,48			
Post test	Peer Group	2,57	,55	-.11	14	.003*
	Teacher Group	2,62	,10			

Firstly, for the pre test, the analyses indicated that there was no significant difference between two feedback groups at the beginning of the study, since *P=.90>.05*. Thus, it could be claimed that the two groups were comparable at the beginning of the study. Their beliefs about teaching a language were more or less similar. On the other hand when the post tests results of two groups were compared, it was found that there was a significant difference between groups about their teaching beliefs at the end of the study. Since *P=.003<.05* so the teacher-mediated and peer feedback groups' teaching beliefs were different at the post test. When Tukey HSD post hoc test was applied to detect which group caused this difference it was obtained that the peer feedback group caused this difference. The participants in the peer group changed their beliefs about teaching a language as a result of their teaching practice and feedback mode they received at the post observation feedback sessions; that is, peer feedback.

As different from the categorization of the original scale, which are content knowledge, teacher curricular activities, and learner activities, the items in the teaching belief inventory were analyzed under four main categories for each group; namely grammar teaching, production, practice and students' errors to cover the scope of the study better. Through such categorization, it was aimed to have better understanding of the difference between the teacher-mediated and peer feedback group. New categorization was conducted by the researcher considering the explanations in the original scale and language teaching stages. After two experts in the field of language teaching reviewed the categorization, the items in each category were reanalyzed concerning both feedback groups' results at the pre and post tests. To exemplify the distribution, one item for each category was presented.

The figures in the Table 3 below and overall analysis of the items at each category showed that the feedback types did influence the participants' beliefs about language teaching. The most striking result was about grammar teaching, at the beginning of the study most of the students in each group believed in the necessity of grammar teaching, however, at the end of the study it seemed that they did not insist on pure grammar teaching so much. In detail; while 75 percentages of the pre-service teachers agreed on the item related to precise grammar teaching in the pre-test, this percentage decreased to 37,5%. Likewise, the decrease in the agreement ratios of the pre-service teachers in the peer feedback group was also observed. Their beliefs in the precise direct grammar teaching changed as a result of the different feedback treatments, while 62,5 of the pre-service teachers agreed on the item, at the end of the study, only 42% of them agreed. Moreover, it can be interpreted that the pre-service teachers started to believe that grammar teaching is a means rather than as an end to language learning and teaching. In order words, direct teaching with presentations and grammar rules was not appreciated so much at the end of the treatments, instead; grammar teaching is seen as a means to integrate all language skills.

Table 3. Examples of the Frequencies for Some Items Regarding to the Different Feedback Groups in Pre and Post Tests

Category	Peer Feedback Group		Teacher-Mediated Feedback Group	
	Pretest "Agree" (%)	Posttest "Agree" (%)	Pretest "Agree" (%)	Posttest "Agree" (%)
Grammar Teaching Item 11: "It is important to provide clear, frequent, precise presentations of grammatical structures during English language instruction."	75	37,5	62,5	42
Production Item 15 "It is not necessary to actually teach students how to speak English, they usually begin English on their own"	37,5	25,0	25,0	30,1
Practice Item 12 "Language can be described as a set of behaviors which are mastered through lots of drill and practice with the language patters of native speakers"	75,0	37,5	62,5	37,5
Students' Errors Item 13 "When students make oral errors, it is best to ignore them as long as you can understand what they are saying"	12,5	25	50,0	37,5

In a similar vein, the changes in the pre-service teachers' beliefs were observed for the items that were categorized under production and practice, there was apparent decrease in the frequencies of "agree" it seemed that they revised their beliefs as a result of the treatments. This decrease in the percentages could be interpreted as positive, as exemplified in the table above, the pre-service teachers' ideas about the items that defended more teacher-centered or less communicative methods as in item 11 for grammar teaching changed towards more student-centered and communicative methods and their agreement levels to such items decreased. Similarly, the pre-service teachers' beliefs about the practice with the native speakers' language patterns changed in both groups, they did not so much believe that language learning means only practice and drills. The items foregrounding the communication were favored by the pre-service teachers more.

However, it should be emphasized that to interpret that only feedback type was a determinant factor for the changes in the pre-service teachers beliefs could be misleading because the students went for teaching practice during the   study and it was the first time that they taught in a class, so these results reflected the changes of beliefs due to their teaching practice as well as feedback types they received at the post-observation sessions.

Thus, to reveal the effect of different feedback modes on the pre-service teachers' beliefs and support these quantitative findings, the qualitative data collected from the in-depth interviews with four participants were analyzed.

The Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions on their Teaching Beliefs and Different Feedback Modes

The pre-service teachers to be interviewed were selected according to their scores in the teaching belief inventory. From each group; the ones who changed their beliefs and who did not change at all were selected, thus totally two pre-service teachers from each group were selected. Instead of using the names of the participants, they were labeled as S1, S2, S3 and S4 to ensure the anonymity of the results.

The interview questions were designed considering the items in teaching belief inventory, so it is aimed to reveal in-depth the participants' beliefs about the role of grammar teaching, practice, production skills and their opinions about the students' errors; in brief their beliefs on the language teaching stages, as well as their beliefs about the foreign language and language learning.

After the recorded interviews were transcribed, they were analyzed through content analysis. Once the transcripts were examined overall, codes were assigned by two raters independently, and the emerged codes were gathered under main categories involving the sub-categories. The main four categories determined in the analysis were; namely *Nature of Language; Learning a Language; Teaching language;* and *Language Learner*. Some categories contained subcategories, for instance the category of *teaching a language* consisted of four subcategories, including the aim of teaching, teaching procedure, grammar teaching and dealing with the students' errors. The researcher and another rater conducted coding independently, then the determined codes were compared, as a result, the inter-rater reliability was obtained as 95% through Miles and Huberman's formula (1994).

In the following table, the broad categories and including codes were presented.

Table 4. The Emerged Categories about the Participants' Teaching Beliefs

Categories	Codes
Nature of Language	• Tool for Communication • Expressing ones' opinions
Learning a Language	• Ability • Willingness (Love)
Teaching a Language Aim of Teaching	• To let students speak • To gain communicative competence 　　Native-like speaking 　　Fluency
The Role of Grammar and Grammar Teaching	• Important to make sentences • Important to succeed in exams
Teaching Procedure	• Creating a Context • To use of Pictures, Realia and　Authentic Materials • Speaking in English (minimum L1 use) • Communicative Activities 　　Information-gap Activities 　　Use of Cue Cards 　　Role-plays
Students' Errors	• Tolerance to Errors while speaking • Need to correct written errors 　　Fossilization
Learning a Lerner "Good" Students	• Participating • Motivated
"Poor" students	• Anxious • Making errors

The overall results of the qualitative analysis of the interviews indicated that the participants favored the communicative teaching and meaning-focused activities, regardless of the feedback groups. For instance; in the interviews, the participants pinpointed the significance of communicative activities such as information-gap activities, role plays to improve students' communicative competence. Likewise, the use of visual materials and effective context in the lessons was highlighted as important components of communicative teaching. Although, some of them emphasized the significance of the grammar to make appropriate sentence while speaking or writing, to improve communicative competence was suggested as the best way for teaching English. In that sense, they mostly argued that instead of L1, teachers should use L2 (English in that context) to reinforce communication in the class.

While defining the nature of language, there was a consensus among the participants that language is a tool for communication and essential to express their ideas. For foreign language, it was defined as the privilege to get in touch with more people all over the world. As well as communicative nature of language, the participants associated the learning a language as ability For instance; one of the pre-service teachers expressed that

> *"…Knowing a language is the ability to communicate with the native speakers. … since a language is a means of communication and if you can use it in a communication, conversation…it means that you know that language"* (S1).

In this respect, S3 explained that

> *"…For example me, I chose this department (English Language Teaching) because my teachers told I have an ability to learn a language….thus, learning a language is a matter of ability…If you have ability you can learn…".*

Furthermore, motivation and willingness to learn a language was underlined for learning a language, thus S2 stated that

> *"…some of our students in our class…I mean…in my teaching practice…are really poor, they cannot learn English because they do not want…most of then ask why I should learn…English is not useful for me…I will not use it….as teachers we should change it"*

Considering their definitions of language, particularly foreign language and explanations about learning a language, they were asked to analyze the case for all language learners. In this sense, the participants complained about how the communicative nature of language is usually ignored at schools while grammar rules and other mechanical practices are overemphasized. Regarding this, while S1 explained that

> *"The students (in the schools) think that they know language because they know grammar…in fact they are tested on the grammar, so they assume that if they know grammar they can do everything about language.."* , S4 added that *"Learning a language is not natural for us, in our country English is a language taught with rules…However speaking is much more important, I want to speak fluently…like a native speaker."*

On the other hand, some pre-service teachers also underlined the role of grammar for successful communication and success in exams. For instance; S2 claimed that

> *"…Knowing a language means ..to me…is grammar to make appropriate sentences…rather than speaking….in fact we have trained so……in schools…there is a traditional approach to teaching…they follow book and they focus on forms, grammar…".*

Moreover, S2 drew attention the significance of grammar for the success at the exams, particularly the general language proficiency exams or other exams at schools, as

> *"…while teaching if we want success…I mean good scores in the exams like foreign language proficiency examination for state employees or other exams…we should focus on grammar, forms…but if we want to make our students speak we should focus on use, language use…production…"*

This quote *ex*plains the dilemma that the pre-service teachers usually encounter. They have trained with focus on grammar and they were motivated to succeed in the exams at schools until now, however they were also trained and realized that language is for communication in their teacher education program. Thus, in their teaching, they are in an attempt to integrate these two contradictory beliefs.

On the other hand, it was observed that some of the participants internalized the idea of communicative language teaching criticizing the traditional approach. For instance; S1 stated that

> "…at schools, students learn…structure, grammar, at the schools in Turkey, communication is not focused….However, I realize that…I saw at the school that I go for the teaching practice, it has began to change… Usually the focus is on grammar, did shows the use of past tense, will for future tense. In fact in my opinion this information is not useful, for the students, or for us, for communication. Of course grammar is important but this should be taught in more real life context….which means use this structure for this function in such context will be more permanent and better…"

In addition to the idea of creating context, one of the students emphasized the integration of language into the students' everyday lives as the best way of teaching; S3 expressed that

> "…the best way of teaching English is to integrate teaching with their lives out of school and to create context for language, and language use …because at home when the students close their notebooks, language should not be out of their lives, they should use language every time…"

In addition, the participants agreed that to adopt the significance of communication to the students, the teachers should use foreign language very fluently and the use of mother tongue should be at the minimum level; S4 stated that

> "For best teaching, …if we could communicate with native speakers, we could speak fluently, without considering the rules, being afraid of making errors…maybe as teacher if we could be native-like teachers, …it would be best way to teach English.".

Moreover, the use of pictures and communicative activities were some other suggestions for best way of teaching a language.

In general, it seemed that the participants in the interview agreed on the communicative approach to language teaching and they believed that the students should be involved in the lesson. For instance; their discrimination between "good" and "bad" student was also based on participation, if the student participated in the lesson, it was a good student, according to them (S1-S3). On the other hand, "making errors" was a discriminator to define a student as a poor student. The pre-service teachers all agreed that if the student did not have any motivation to learn a language and he continues making errors in spite of teachers' attempts to correct, such a student is a poor student (S3-S2).

The Effect of Feedback modes on their Language Teaching Beliefs

As in line with the aim of the study, in the interviews, it was also questioned the effect of feedback modes on their teaching beliefs, thus the students were asked to evaluate the process during the study. As a result of the content analysis of the pre-service teachers' responses about the different feedback modes at the post-observational feedback sessions, the following categories were emerged:

Table 5. The Emerged Categories about the Effects of Feedback Modes
on the Participants' Language Teaching Beliefs

Teacher-mediated Feedback Group	Peer Feedback Group
Authority	**Collaboration**
• grade	• discussion
• guiding	• help
Emotional Reactions	**Emotional Reactions**
• nervous	• comfortable
• support	• support
Post-observation Sessions	**Post-observation Sessions**
• systematic	• unsystematic
• regular	• regular
• planned	• casual

Accordingly, the pre-service teachers associated their feedback modes with different concepts; that is, the pre-service teachers from teacher-mediated feedback group emphasized the sense of authority while the peer feedback pre-service teachers preferred the concept of collaboration to define the characteristic of their feedback mode.

For teacher-mediated feedback, the authority of supervisor was the common point. Although they did not complain about this authority they emphasized that they revised and even changed their practices and knowledge according to her comments in the feedback sessions. Thus, the supervisor was the dominant figure for teacher-mediated feedback group. In that sense, S3 stated that "…*Our supervisor was not so challenging, she wanted us to realize our mistakes…I revised my lesson plans and teaching according to her critics…"*. Although they reported that they negotiated with their teachers on their lesson plans or teaching practices, her reactions were important for them. On the other hand, they were aware of the fact that the feedback that they got from their supervisors was different from the traditional supervisory sessions. In this respect, S4 stated that

> "*Our teacher asked us to tell the good and bad points of out teaching…It was challenging…at first I did not know what to say…later on I got used to it, I evaluated my teaching objectively…….I heard that my friends in other class did not do that it was really good"* .

The pre-service teachers' answers highlighted that in spite of authority figure in the teacher-mediated feedback mode, the reflective skills were emphasized during the teacher-mediated feedback treatment and the pre-service teachers were encouraged to engage in the feedback procedure.

On the other hand, the pre-service teachers at peer feedback group pinpointed that thanks to collaboration within the group they corrected their many practical mistakes. For instance, S2 stated that

> "*My friends' comments were very effective …since they are not my teachers and there will no grade …I know that their comments are sincere…I paid attention to apply their ideas…"* In a similar vein, S1 expressed that "…*I know I inspired my friends….in fact I used their ideas too…they work…some of us could analyze better…"*.

Thus, the pre-service teachers at peer feedback group underlined the advantage of discussion with their peers and getting and providing help during the collaborative feedback sessions with peers.

When the pre-service teachers were interviewed about their feelings during these different feedback treatments, they defined the emotional reactions in line with their definitions on the nature of feedback modes. That is, the pre-service teachers from teacher-mediated feedback group described the process with adjective of "nervous" . For instance; S4 stated that "…*when my lesson was bad…I was nervous in the feedback sessions…*". The reason for such anxiety was explained with grades. In spite of encouraging mood of the teacher and/or reflective and supportive atmosphere during post-observational feedback sessions, the pre-service teachers still felt nervous about the grade they would get at the end of the teaching practice course.

On contrary, the pre-service teachers at the peer feedback group explained that they felt very comfortable during the sessions as they could express their ideas and critics easily without worrying about being evaluated with grade. In this respect, one of the pre-service teachers explained that "*…there was not a boring, nervous atmosphere..it was like we were sitting and discussing…thus I felt free to tell my ideas and I did not get worried when I heard critics…*" (S2).

Although the interview data seemed to favor the peer feedback group due to the pre-service teachers' positive emotional reactions, the pre-service teachers' some comments about the organization of the post-observational sessions revealed that the teacher-mediated feedback sessions were more systematic, regular and planned while the peer feedback sessions were more casual and unplanned in spite of regular meetings. The reason for this was explained that

> "*…teacher was like an orchestrate chef…at every session, the teacher determined what to discuss and she guided us..*"(S3). Additionally, S4 stated that "*..we met every week and all of us should talk… she encouraged us, she asked questions, just to make us talk…*".

On the other hand, S1 confessed that the lack of teacher authority at the peer feedback group caused some chaos during the discussions. For example, S1 expressed that "*…certain friends talked all the time, they tried to be leader of the group. I did not like this…*". Moreover, S2 explained that "*in spite of some organizational problems, it was all good.*".

The pre-service teachers from both feedback groups agreed that these feedback treatments were different from traditional feedback sessions, in which the university supervisor is the only authority listing and grading their good and bad points and not allowing pre-service teachers to reflect on their performances. Thus, these post-observational feedback sessions, under investigation in this study, were found as very supportive and challenging the reflective skills during teaching practice. Moreover, these findings revealed the potential for reflective teacher-mediated feedback as well as for peer feedback to improve the participants' teaching practices by changing the "detrimental" beliefs, which can harm their positive attitudes and their further practices.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study was conducted to determine the effects of feedback types the students received about their teaching practices in the post-observational sessions on their beliefs about teaching and learning a foreign language. The motivation for this study was the assumption that beliefs are the contributory factor of the pre-service teachers' future practices. (Borg, 2001) As Peacock (2001) underlined teachers acquire their teaching beliefs mostly on methodology courses and during their teaching experience. In the same way, Andrews (2006) found that the teachers acquired beliefs during their education program did not so much change over the years. Therefore, this study focused on the pre-service teachers' language teaching beliefs, particularly to address the gap about the connection between the effects of feedback types to the teaching practices and the teachers' beliefs. In order to

obtain more in-depth results, semi-structured interviews were carried out along with the language teaching belief inventory. The results revealed that the students' beliefs about language teaching changed during the study, regarding to the feedback type they received. Particularly, peer feedback group revised their beliefs.

The findings of the interviews indicated that the participants favored communicative approach to language teaching, based on their belief that language is for communication and the students should acquire skills of speaking to communicate effectively. The best way of teaching was defined as the way that could integrate language into the students' lives and let them use language fluently. Thus, as the major characteristic of language teacher was reported as native-like speaking, thus most of them defined their weakness as the problems in the pronunciation and fluency while speaking in English. They explained that they reflected these beliefs on communicative teaching to their teaching practices by using the realia, pictures and authentic material that could engage students in the lesson and applying communicative activities such as information-gap, role-plays. Although they underscored the assumption that language is a matter of ability, they reported that through communicative activities students could be involved in the lesson and motivated to learn a language.

Considering the findings and the differences in the beliefs of peer group over the period, it could be interpreted that peer feedback enabled the participants to revise their beliefs and change any different or "detrimental" beliefs according to their peers' comments. As Forbes (2004) pinpointed the peer feedback triggers critical reflection skills within the group, and these skills enabled the pre-service teachers to reflect on their practices and beliefs, comparing with others'. For this study, it was possible to assume that the interaction within groups and the opportunities to observe and criticize others as well as being observed and criticized helped learners reconsider their beliefs. In fact, in the follow-up interview, the participants from the peer feedback group emphasized that they were inspired from their friends' ideas and since they were not worried about the grade, they internalized the feedback much more effectively.

On the other hand, the changes of beliefs of teacher-mediated feedback group were not statistically significant. Certainly, it does not mean that teacher-mediated feedback is useless or ineffective, but it could be claimed that the participants in this group could not change their beliefs. Gebhard and Oprandy (1999) explained such context that the supervisors usually dictate the theoretical knowledge of methodology and their own beliefs in the post-observational sessions. In many supervisory sessions, the pre-service teachers are passive recipients and they accept whatever the supervisors say without questioning it (Cornu, 2005). Although in this study, the supervisor tried to provide reflective feedback to the students, which could foster reflective thinking on their beliefs and practices, it could be assumed that due to the authoritarian role of the supervisor, being a powerful figure, in the eye of the pre-service teachers, the participants could not reflect on their beliefs and teaching as effective as peer feedback group, they had anxiety to be appreciated by a teacher. In the interviews, it was emphasized by the participants that they were anxious in the feedback sessions if their lessons were not so effective. They were afraid of being criticized by the supervisor. Consequently it could be interpreted that teacher-mediated feedback could not benefit from the reflective nature of teacher feedback due to their beliefs about supervisors, their anxiety about success and failure, that is grade, and thus self-efficacy.

These findings were consistent with Hyland and Lo's (2006) study that the pre-service teachers accepted the dominant role of supervisors in the feedback process due to their assessor's roles. Thus, they mostly preferred to accept their supervisors' comments rather than disagree and negotiate with them. This could hinder the reflective skills or this could slow down the changes of "detrimental" beliefs about teaching because the pre-service teacher would just imitate whatever their supervisor

suggested without reflecting on their practices and beliefs, like in this study. On the other hand, it should be stated that reflective feedback in supervisory sessions are quite new to the pre-service teachers-in the study. Although reflection and reflective practice have been popular very recently (e.g. Nissila, 2005) the effects of teacher-mediated reflective feedback should be assessed in a longer term that could help learners change their beliefs, prejudices about the authoritarian supervisor and to negotiate and reflect on their experiences with the supervisor.

To sum up, the results revealed that the feedback types; peer or teacher mediated, have potential to change the teachers' beliefs, particularly "detrimental" beliefs. The contributory factor for this change is the reflective nature of feedback. In the peer feedback group, it was obvious that the participants had more opportunities to reflect on their practices by collaborating with their friends. On the other hand, for teacher-mediated group, the participants could not benefit from the reflective feedback they received due to their prejudice about the supervisor as a powerful figure.

The results of this study could shed some lights on the effectiveness of feedback in the pre-service teachers' beliefs and thus their teaching practices. Particularly, potential of peer feedback, learning communities was obvious according to the results. These findings could inspire the experts and instructors in the teacher education programs to revise the programs and to construct learning communities applying peer feedback to trigger reflection and collaboration among students. Furthermore, the potential of reflective feedback for teacher-mediated supervisory sessions was also revealed, thus considering the results, it could be suggested the post-observational sessions could be redesigned, integrating reflective feedback rather than dictation of the supervisors.

In addition to such contributions of this study, it should be stated that there were some limitations in the study. Firstly, individual differences were the most important intervening variables that could not be omitted. Conducting the same study with different groups, the reliability of the results could be ensured. Moreover, as emphasized so far, this study lasted only for a month, thus the results were very limited to determine the long lasting effects of feedback types. Particularly, as mentioned, teacher-mediated group needed more time to get accustomed to the reflective feedback from the supervisor, as different from their traditional supervisory sessions. Thus, in a longer period, the results could be more explanatory about the effects of the feedback types. Finally, since the study was conducted with an intact class that was available, the size of participants was few to generalize the results, yet the number of participants should be increased in other further studies to have more generalizable results.

In the further studies, the students' teaching practices could be observed and taken into account to determine the effects of the feedback types. Although the connection between beliefs and teaching practices were explained in detail referring to the literature in this study, this aspect could be investigated.

Note: Part of this paper was presented at the International Society for Language Studies Conference (ISLS 2007), 2-4 April 2007, Honolulu, HI USA

<div align="center">

References

</div>

Andrews, S. (2003). 'Just like instant noodles': L2 teachers and their beliefs about grammar pedagogy. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 9(4),* 351-375.

Andrews, S. (2006). The evolution of teachers' language awareness. *Language Awareness, 15 (1),* 1-19.

Borg, M. (2001). Teacher's beliefs. *ELT Journal, 55(2)*, 187-189.

Butler, D.L., & Winne, P.h. (1995). Feedback and Self-regulated Learning: A theoretical Synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 65*(3), 245-281.

Cook, P.F., Young, J.R., & Evensen, N. (2001). *Using mediated learning to improve the level of reflection of preservice teachers*. Paper presented to International Conference on Learning Potential in Canada.

Cornu, R. L. (2005). Peer mentoring: Engaging pre-service teachers in mentoring one another. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 13(3).* 355-366.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). Educational research: Planning, condacting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (*2nd ed.*). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Doyle, M. (1997). Beyond life history as a student: Preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning. *College Student Journal, 31*, 519-532.

Forbes, C. T. (2004). Peer mentoring in the development of beginning secondary science teachers: Three case studies. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 12*(2), 219-239.

Gebhard, J. G., & Oprandy, R. (1999). Language teaching awareness: A guide to exploring beliefs and practices. Cambridge: CUP.

Hyland, F., & Loi M. M. (2006). Examining interaction in the teaching practicum: Issues of language, power and control. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 14*(2), 163-186.

Kari, B. (2000). Language teacher observation and reflective diaries: An alternative perspective, *Education, Fall*, 1-8. Retrieved March 03, 2009, from http://www.teachingacademy.wisc.edu/Assistance/MOO/listfb.htm

Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum Qualitative Social Research. 1*(2). Retrieved November 25, 2010, from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/viewArticle/1089/2385

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd Ed.). California: Sage Publications

Nissila, S. (2005). Individual and collective reflection: How to meet the needs of development in teaching. *European Journal of Teacher Education. 28*(2), 209-219.

Orland-Barak, L. (2005). Portfolios as evidence of reflective practice: What remains untold. *Educational Research, 47*(1), 25-44.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 10*(2), 205-217.

Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning: A longitudinal study. *System, 29*, 177-195.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: CUP.

Richards, J. Gallo, P. B., & Renandya, W. A. (2001). Exploring teachers' beliefs and the processes of change. *The PAC Journal, 1*(1), 41-62.

Sanders, M., Dowson, M., & Sinclair, C. (2005). What do associate teacher do anyway? A Comparison of theoretical conceptualizations in the literature and observed practices in the field. *Teachers College Record, 107*(4), 706-738.

Sinclair, C., Munns, G., & Woodward, H. (2005). Get real: Making problematic pathway into teaching profession. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(2), 209-222.

Smith, K., & Lev-Ari, L. (2005). The place of the practicum in pre-service teacher education: The voice of the students. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(3), 289-302.

Yost, D., Sentner, S., & Forlenza-Bailey, A. (2000). An examination of the construct of critical reflection: Implications for teacher education Programming in the 21st Century, *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(1), 39-49.