

The Progress a Pre-Service English Language Teacher Made in Her Feedback Giving Practices in Distance Teaching Practicum

Gülten KOŞAR

gulten.kosar@mku.edu.tr

Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Turkey

Abstract

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, teaching practicum has been conducted in online learning settings in Turkey, which, in return, has made pre-service English language teachers do their practicums online. The lack of research into the effect of distance teaching practicum on pre-service English language teachers' practices of giving feedback prompted the researcher to carry out this research. This instrumental case study aims to investigate the changes in a pre-service English language teacher's feedback giving practices in the English lessons she taught in the distance teaching practicum and her views about how the distance teaching practicum affected her skills of providing feedback. The results obtained from the analysis of the data collected from the researcher's notes on the pre-service English language teacher's provision of feedback in the four online lessons she taught, post-lesson telephone interviews and end-of-study semi-structured interview indicated her teaching experiences helped her make a considerable progress in her skills in giving effective feedback. The findings pointed to the significance of distance teaching practicum in developing pre-service English language teachers' feedback giving practices.

Keywords:

distance teaching practicum, effective feedback, online language teaching, pre-service English language teacher, progress in giving effective feedback

How to cite:

Koşar, G. (2021). The Progress a Pre-Service English Language Teacher Made in Her Feedback Giving Practices in Distance Teaching Practicum. *Journal of English Teaching*, 7(3), 366-381. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v7i3.3145>

INTRODUCTION

Teacher feedback is regarded by language learners as the indicator of whether they have been doing well in their journey of language learning and/or what to focus on to improve their proficiency in the target language. That is to say, language learners value teacher feedback (Mahvelati, 2021) as they deem the teacher as the supplier of the useful feedback on their language learning performance. Therefore, even though there exist other sources of feedback such as peer and automated feedback, teacher feedback is viewed to be the principle and the most reliable source. To illustrate, the findings in the study conducted by Peled, Shalom and Sharon (2014) revealed that female student teachers construed giving feedback as the job of the teacher.

Teacher feedback has been examined in a wide range of studies (e.g., Boggs, 2019; Brooks et al., 2021; Engwall & Bälter, 2007) to date. The particular significance teacher feedback has for language learners sheds light on the need for conducting more research on different aspects of teacher feedback like its timing and mode and the effect of instructional context on it. In addition, as well as scrutinizing in-service English language teachers' practices and beliefs in giving feedback, exploring pre-service English language teachers' feedback practices and beliefs could have a considerable merit in training them in giving effective feedback to students of different ages and providing them with opportunities for practicing giving feedback both in the microteaching they will conduct in the courses they take and/or as teaching real students in teaching practicum. In view of the importance of investigating pre-service English language teachers' provision of feedback in the lessons taught in teaching practicum, this study was carried out to examine the changes in a pre-service English language teacher's feedback practices in the online English lessons she taught during her distance teaching practicum.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher Feedback

Hattie and Timperley (2007, p. 81) define teacher feedback as “information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding”. Feedback could be summative, meaning it can be given at the end of a period of study or formative, meaning it could be provided during the process of learning (Lee, 2017). Types of feedback used by the teacher could be shaped by their feedback purposes (Singh & Mueller, 2021). Feedback strategies pursued by the teacher might change in accord with a set of factors. Table 1 illustrates feedback strategies introduced by Brookhart (2008, p. 5).

As shown in Table 1, a variation may occur in feedback strategies in respect of timing, amount, mode and audience. Effectiveness of teacher feedback is contingent upon its quality and student engagement is significant for the effectiveness of teacher feedback (Zhang & Hyland, 2018). Putting this at the center, Ryan, Henderson, Ryan and Kennedy, (2021, p. 12-13) suggested a conceptual model involving eight learner-centered feedback components given below:

1. Comments which provide actionable information to help the student improve aspects of similar tasks that they may undertake in the future.
2. Comments which provide actionable information to help the student achieve the learning outcomes for the subject.

3. Comments which provide actionable information to help the student develop learning skills, processes or strategies that could be useful across and beyond their degree.
4. Comments which highlight strengths and weaknesses in terms of specific aspects of the student’s task, such as grammar, content, structure.
5. Comments which summarize the overall strengths and weaknesses of the student’s performance in relation to the learning outcomes/assessment criteria.
6. Comments which encourage the student to take an active role by discussing their work with the teacher or tutor, engaging in further study, or seeking help from sources other than the teacher.
7. Comments which affirm student’s achievement on the completed performance and/or encourage them in their future work.
8. Comments which convey information that will strengthen the teacher’s relationship with the student.

Table 1. *Feedback Strategies*

Feedback Strategies Can Vary in . . .	In These Ways . . .	Recommendations for Good Feedback
Timing	When given How often	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide immediate feedback for knowledge of facts (right/wrong). • Delay feedback slightly for more comprehensive reviews of student thinking and processing. • Never delay feedback beyond when it would make a difference to students. • Provide feedback as often as is practical, for all major assignments
Amount	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many points made • How much about each point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize—pick the most important points. • Choose points that relate to major learning goals. • Consider the student’s developmental level.
Mode	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oral • Written • Visual/demonstration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select the best mode for the message. Would a comment in passing the student’s desk suffice? Is a conference needed? • Interactive feedback (talking with the student) is best when possible. • Give written feedback on written work or on assignment cover sheets. • Use demonstration if “how to do something” is an issue or if the student needs an example.
Audience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual • Group/Class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual feedback says, “The teacher values my learning.” • Group/class feedback works if most of the class missed the same concept on an assignment, which presents an opportunity for reteaching.

Other than using teacher feedback as the indicator of students' strengths and weaknesses and as the determiner of a course of action to overcome weaknesses, it was presented as a tool to promote learner autonomy in Fletcher' (2018) study. Likewise, scaffolding teacher feedback was presented to positively affect male and female students' self-regulated learning in Guo's (2021) paper.

Professional development activities are found to be influential in the positive changes in teachers' feedback practices (Gamlem, 2015) and their beliefs of corrective feedback (Ha & Murray, 2021). The feedback the teachers trained in tutoring skills provided was perceived by secondary school students as more motivating than the one given by the teachers trained in content knowledge in Hsiao, Brouns, Van Brugen and Sloep (2015) research. Hu and Choo (2016) suggested training student teachers on the use of linguistic resources indicating attitude in providing effective feedback, and in relation to that, in stimulating student learning. Reporting on the inability of the pre-service teachers to appraise students' current level of achievement and to give effective feedback, Ropohl and Rönnebeck (2019) pointed to the importance of teaching the topic of accurately judging students' current level of achievement and providing good feedback, bringing forth the crucial role of the pre-service teacher education in preparing student teachers for providing effective feedback.

Feedback in Language Teaching

Providing good feedback to language learners' productions could enable teachers to improve their own feedback practices and literacy (Yu, 2021) and foster student language learning. For instance, teacher feedback was illustrated to positively affect the development of students' writing skills in Peterson and Porter's (2014) study. Effective feedback was demonstrated to promote secondary school students' school identification and behavioral engagement in Carvalho, Santos, António and Martins's (2020) study. The factors leading to non-effective feedback has been the focal point in the literature on teacher feedback. For example, exploring the barriers to the provision of effective feedback through the lens of university students and teachers, Henderson, Ryan and Phillips (2019) reported that feedback practices including feedback comments and contextual constraints involving lack of time for giving effective feedback and individual incapability meaning not having the expertise to provide good feedback were the barriers to giving good feedback.

Characteristics of effective feedback, which could be provided at different levels of directness, are designated by Cambridge University Press (2020, p. 3-5) as follows:

- Effective feedback is about learning tasks.
- Effective feedback is specific and related to learning goals.
- Effective feedback is appropriately challenging.
- Effective feedback entails the active involvement of the learner.
- Effective feedback is a combination of the positive and the negative.

According to Hattie and Timperley (2007, p. 91), "The most common type of feedback given by most teachers in most classrooms is corrective feedback, which focuses

on learners' errors". English as a second language (ESL) teachers' corrective feedback practices were investigated in Couper's (2019) research, the findings of which indicated recasts were the most frequently used feedback type. The two dimensions of feedback strategies proposed by Ellis (2012, p. 139) are given in Table 2 below.

Table 2. *Two Dimensions of Corrective Feedback Strategies*

	Implicit	Explicit
Input providing	Recasts	Explicit correction only
Output providing	Repetition Clarification requests	Metalinguistic clue Elicitation

For Ellis (2012), corrective feedback strategies could be input and output providing, both of which can be realized either implicitly or explicitly. Implicit input providing involves recasts and explicit input providing includes explicit correction only. Implicit output providing encompasses repetition and clarification requests and explicit output providing subsumes metalinguistic clue and elicitation. According to Thornbury (2006), feedback can be positive or negative. Positive feedback is acknowledging that student production is accurate while negative feedback is evidence of an error made by the student.

Using different sources of feedback is presented to be effective at facilitating student learning (Niu, Shan & You, 2021). The way an experienced Chinese English-as-a-foreign-language teacher gave feedback on students' performance on oral presentation tasks was explored in Wang, Teo and Yu (2016) research, the findings of which demonstrated that the teacher gave oral feedback on pronunciation, content and logical thinking while provided written feedback on PowerPoint design. Extended feedback dialogues could enhance EFL learners' learning (Vattøy & Gamlem, 2020). Language teachers' feedback beliefs affect their feedback practices (Vattøy, 2020). To illustrate, exploring corrective feedback and the association between Chinese-as-a-second-language teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback and their practices of it, Bao (2019) reported the weight placed by the teachers on corrective feedback and their classroom practices mirrored their beliefs about it. However, there could be inconsistencies between language teachers' beliefs about giving feedback and their feedback practices (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019).

According to van der Kleij and Adie (2020), feedback effectiveness is context-dependent. Contextualized feedback accompanied by teacher scaffolding was yielded to be meaningful for improvement in writing in a second language in the study done by Li and Zhang (2021). The way the language teacher provides feedback could vary in a coordinated way with the features of the context. For example, the study by Mahalingappa, Polat and Wang (2021) exploring the perceptions of the EFL teachers in China and ESL teachers in the U.S. showed that the English language teachers in both contexts contended that oral corrective feedback was necessary, yet the feedback types they used were affected by socio-cultural factors.

Pointing out the significance of the development of feedback literacy, Carless (2020) noted that teacher-student collaboration enables its development among teachers and students. Student feedback literacy was depicted to be positively influenced by teacher feedback on peer feedback on the grounds that it was done in light of learner differences (Han & Xu, 2020). In addition, the findings showed the college students participants appreciated mid-course feedback more than the one offered at the end of the course as they had a chance to use teacher feedback when it was given in the mid-course.

Teacher Feedback Given in Online Learning Environments

As well as studies on teacher feedback given face-to-face, teacher feedback given in virtual environments has been examined. For example, the study carried out by Ene and Upton (2018) reported the positive effect of combining asynchronous teacher electronic feedback with synchronous text-based chats on improving university level ESL learners' writing skills and teachers and students' positive perceptions regarding electronic feedback. The pre-service teachers participating in Kılıçkaya's (2019) study preferred concordance and metalinguistic feedback from among the other feedback types the teacher provided on online advanced English grammar quizzes.

Highlighting the significance of students' being responsive to the teacher feedback and the interaction between the teacher and student, Saeed and Al Qunayeer (2020) reported the use of google docs facilitated the interactive feedback through which university students engaged in negotiating teacher feedback. Similarly, the research by Tan, Whipp, Gagne and Van Quaquebeke (2020) revealed expert teachers valued the two-way feedback between the teacher and student but factors like time constraints and class size were obstacles to it. There could be differences between the effectiveness of teacher feedback in virtual and face-to-face environments. For example, the findings in the study conducted by Thurlings, Vermeulen, Kreijn, Bastiaens and Stijnen. (2012) indicated teacher feedback was perceived to be more effective in face-to-face groups than that in the virtual group. Investigating the decision-making process behind university students' feedback uptake in an online EFL writing context, it was yielded in Tian and Zhou's (2020) study that they engaged with the sources of peer, teacher and automated feedback in a dynamic way. University teachers partaking in the study by Wei and Yanmei (2018) stated they used software programs to provide feedback more interactively and timely.

The review of literature has revealed that pre-service EFL teachers' feedback practices in not only face-to-face English classes but also online English classes have not been explored heretofore. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic pre-service EFL teachers in the context of this study could not do their teaching practicums by physically being in their placement schools but by attending to the online English lessons taught by their mentor teachers and practicing teaching online. Considering the lack of research into pre-service EFL teachers' feedback practices in distance teaching practicum, this instrumental case study targets examining the changes in a pre-service EFL teacher's feedback practices in the online English lessons she taught when doing her distance teaching practicum. The research questions to which answers were sought in this research are:

- 1- What changes took place in Alice’s feedback practices during her distance teaching practicum?
- 2- What did Alice think about the effect of the distance teaching practicum on her feedback practices?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design, the Context, and the Participant

The reason behind designing this research as an instrumental case study could be clarified by bearing in mind the purpose of instrumental case studies identified by Creswell (2012), according to whom, instrumental case studies “study a case that provides insights into an issue” (p. 466). In view of the objective of this research, investigating the changes in a pre-service EFL teacher’s feedback practices in distance teaching practicum and her thoughts about the influence of distance teaching practicum on her feedback practices, it becomes evident that this study is an instrumental case study.

This study was carried out in a state university in Turkey in the context of Teaching Practicum II course lasting for 14 weeks. Teaching practicum II course is offered in the last term of the pre-service English language teacher education program in which they have the chance to gain experience in teaching through first-hand teaching experiences and observing mentor teachers’ instructional practices. The COVID-19 pandemic has caused the convergence of teaching practicum conducted face-to-face into a distance one just like the other courses offered in the pre-service teacher education program.

Table 3. *The Content of the Four Lessons Alice Taught*

Lesson, the week when it was taught and the grade that was taught	The skill taught	Lesson Objectives
1 - week 3 - Grade 10	Speaking	Students will be able to learn travels words. Students will be able to describe the places they would like to travel to. Students will be able to describe the cities they would like to travel to.
2 – week 6 - Grade 9	Listening	Students will be able to develop their skills of listening for details. Students will be able to talk about their favorite TV series and movies.
3 – week 8 - Grade 11	Writing	Students will be able to write a short formal e-mail. Students will learn phrases used in formal emails.
4 – week 12 - Grade 9	Reading	Students will develop their skills in scanning texts.

A female senior pre-service EFL teacher aged 22 and supervised by the researcher in Teaching Practicum II course participated in this research (Pseudonym Alice will be used throughout the study to preserve her privacy). Alice was informed about the purpose of the research and her consent was obtained before the start of the study. She was placed in a state high school by the Provincial Directorate for National Education and had to join the online English lessons taught by her mentor teacher and teach at least four lessons. Her teaching performance on the first two English lessons determined her midterm exam score while that on the last two lessons determined her final exam score in Teaching Practicum II course. The content of each lesson lasting for 30-40 minutes was determined through the medium of the negotiations between Alice, the mentor teacher and the university supervisor, the researcher. Table 3 provides info on the content of the four lessons she taught.

Data Collection Tools

Researcher's Notes on Alice's Feedback Practices

The researcher took notes of Alice's feedback practices during each lesson. Besides the given positive and negative feedback on students' productions, the errors on which no corrective feedback was provided and the instances which needed positive feedback but was not provided were jotted down. Additionally, the researcher noted her ideas about the feedback provided by Alice. The notes guided the interviews with her. The researcher's notes on Alice's feedback were used to find answers to the first research question.

Post-Lesson Telephone Interviews

A post-lesson telephone interview was conducted with Alice on the same day when she taught each online lesson. The interviews were held on the day when the teaching was conducted in that it was postulated that Alice's memories of her feedback practices would be vivid. The questions in each interview were created taking into account her feedback practices in the lessons. Aside from asking questions about why she did not give feedback to the students when it was required, the researcher praised her for her good feedback practices in the lessons. During the telephone interviews, the researcher noted Alice's responses. Each interview lasted for 25-35 minutes. The data obtained from the post-lesson telephone interviews was used to answer the research question of what changes took place in Alice's feedback practices in her distance teaching practicum.

End-of-Study Semi-Structured Interview

In the last week of Teaching Practicum II course, a semi-structured interview was carried out with Alice to disclose her views about the impact of the lessons she taught in her distance teaching practicum on the progress she made in giving good feedback. The questions were prepared seeing her feedback practices in the online English lessons, the importance of unveiling her perceptions with respect to the adequacy of the pre-service teacher education program on improving her ability to provide effective feedback and whether the feedback types she employed would have varied if she had offered the lessons face-to-face. The interview questions are given below.

1. What do you think about the effect, if any, of the online lessons you taught on your skills in providing feedback?
2. Why do you think you only used recasts to give negative feedback?
3. Would you have preferred to use recasts as much as you did if you had done your teaching practicum face-to-face? Please explain.

4. What do you think about the sufficiency of the pre-service English language teacher education program in developing your ability to give effective feedback?

The end-of-study interview lasted for 22 minutes and Alice's responses were written down. The findings obtained from the interview were used to answer the research question of what Alice thought about the effect of the distance teaching practicum on her skills in providing effective feedback.

FINDINGS

The Changes that Took Place in Alice's Feedback Practices in Her Distance Teaching Practicum

The researcher's notes on Alice's feedback practices in the four online lessons she taught indicated that Alice made a considerable progress in giving feedback. Table 4 demonstrates the notes the researcher kept on the feedback she provided in each lesson.

Table 4. *The Researcher's Notes on Alice's Feedback Practices in Each Lesson*

Lesson	The researcher's notes on Alice's feedback practices
Lesson 1	"She only gave positive feedback and did not provide any negative feedback to the students during the lesson."
Lesson 2	"As well as positive feedback, she used recasts to provide negative feedback but ignored some errors."
Lesson 3	"She provided positive feedback in a very effective way, but did not give negative feedback when needed."
Lesson 4	"She was very careful about providing feedback to the students and effectively gave feedback to them."

As seen in Table 4, an improvement on Alice's feedback practices took place. In the first lesson she taught, Alice provided only positive feedback but did not give any corrective feedback. In the second and third lessons, she performed better on providing feedback to the students, and in the last lesson, according to the researcher, she adeptly provided effective feedback.

The post-lesson telephone interviews also provided comprehensive data on the changes that occurred in Alice's feedback practices. The findings obtained from the post-lesson telephone interviews are presented separately.

First Post-Lesson Telephone Interview

Since Alice did not provide any negative feedback to the students in the first lesson, she was asked why she did not provide any corrective feedback to the students by sharing specific extracts from the lesson. For instance, one of the students participated in the lesson stating the place she wanted to visit, involving a pronunciation error:

Student: I want to visit the tunnels. (Alice did not correct the student's pronunciation error when she pronounced the word /'tʌnl/ as /'tunl/.)

Remembering the student's production, Alice stated that the lesson was online, she had to complete the lesson in 35 minutes and the level of her teaching anxiety was high; for these reasons, the pronunciation error the student made went unnoticed. In the interview, another overlooked error was verbalized.

Student: I would to visit Rome.

Asked why she did not correct the error, Alice responded she had not noticed the error. She added that even if she had recognized the error, she wouldn't have attempted to correct it as the student's message was intelligible; that is, the grammatical error did not have a negative influence on communicating the meaning of the utterance.

Second Post-Lesson Telephone Interview

Second online lesson Alice taught was a listening lesson. She solely used recasts to correct students' errors. The researcher asked her why she preferred to use recasts to correct the student's error by sharing the following extract from the lesson.

Alice: How often do you watch TV?

Student: I never TV.

Alice: Thank you. You never watch TV.

Alice claimed that recasting was the most appropriate feedback type for students aged 15-16 because she believed that they did not want to be corrected explicitly. The researcher asked her why she did not use clarification requests apart from the recasts she used. Alice stated that she did not know what they are. After hearing an example of clarification requests from the researcher, Alice said she did not know that feedback type and would use it in the following lessons she would teach.

Third Post-Lesson Telephone Interview

The eleventh graders Alice taught in the third lesson were expected to write a short formal email to their English teachers. Subsequent to the completion of the analysis of an example of a short formal email written to an English teacher, the students were given ten minutes to write a formal email. Then, she listened to the emails of three students and praised them for writing the emails. The statements in the email included grammatical errors; nevertheless, Alice did not correct them. Sharing one of the errors made by one of the students, given below, the researcher asked Alice why she did not give corrective feedback.

Student: Dear Teacher,

I have to submitted my assignment today but I couldn't finished it. Can I email it you tomorrow?

Regards

Alice highlighted that she noticed the errors the student and others made and was aware of the fact that she had to provide feedback to the students. She said that the lesson lasted only for 35 minutes and she wanted to listen to more student productions before ending the lesson, and thus, she did not provide corrective feedback to the students.

Fourth Post-Lesson Telephone Interview

Alice used both positive feedback and recasts to correct students' errors in the fourth lesson in which she aimed at supporting 9th graders in developing their skills of scanning a text. The researcher shared the examples of the recasts she used in the lesson and the

positive feedback she provided, examples of which are given below, and asked her what affected her provision of good feedback to the students.

Extract 1:

Student: There is a /su'spenʃən/ bridge.

Alice: Ok. There is a /sə'spenʃən/ bridge.

Extract 2:

Student: I'd like to go to Hollywood. It's really amazing.

Alice: Very good. I hope you will go there one day.

Pointing to the positive effect of gaining teaching experience on learning to give effective feedback, Alice stated the chief reason behind improving her skills of providing good feedback was practicing teaching in the distance teaching practicum. She contended that giving feedback was a crucial part of quality teaching and the more she taught the better she would be at providing feedback.

Alice's Thoughts on the Effect of the Distance Teaching Practicum on Her Skills of Providing Effective feedback

The questions in the end-of-study semi-structured interview served for uncovering Alice's thoughts about the effect of the distance teaching practicum on her ability to give feedback. In line with her responses to the question of what factors positively affected her feedback giving practices in the fourth post lesson interview, Alice argued practicing online teaching in the distance teaching practicum enabled her to teach real students four times. She alleged because she taught different skills in the distance teaching practicum, she found an opportunity for offering feedback as teaching four language skills.

The feedback type Alice used in her online lessons was recasting. In the end-of-study interview, she pointed out she believed recasting is the most appropriate feedback type for adolescents because they did not want their English teachers to correct them explicitly. She also stated in the interview that she would have used recasts if she had done her teaching practicum face-to-face. She maintained recasting was the most effective feedback type for high schoolers irrespective of the learning environment, face-to-face or online.

The interview also provided information about Alice's perceptions regarding the sufficiency of the pre-service English language teacher education program in developing her ability to give feedback. Alice did not think that the courses she took prepared her for providing effective feedback. When the researcher requested her to provide more details about why she did not believe the courses that were offered did not help her learn about how to provide good feedback, Alice expounded that she had practiced microteaching in the three courses she took; nonetheless, she had not been given any feedback by the lecturers on how she provided feedback.

DISCUSSION

This instrumental case study was carried out to investigate the changes that took place in Alice's feedback giving practices. The researcher's notes on Alice's feedback practices revealed the improvement in her feedback practices. Furthermore, the post-lesson telephone interviews indicated that Alice also thought that she developed her feedback

giving practices in the distance teaching practicum. The findings with regard to Alice's perceptions of how the distance teaching practicum impacted on her provision of feedback showed that Alice believed it enhanced her skills of giving feedback. The findings point to the pivotal role occupied by teaching practicum in the development of pre-service English language teachers' pedagogical knowledge and skills regardless of where it is conducted, in an online or face-to-face environment. The COVID-19 pandemic, though resulted in severe problems particularly for teachers and students who had never practiced online language learning and teaching before, has enabled pre-service English language teachers to practice teaching online. Teaching involves giving feedback as well; pre-service English language teachers, thus, gained experience in providing feedback in online lessons by virtue of distance teaching practicum. Considering the effect of the distance teaching practicum on Alice's feedback giving practices, teacher educators and mentor teachers need to provide feedback on pre-service English language teachers' feedback practices in the online lessons they teach.

Alice used positive feedback and employed recasts to correct students' errors implicitly. Similarly, the ESL teachers participating in Couper's (2019) research commonly used recasts. She stated in the end-of-study semi-structured interview and the second post-lesson telephone interview that recasting was the most effective feedback type for high schoolers in that they did not desire to be corrected by their teachers explicitly. However, her responses in the second post-lesson interview indicated that she was not knowledgeable about clarification requests, another technique to be used for providing feedback implicitly. This implies the importance of integrating the teaching of how to give effective feedback to students of different ages into the pre-service English language teacher education curriculum. Moreover, pre-service English language teacher educators need to train pre-service English language teachers in providing effective feedback and to offer opportunities to them to practice giving feedback by using diverse feedback types in their microteaching. Likewise, Ropohl and Rönnebeck (2019) suggested to train pre-service teachers in providing effective feedback.

Alice contended that recasts were the most effective feedback type for adolescents. Given that teacher feedback beliefs impinge upon their feedback practices, as was suggested by Vattøy (2020), it is evident that it is necessary to uncover pre-service English language teachers' beliefs concerning the provision of good feedback, which have the potential to guide their prospective feedback practices. Feedback types other than recasts could work well in adolescent classes and a combination of distinct feedback types might be used depending on learner differences and task difficulty. This brings forth the vital role played by the pre-service English language teacher education program in training pre-service English language teachers in providing effective feedback.

CONCLUSIONS

This instrumental case study, exploring a pre-service English language teacher's feedback practices in the distance teaching practicum, is likely to add to the literature in view of the lack of research into it. The results indicated Alice made a progress in giving good feedback to high schoolers from the first online lesson to the fourth one and believed that the distance teaching practicum positively affected her feedback practices. Despite the fact the data was gathered from a pre-service English language teacher, teacher educators training student teachers at distinct disciplines and student teachers of different subject areas could benefit from the findings in this research.

The findings cannot be generalized to other contexts due to the fact that only one pre-service English language teacher took part in this study. Further research can be conducted to explore more student English language teachers' feedback practices in teaching practicum and/or distance teaching practicum. Feedback types used by pre-service English language teachers in online classes may differ from the ones used in face-to-face classes. Therefore, their feedback practices in online and face-to-face classes could be compared and contrasted to each other. Feedback types used as teaching students of different ages could vary as well, and therefore, future studies could examine the differences in pre-service English language teachers' feedback practices at diverse levels of education.

REFERENCES

- Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes: Teachers' beliefs versus their practices. *System*, 82, 140-150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.004>
- Boggs, J. A. (2019). Effects of teacher-scaffolded and self-scaffolded corrective feedback compared to direct corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy in English L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 46, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100671>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Brooks, C., Burton, R., Van der Kleij, F., Ablaza, C., Carroll, A., Hattie, J., & Neill, S. (2021). Teachers activating learners: The effects of a student-centred feedback approach on writing achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 105, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103387>
- Cambridge University Press. (2020). Giving feedback to language learners. CUP. Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/gb/files/4415/8594/0876/Giving_Feedback_minipaper_ONLINE.pdf.
- Carless, D. (2020). Longitudinal perspectives on students' experiences of feedback: A need for teacher-student partnerships. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(3), 425-438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1684455>
- Carvalho, C., Santos, N. N., António, R., & Martins, D. S. M. (2020). Supporting students' engagement with teachers' feedback: the role of students' school identification. *Educational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2020.1849564>
- Couper, G. (2019). Teachers' cognitions of corrective feedback on pronunciation: Their beliefs, perceptions and practices. *System*, 84, 41-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.003>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ene, E., & Upton, T. A. (2018). Synchronous and asynchronous teacher electronic feedback and learner uptake in ESL composition. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 41, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.05.005>

- Engwall, O., & Bälter, O. (2007). Pronunciation feedback from real and virtual language teachers. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 20(3), 235-263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220701489507>
- Fletcher, A. K. (2018). Help seeking: agentic learners initiating feedback. *Educational Review*, 70(4), 389-408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2017.1340871>
- Gamlem, S. V. (2015). Feedback to support learning: changes in teachers' practice and beliefs. *Teacher Development*, 19(4), 461-482. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2015.1060254>
- Guo, W. (2021). Gender differences in teacher feedback and students' self-regulated learning. *Educational Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2021.1943648>
- Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2021). The impact of a professional development program on EFL teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. *System*, 96, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102405>
- Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2020). The development of student feedback literacy: the influences of teacher feedback on peer feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(5), 680-696. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1689545>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>.
- Henderson, M., Ryan, T., & Phillips, M. (2019). The challenges of feedback in higher education, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(8), 1237-1252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1599815>
- Hsiao, Y. P., Brouns, F., Van Brugen, J., & Sloep, P. B. (2015). Effects of training peer tutors in content knowledge versus tutoring skills on giving feedback to help tutees' complex tasks. *Educational Studies*, 41(5), 499-512. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2015.1062079>
- Hu, G., & Choo, L. (2016). The impact of disciplinary background and teaching experience on the use of evaluative language in teacher feedback. *Teachers and Teaching*, 22(3), 329-349. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2015.1058591>
- Kılıçkaya, F. (2019). Pre-service language teachers' online written corrective feedback preferences and timing of feedback in computer-supported L2 grammar instruction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1668811>
- Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Singapore: Springer.
- Li, D., & Zhang, L. (2021). Contextualizing feedback in L2 writing: the role of teacher scaffolding. *Language Awareness*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2021.1931261>
- Mao, S. S., & Crosthwaite, P. (2019). Investigating written corrective feedback: (Mis)alignment of teachers' beliefs and practice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 45, 46-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.05.004>
- Mahalingappa, L., Polat, N., & Wang, R. (2021). A cross-cultural comparison in pedagogical beliefs about oral corrective feedback: the case of English language teachers in China versus the U.S. *Language Awareness*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2021.1900211>
- Mahvelati, E. H. (2021). Learners' perceptions and performance under peer versus teacher corrective feedback conditions. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 70, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.100995>

- Niu, R., Shan, P., & You, X. (2021). Complementation of multiple sources of feedback in EFL learners' writing. *Assessing Writing*, 49, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100549>
- Peled, Y., Shalom, O. B., & Sharon, R. (2014). Characterisation of pre-service teachers' attitude to feedback in a wiki-environment framework. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 22(5), 578-593. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2012.731002>
- Peterson, S. S., & Porter, C. (2014). Grade one peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Education 3-13*, 3(13), 237-257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2012.670256>
- Ropohl, M., & Rönnebeck, S. (2014). Making learning effective – quantity and quality of pre-service teachers' feedback. *International Journal of Science Education*, 41(15), 2156-2176.
- Ryan, T., Henderson, M., Ryan, K., & Kennedy, G. (2021). Identifying the components of effective learner-centred feedback information. *Teaching in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.1913723>
- Saeed, M. A., & Al Qunayeer, H. S. (2020). Exploring teacher interactive e-feedback on students' writing through Google Docs: Factors promoting interactivity and potential for learning. *The Language Learning Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2020.1786711>
- Singh, K., & Mueller, J. (2021). Taking a nuanced view of the role of teacher feedback in the elementary classroom. *Teachers and Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2021.1933415>
- Tan, F. D. H., Whipp, P. R., Gagne, M., & Van Quaquebeke, N. (2020). Expert teacher perceptions of two-way feedback interaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 87, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102930>
- Thornbury, S. (2006). *An A-Z of ELT*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Thurlings, M., Vermeulen, M., Kreijn, K., Bastiaens, T., & Stijnen, S. (2012). Development of the teacher feedback observation scheme: Evaluating the quality of feedback in peer groups. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 38(2), 193-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2012.656444>
- Tian, L., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Learner engagement with automated feedback, peer feedback and teacher feedback in an online EFL writing context. *System*, 91, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102247>
- Van der Kleij, F., & Adie, L. (2020). Towards effective feedback: an investigation of teachers' and students' perceptions of oral feedback in classroom practice. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 27(3), 252-270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2020.1748871>
- Vattøy, K. D. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about feedback practice as related to student self-regulation, self-efficacy, and language skills in teaching English as a foreign language. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 64, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.100828>
- Vattøy, K. D., & Gamlem, S. M. (2020). Teacher–student interactions and feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 50(3), 371-389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2019.1707512>
- Wang, B., Teo, T., & Yu, S. (2016). Teacher feedback to student oral presentations in EFL classrooms: A case study. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 43(2), 262-264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2016.1257507>

- Wei, W., & Yanmei, X. (2018). University teachers' reflections on the reasons behind their changing feedback practice. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(6), 867-879. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1414146>
- Yu, S. (2021). Feedback-giving practice for L2 writing teachers: Friend or foe? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100798>
- Zhang, Z., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 36, 90-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004>