



Collaborative Feedback in Enhancing Master Level English Specializing Students' Instructional Skills

Hari Maya Sharma

hmsharma1971@gmail.com

Lecturer

Central Department of Education, TU, Kirtipur

Keywords

Collaborative feedback, micro/peer-teaching, role-distance, participatory action research, teaching practice

Abstract

This study was conducted after identifying problems in the micro-teaching activities of M.Ed. fourth-semester English specializing students studying at Central Department of Education, Tribhuvan University in 2078 and 2079. The majority of the students had weaknesses in lesson planning, presentation, material selection, teaching strategies, text development and evaluation. As the internal supervisor, I proposed using collaborative feedback to address these issues. The study aimed to assess the effectiveness of collaborative feedback in improving students' instructional skills and engagement. Using a Participatory Action Research (PAR) design and involving 22 students in nine rounds of micro/peer teaching, data were collected through peer/teacher evaluations, classroom observations of each student, and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). The data were analyzed thematically. The findings indicate that collaborative feedback helped students identify their areas of strengths and weaknesses in presentation skills, classroom interaction, and material construction and use leading to better lesson planning, teaching strategies and overall teaching skills. Collaborative feedback offered opportunities for learning from others, increased motivation and receptivity to feedback.

Introduction

The development of effective teaching skills in English among prospective teachers is crucial, particularly in multilingual contexts where English is a foreign language. This is a key concern in the landscape of English

pedagogy in Nepal. Effective teaching skills encompass good presentation, effective lesson planning, innovative teaching strategies, classroom management, time and resource management, and appropriate formative/summative assessment practices (Shulman,

1987). The Faculty of Education at Tribhuvan University, established to train the teachers, plays a significant role in producing skilled teacher educators. To this end, Bachelor's and Master's students are introduced to innovations in English language teaching and engaged in a practice teaching program during the final phase of their curriculum. This program focuses on developing effective teaching skills, constructing assessment tools, and administering and analyzing these assessments.

This article has been developed from the insights of action research conducted with two cohorts of Master of English Education (M.Ed.) students in their fourth semester batch 2078 and 2079, during their practice teaching program. This program aims to equip students with practical teaching experience and enhance their professional skills through activities such as micro-teaching, peer-teaching, real-teaching, lesson planning, material and test construction, peer observations, evaluations, and writing a comprehensive report. During micro-teaching and peer-teaching sessions, students are expected to perform the roles of both teacher and observer, providing opportunities for self-reflection and peer feedback. However, many students faced significant difficulties in preparing lesson plans, conducting micro-teaching sessions, and effectively using teaching materials. I observed that nearly all students from each cohort I oriented struggled with problems in preparing effective lesson plans, conducting micro-teaching sessions, and developing as well as utilizing relevant and quality instructional materials. These challenges were further compounded by a tendency to avoid their assigned roles and responsibilities, which caused barriers in both individual success and the overall effectiveness of the Teaching Practice Program. These revealed the presence of a

persistent issue waiting for resolution that motivated me to implement collaborative feedback as an instant strategy to address the problem.

To address these issues, this study explores the effectiveness of collaborative feedback on students' pedagogical progress, self-efficacy, and reflective practice. Using participatory action research, I aimed to provide valuable insights into how collaborative feedback can foster meaningful learning experiences and enhance the teaching skills of the students. Participatory Action Research is a collaborative approach in itself that actively involves participants-researchers in the research process by focusing on collective efforts with researcher and participants to identify issues, develop strategies, and implement actions for improvement. It is a cyclical approach that involves continuous reflection, action, and evaluation, fostering empowerment and capacity-building among participants. Its main purpose is to create context specific solutions, generating new knowledge simultaneously.

Review of the Literature

Various scholars have highlighted feedback as a crucial component of teacher education as it provides opportunities for self-reflection, improvement, and professional growth (MacIntyre, Gregersen, & Mercer, 2016). Learners receive immediate feedback and clarification requests through interaction with peers and teacher which can enhance comprehension and promote deeper processing of language (Hedge, 2000).

Collaborative feedback

Collaborative feedback is particularly an effective process of giving and receiving feedback from teachers and peers in collaborative environments which facilitates

a reciprocal exchange of perspectives by enriching the learning experience for all involved (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). Research indicates that feedback significantly affects learning performance (Hattie & Timperley, 2007), with collaborative feedback being more effective than individual feedback (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). Collaborative feedback focuses on learning and development rather than just evaluating students' performance. It helps students to identify their strengths and weaknesses, and provides them with opportunities to learn from others (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Nguyen, 2019; Barkley, Cross, & Major, 2014). Collaborative feedback can be peer feedback (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Boud, Keogh, & Walker, 1985), self-assessment feedback (Sadler, 1989), group feedback (Gibbs & Simpson, 2004), 360-degree feedback (McKinsey & Company, 2010), appreciative feedback (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987), and developmental feedback (Stokes, 2004).

In teacher education, collaborative feedback supports students' learning and enhances their teaching skills in multiple ways. During micro-teaching and peer-teaching, it provides opportunities for positive and constructive feedback from peers and teacher, enabling them to detect their strengths and areas for improvement (Nguyen, 2019). It fosters active engagement in teaching and encourages self-reflection on personal strengths and weaknesses (Black, & Wiliam, 1998). Collaborative feedback promotes a collaborative learning environment, a spirit of teamwork and the ability to work together. It helps develop bond, build trust and open up interaction resulting more productive and effective learning (Boud, Keogh, & Walker, 1985). Not only encouraging learner autonomy and critical thinking, collaborative feedback enhances their engagement with language, improves learners' observation,

analysis, application and creative skills (Yang, Badger, & Yu, 2006). It also enhances students' motivation and skills in micro-/peer-teaching, peer-observation, material construction, test construction, administration and analysis (Brookfield, 1987).

Despite such identifiable benefits of collaborative feedback, existing literatures have primarily focused on the process and outcomes of feedback in general teacher education contexts (MacIntyre et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2001), with limited attention given to the specific psychological barriers that may hinder the receptivity and engagement of prospective teachers. This research gap underlines the need for study by exploring the interplay between collaborative feedback processes and these challenges within the framework of participatory action research while implementing the course "Teaching Practice (Eng. Ed. 542), under Tribhuvan University, Nepal.

Teaching practice (Eng. Ed. 542) (now it has been changed) was one of the core courses in the course cycle of Master's in English Education. It is completely a practical course recommended for fourth semester aiming to provide students the hands-on experiences in teaching so that they can be competent professionals through live teaching experiences on campus and in cooperating institutions under the close supervision of faculty members of concerned campuses/college. They have to undertake micro teaching, peer teaching, teaching at school/college/campus, peer observation, test construction, action research and overall report writing in sequential stages. The main objectives of the given course were: 1.) to provide hands-on learning in preparing effective lesson plans with appropriate teaching techniques and materials in different

situations, construct, administer, analyze and interpret appropriate tests to assess the effectiveness of their own teaching. 2.) to make them familiar with possible challenges in teaching as well as teaching practice programs and ways to address them, and 3.) to develop skills of report writing on teaching practice programs.

The major activities were organized into four overall stages. Accordingly, stage 1: Micro teaching for which 9 hours was allocated. In this stage, students had to firstly construct operational calendar, work plan and unit plan; secondly, do teaching for which they had to prepare 6 micro lesson plans (at least 3 lessons teaching). They also had to prepare teaching materials and practice micro-teaching and observe micro-lesson of their peer, analyze and give feedback in the presence of supervisor. Stage 2: Peer teaching for which 18 hours was allocated. Teaching was the first activity in which students had to prepare at least 10 peer lesson plans with instructional teaching materials (at least 5 lessons teaching), observe 2 lessons of peers in the presence of supervisor, analyze and give feedback, practice both subjective and objective tests construction. In stage 3: Teaching at school/campus for which 18 hours was allocated. In this stage, students had to teach at least 12 lessons in related subjects in the cooperating institution, observe at least 2 lessons of peers in the presence of the supervisor, analyze the reflection from the observation of peers and provide feedback to the student teacher and identify good practices. Test construction was the other activity under which students had to construct one set test construction, administer, analyze and interpret the test results. Another principal activity was to carry out action research and prepare and execute its report. For stage 4: entitled 'Overall Report Writing' was allocated 3 hours in which students

were expected to prepare an overall report of teaching practice in the given format.

Theoretical framework. Peers and teacher involved collaborative feedback provided a framework for this study. The idea of using collaborative feedback was based on Kluger and DeNisi's (1996) 'Feedback Intervention Theory (FIT)' in this study. FIT highlights the influences of feedback in learners' performance by integrating various theoretical perspectives. Feedback interventions are actions that are taken by external agents (such as teacher or peers or both) to provide information regarding certain aspects of one's task performance (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). According to the FIT theory, learners might react to performance gaps in a variety of ways: working harder to match the norm, working less hard, rejecting feedback, or giving up working. Their responses are determined by their commitment to fulfil the objectives, clarity of goal, and their optimism towards the success with further work.

Kluger & DeNisi's (1996) FIT identifies three main elements: the attention focus, feedback indicator, and feedback standard. Learners' performance is assessed against the feedback standard paying attention to the discrepancy between expected and actual performances. The feedback might be positive or negative. The positive feedback denotes that the performance meets the standard, while the negative feedback reflects the performance falls short. When learners focus their attention, they can manage several aspects at once: understanding the task, being motivated and putting in effort, and handling their emotions and self-evaluating their performances. This theory states that when a learner receives feedback indicating that a goal had not been met, his/her attention might be on one of these three levels: task level, task motivation level,

and meta-task level. Task-level emphasizes on how well learners are doing and the strategies they are using. Task motivation level is about their effort and persistence in doing the work. Meta-task level affects their self-esteem and confidence. Kluger and DeNisi (1996) argue that learners typically process feedback at the task level, but that the feedback can influence the level at which the feedback is received and attended to.

The above discussed features justify that FIT can address the problem of lack of confidence and role-distance in micro and peer teaching activities. The task-level feedback can provide clear guidance to the students to select and use appropriate strategies to improve their confidence in teaching (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). It reduces role-distance by making the performance and standards of the teaching role more explicit. Similarly, task motivation level feedback encourages effort and determination by reinforcing learners' hard work and dedication. It boosts their motivation and reduces feelings of role-distance by showing their efforts are valued. Finally, meta-task level feedback enriches self-worth and self-efficacy by offering positive feedback on the learners' overall performance and abilities. This helps build confidence and reduces role-distance by making students feel more competent and connected to their roles.

Keeping these facts in mind, a framework was developed in order to assess how well collaborative feedback could improve the teaching abilities of Master's the participant students. The framework covered classroom management, materials constructions, instructional strategies, student engagement tactics, and assessment procedures.

Research Method: The intervention design

This study employs a Participatory Action Research to address identified problems and effect change within targeted communities (Best & Kahn, 2006; Kapoor & Jordan, 2009). PAR engages learners in real-world experiences through collaborative participation, experimentation, and subsequent reflection (Henderson, 2017; Kemmis & McTaggart, 2000) between researchers and participants, involving participants in all phases of the study, from planning to implementation. Through this approach, participants explore shared interests, engage in reflective inquiry, and take practical action to address their own issues as co-researchers rather than mere subjects of study (Kapoor & Jordan, 2009; Kemmis, McTaggart, & Nixon, 2014).

This study was conducted in the Department of English Education at Tribhuvan University, Nepal to address issues related to poor presentation skills and inadequate teaching competencies among M.Ed. fourth-semester students. The collaborative and reflective nature of PAR aligns with the study's objectives. The research was conducted over two cycles, involving two cohorts of 22 students from the academic years 2078 and 2079, with 12 students from the 2078 cohort and 10 from the 2079 cohort. This sample size was formed from groups those were assigned by the Department for micro-teaching purposes in the academic years 2078 and 2079. The first cycle of the intervention was applied to the 2078 cohort, while the second cycle was implemented to the 2079 cohort.

This study was immediately planned after the first round of micro-teaching was completed by 2078 cohort. On the outset of first round micro-teaching those students were provided

with various samples of lesson plans, asked to select the most appropriate format. Working in group they selected the Engage-Study-Activate (ESA) model. Then, we collaboratively fixed the schedule for micro-teaching: daily two-hour sessions and three rounds of micro-teaching and six rounds of peer-teaching.

As plan, the first round of micro-teaching activity was initiated and each of the trainee teachers practiced micro-teaching, revealing multiple deficiencies in developing lesson plan, materials construction and use, testing and evaluation, presentation and teaching skills and showing tendencies of role distance. They often tried to escape from their work pretending in various ways: frequently showing lack of engagement and commitment to their tasks, exhibiting what Goffman (1959) referred to as 'role distance'. All these stimulated me to use collaborative feedback as intervention among multiple possible solutions. After discussing together, we (I and students) decided to apply collaborative feedback as an intervention from the second round of micro-teaching to 2078 cohort and similar intervention was applied 2079 cohort.

On the outset, students were oriented towards their roles: both as a student of their fellow-teacher and a co-researcher or observer. As a student they had to take part in classroom activities and as a co-researcher they had to observe peers' teaching, quality of materials and their use, fill up evaluation form and provide positive as well as constructive feedback both in oral and written modes. The intervention was extended during on-campus activities in academic year and each student received collaborative feedback during 8 rounds of micro-teaching and peer-teaching (i.e., 2 round micro teaching and 6 round peer-teaching) activities as per the provision

of curriculum. The lesson plans, teaching strategies, teaching materials and their uses were assessed during teaching and positive and constructive feedback were provided immediately after the class taken both in written as well as oral forms. Instead of filling up the evaluation form, the detail correction, remarks regarding strengths and weaknesses were detected on each lesson plan.

We (I and peers) offered organized input during feedback sessions, highlighting differences between the accepted standards and current practices. Feedback, both constructive and positive, was used to address areas that required development and to promote successful practices. In order to motivate effort and persistence in improving teaching methods, feedback treatments were created to center attention on particular teaching tasks and strategies, such as leading class discussions or utilizing active learning techniques. Understanding the emotional significance of the feedback, it was given in a way that was encouraging in order to prevent unfavorable self-related reactions, such lowered self-esteem or elevated anxiety. Students were urged to embrace a growth attitude and see critical responses as a chance for ongoing professional development. Through the use of FIT in this setting, a systematic and encouraging feedback process was designed to help the participant students become more proficient teachers, fostering their professional development and classroom efficacy.

Analysis

Document analysis (such as written feedback provided on observations forms and written feedbacks given on the lesson plan register of each trainee teacher), classroom observation, and focus group discussion were conducted during both cycles of the intervention.

Feedback was provided by teachers and peers in both written and oral formats. Written feedback was collected using observation forms, including peer-observation forms completed by students and presentation evaluation forms completed by the teacher. Additionally, teachers reviewed lesson plans and instructional materials, assessing them for quality, relevance, and effective use, and provided constructive written feedback. These written evaluations were systematically documented, and the progress of students' presentations was assessed and thematized.

Classroom observations were conducted as complete participant observations, with all students serving as participants, presenters, and co-researchers. I also actively participated in classroom activities, while simultaneously supervising students' engagement, motivation, and role distance as they assumed various roles. The presenters were individually provided feedback throughout these activities, which were repeated over eight rounds of student teaching. Each student received feedback in all rounds of both intervention cycles.

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were also conducted at the end of each intervention cycle, with each session lasting approximately two hours. The discussions focused on the lived experiences of both the students and the teacher (myself) during the intervention, incorporating reflections from the beginning and end of the process. Although the students were specializing in English, they were given the option to express in English or Nepali. Most students responded in English, occasionally code-switching to Nepali when they encountered language barriers. The discussions were recorded and transcribed, preserving the original content.

The responded peer observation forms and teacher evaluation forms about the teaching of each student were systematically arranged in chronological order and analyzed their progress in teaching skills based on peers' and teacher's evaluation, written and oral feedbacks from peers and teachers and students' reflection during FGD. The thematic analysis was done trying to provide thick description to portray the activities to the audiences and to explain the progress seen on the students after getting collaborative feedback.

Findings

The study findings were emerged from observation, FGD and analysis of reports/plans. These findings highlight the effectiveness of collaborative feedback in reducing role-distance among practice teaching students and enhancing their teaching skills in dynamic ways. The themes emerged from the analysis included: increasing motivation, promotion of learner autonomy and critical thinking, enhancement of presentation skills, an improvement in evaluation skills.

Increased motivation. As Brookfield (1987) and Hattie and Timperley (2007) highlight, the collaborative feedback contributes to increased self-efficacy and motivation that enhances students' skills in micro-teaching, peer-teaching. It also enhances the skill of peer-observation, material construction, test construction/ administration and analysis. The iterative process of written and oral feedback, peer observation and teacher observation directly contribute to increasing students' motivation. By engaging in multiple rounds of micro-teaching and peer-teaching and receiving feedback, students were motivated and dedicated in teaching and performing given tasks. The classroom observation and

document analysis revealed that students frequently tried to perform various activities to improve their task.

In their Feedback Intervention Theory, Kluger and DeNisi's (1996) underscore the influences of feedback in individual learner's task performance and argue that feedbacks enforce an individual to respond the performance gaps either by working harder to match the standard, or working, rejecting feedback, or giving up working. Aligning this theory, I found each student worked harder to match the standard. For example, they repeatedly tried to preparing micro/peer teaching lesson plan, material construction and their effective use, test construction and administration, and analysis. Among many, the following story of Sabita reveals this fact:

We jointly decided to prepare lesson plan following Engage-Study-Activate (ESA) model with materials construction, selection and their appropriate use, however Sabita prepared her lesson plan following PPP model but with vague objectives. Her materials were also not much relevant and practicable to use as some flash cards were not in standard size, the writing on the cards were not visible from the back side of the classroom. After the written and oral feedback from the supervisor and peers, she attempted to follow the format (ESA) with effective teaching learning strategies, construct materials in a standard format and font.

Similarly, during FGD Binaya shared his experiences regarding how immediate collaborative feedback increased his motivation toward doing quality tasks during micro/peer-teaching program. The following excerpt shows this fact:

Before we decided to implement collaborative feedback, my focus was mainly on just getting the work done without taking it seriously. When preparing lesson plans for micro/peer teaching, I treated it as a formality and tried to finish as quickly as possible. However, after receiving feedback from my supervisor and peers, I feel more motivated and optimistic about improving. Now, I am genuinely committed to doing better and learning more. I even spend more time on these activities at home.

It shows that the intervention of collaborative feedback encourages learners to work harder to match the standard. Consistent with Brookfield (1987), the structured feedback process significantly enhanced students' motivation, as they were able to see their progress over time. The opportunity to receive and act on feedback over multiple rounds encouraged persistence and effort, leading to sustained improvement in teaching performance. It also reveals that students' motivation was increased to perform the task with determination and attachment.

Promotion of autonomy and critical thinking. Consistent with Kapoor & Jordan's (2009) and Kemmis, McTaggart, & Nixon's (2014) emphasis on the dynamic nature of the intervention which allow students to function as autonomous learners. By engaging in multiple rounds of feedback from both teacher and peers and reflection, students developed the ability to independently address their teaching challenges. The collaborative feedback process empowered them to take responsibility of their learning and develop their teaching skills in a supportive and constructive environment. Their active participation as co-researchers developed

autonomy and critical thinking aligning with the findings of Yang, Badger, & Yu (2006). It also provided opportunity to them to actively engage in the feedback process that promoted engagement in independent thinking and decision-making. This progress was not only found while analyzing the documents such as peer/teacher evaluation forms, lesson planning and materials, close observation of micro and peer teaching but also from their responses during the FGDs. The following excerpt of a respondent is evidence for this:

Before this, I had only the experience of feedback by the teacher and by more talented friend individually. It is my first experience to take part as both the recipient as well as provider of feedback iteratively. It has definitely developed my confidence in doing my task independently. While selecting teaching item, setting up teaching objectives and constructing and selecting teaching materials, making plan to use them in the classroom, I think how it can be

skill also improved including voice projection and classroom movement. They produced very good lesson plans and effectively implemented them in the classroom. The following snapshots are the evidences:

Micro-lesson plan:

Micro-Lesson Plan-2

Date: 2020-04-04

Name of School: Sublink : Compulsory English
Unit : One
Topic : Critical Thinking
Teaching Item : Spelling
Issue : Expressing disappointment
Student Teacher : Chaitanya Reddy

Teaching Aids : Sentence cards, Study and materials

Learner Objective	Teacher Objective
By the end of the lesson, students will be able to express their disappointment.	To facilitate students for active engagement in learning.
Anticipated problems of students	Solution
→ Confusion of spelling disappointed word	→ Use as many as examples to facilitate them.
Anticipated problems of teacher	Solution
→ Student participation	→ Engage students into group/paired activities.

Phase	Procedure	Time	Interaction
Engage	→ Teacher asks students to recall their word -disappointing moments and their response for those situations → Teacher asks students to read out the conversation given in the textbook and other should listen carefully → Teacher asks the students to find expressions that express disappointment → Teacher gives general ideas about	17 minutes	T-S
Study		3 minutes	S-T

more effective, that can increase students' engagement and their thinking capacity. The feedback we exchange in group develops our confidence and self-reflection which increases my decision-making power.

Other participants of FGDs agreed with her and added their experiences completely aligning with this response.

Enhanced presentation skills. Students developed the skills necessary for effective presentation, including voice projection, classroom movement, and student involvement. The classroom observation and participation during multiple rounds of micro/peer teaching showed students' gradual progress in presentation skills. As Kluger and Denisi (1996) highlights the importance of feedback in improving performance, the students improved their ability to engage students, select appropriate teaching strategies, and implement them effectively. More notably, their presentation

A short video in which and an message them to compare their suggested pictures with the video

Activate

- Teacher provides a minute to each student to write any three words/phrases about hyperloop.
- The students will share their writings in front of the classroom.

3 minutes S-S

Evaluation (2 minutes)

Present some points regarding hyperloop.

Comments/Suggestions:

- Excellent lesson plan
- Excellent activities to give the interest of students
- Excellent materials in terms of font size, color & use
- Very good materials in very good
- Writing content clarity is very good
- Video was excellent to make the concept of it
- Good job

It could be more clear if you changed the picture of hyperloop than describing it in words
Findings you did (show it, that is awesome!)

Traine Teacher: Chaitanya Reddy
Internal Supervisor: [Signature]
External Supervisor: [Signature]

Peer lesson plan:

Peer Lesson Plan-1

Name of school: D.D. College, D.D. Date: 2023-08-10
 Topic: Planning and Learning Date: 23/8
 Teaching Aids: Grammar Class: 113
 Subject: Compulsory English
 Focus: Grammar and the types of sentences Page: 18, 19
 Student teacher: Divyanshu K. No. of students: 10

Teaching Aids: Main (made daily word cards), C.I. 107

Learner Objective	Teacher Objective
On the completion of the lesson the students will be able to: differentiate the types of question sentences. 1. make different types of question sentences (verb, etc.)	To facilitate the students to know and make question sentences.
Anticipated problems of students	Solution
Difficulty to identify the type of sentence, question sentence. Confusion to generate the structure of the sentence	Provide more examples to make easy for the students. Show pictures to facilitate for the generalization of structure
Anticipated problem of teacher	Solution
Participation of students	Encourage the students to participate actively by group/pair work.

Phase	Procedure	Time	Interaction
Engage	Teacher starts with making general questions related with classroom context to the students. Teacher tries to show the concept	5 minute	T-S

disappointment and the situation where one express it.

Activate (4 minutes) S-S

- Teacher divides into different groups and gives each situation of sentence card to those groups.
- Teacher allows 5 minutes to think and generalize expressions that express disappointment for those situation.
- And each group presents their expressions with given situation.

Evaluation (1 minute)
 Tell any four expressions for expressing disappointment.

Homework (1 minute)
 Develop a dialogue using expressions that shows disappointment.

Comments/Suggestions:

Good activity and good use of pictures and cards.
 Try to use more of cards and pictures.
 Try to use more of pictures and cards.
 Things to be improved:
 Better to give some examples before you explain the activity.
 Some of your peers might have confused the sentences.

Traine Teacher: [Signature]
 Internal Supervisor: [Signature]
 External Supervisor: [Signature]

Real Teaching Lesson Plan-7

Name of school: Pitambar International College
 Subject: Optional English (Humanities)
 Unit: Part (A)
 Topic: "What is Metalinguage?"
 Teaching Aids: Narration (essay)
 Focus: Metalinguage.

Teaching aids- Charts, sentence cards, daily word materials, feedback

Learner objective	Teacher objective
On the completion of the lesson the students will be able to elaborate metalinguage, its importance and with examples.	Provide clear illustration of metalinguage using suitable examples.
Anticipated problem of student	Solution
Confusion to differentiate between metalinguage with other simple normal languages as given in the text.	Facilitate students using sentence cards, charts, etc.
Anticipated problem of teacher	Solution
Active participation of students in learning.	Encourage students categorizing into pairs.

Phase	Procedure	Time	Interaction
Engage	Teacher writes some sentences using metalinguages and normal language on the boards given the text. Then, teacher raises questions relating with the sentences whether these sentences are similar or different, correct or incorrect etc.	5 minute	T-S

And teacher allows students for discussion and encourages students to speak freely.

At last of this phase, teacher asks students to write their answers on the exercise book and later compare their after study phase.

At first, teacher divides the class into four different pairs and asks the students to draw the text for the situation in pairs informing them with the procedure at starting.

Secondly, when they finish skimming, each pair is given time to present the things that they find while skimming the text.

Then, teacher appreciates students on their performance providing feedback.

And teacher shows charts and sentence cards and students are asked to read the charts and cards.

At last, teacher allows students to compare their works to engage phase and asks them to make correction if they need.

Teacher explains the charts and concludes the text.

As divided the class above, each pair is asked to present their ideas on the metacards and sentence cards which are given by teacher.

Each pair is encouraged and facilitated to speak and present their ideas in the class without hesitation.

Study (20 minute) S-T

Activate (13 min) S-T

Then, teacher provides feedback with appreciation and suggestion on their performance.

Teacher allows for discussion if they need.

At last, teacher concludes the phase briefly.

Evaluation (2 minutes)
 Why is it important to use metalinguage?
 Tell any four examples of metalinguage.

Comments/Suggestions:

Well prepared presentation
 Good feedback with materials

Traine Teacher: [Signature]
 Internal Supervisor: [Signature]
 External Supervisor: [Signature]

Real teaching lesson plan with internal supervisor's comments:

Real Teaching Lesson Plan-12

Name of school: Pranand International College Date: 2020-09-12
 Subject: Optional English (Honors/Pre) Class: V-12
 Unit: Five (5) Period: 57th
 Topic: Gender Perspective No. of students: 5
 Teaching Aids: Gender Perspective Duration: 100 minutes
 Focus: Definition, characteristics and roles of gender perspective Student teacher: Divyanshu R.

Teaching aids - Picture of gender roles, machine, marks of a question, videos, daily used materials, feedback, charts

Learner objective	Teacher objective
On the completion of this lesson the students will be able to interpret gender perspective, their features and role in literary text.	Provide clear concept on the topic.
Anticipated problem of student Difficulty in comprehending the concept of the perspective with the characteristics.	Solution Facilitate the students to perceive the fact providing sufficient examples.
Anticipated problem of teacher Students' attention on subject matter.	Solution Attract students' attention creating discussion and role scenes.

Phase	Procedure	Time	Interaction
Engage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First of all, teacher shows sentences cards which contains a question, "What is this?" The students are asked to present their opinion on the question. After identifying their answers, teacher corrects and explains their answers with the concept of perspective. 	5 minutes	T-S

The teacher shows a picture which can be classified from different ways.

- And students are asked to observe the picture and describe the picture.
- At last teacher defines perspective and connect with literature to make easy for further topics of the day.
- Teacher divides the students into four different pairs and they are asked to discuss the text for four minutes. In pairs identifying them with the perspective of observation.
- After four minutes, each pair is given five to present the main points that they found while observing.
- Then teacher appreciates all pairs on their participation with performance positively constructive feedback.
- After that teacher shows the charts but insert the definition, characteristics and the roles of gender perspective in literary text.
- Teacher explains each chart properly and effectively providing contextual and literal examples.
- Teacher allows for discussion and facilitates them if they get confused on any point.
- Lastly, teacher concludes the text in a simple and understandable way.
- He divided the pairs class, each pair is given materials that includes different types of the text.
- Each pair is given four minutes to

Study 20 minutes S-T

Discuss and prepare their answer on the topic while they have got.

- Teacher plays the role of facilitator if they need.
- After four minutes, teacher provides time for each pair to present their answers. Instructions on the particular topic.
- Each pair is encouraged and invited to speak and present their ideas in their class without hesitation.
- Then teacher provides constructive feedback with appreciable and suggestions on their performance.

Active 13 minutes S-T

Evaluation (2 minutes)
 → What do you mean by gender perspective? Test any five features of it.

Comments/ Suggestions

Teacher: _____ Internal Supervisor: _____

Lining up with Barkley, Cross, and Major (2014), they received autonomy-supportive environments, where they could control over their learning that led to greater engagement and learning outcomes. Their enhanced skills to prepare and implement good lesson planning and appropriate material use suggests that the intervention of collaborative feedback developed their learning, facilitated their teaching effectiveness. It also provided opportunity to refine their lesson plans, ensuring that they match the standard and learning objectives. Regarding this issue, all the students during FGDs, had common

voice that they also realized their progress in presentation skill.

Improvement in evaluation skills. Along with the presentation skills, the intervention improved student's evaluation skills, enabling them to assess their own teaching performance and that of their peers critically. The iterative feedback developed a culture of self-reflection, empowered the students to identify their strengths and areas for improvement and make informed adjustments. Consistent with the finding of Chen, Gully, and Eden (2001), this study

confirms that feedback has a stronger impact on learning outcomes when it is provided collaboratively rather than individually. The development of evaluation skills among students suggests that collaborative feedback sessions were effective in fostering reflective practice and self-regulation. In this regard, all the participants had a common experience as revealed in the given excerpt:

As a student of faculty of education, we have got opportunities to study measurement and evaluation as a separate subject. We often construct questions, evaluate students' performance but the collaborative feedback is the best to enhance self-reflection, and sense of criticality in every aspect of teaching learning that enhances evaluation skill. By listening how other friends evaluate our performance and how they evaluate other peers, we can acquire a sense of analyzing same thing from different perspectives.

This shows that collaborative feedback not only improves presentation skill of students, but also promote their self-assessment skills in multiple ways.

Discussion

The findings of this study highlight the effectiveness of collaborative feedback in enhancing the teaching skills of practice teaching students. Drawing on Kluger and DeNisi's (1996) 'Feedback Intervention Theory', it becomes evident that feedback plays a pivotal role in influencing students' motivation and performance. The students in this study demonstrated a significant change in their engagement with teaching tasks, moving from a mere completion of tasks to a dedicated effort to excel. This transformation aligns with Kluger and DeNisi's argument that feedback stimulates individuals to address performance gaps, either by striving to meet

the expected standards or by reassessing their techniques.

The exchange of feedback, as observed in this study, not only increased students' (trainee teachers') motivation but also arouse a sense of ownership over their learning. The reflections shared by participants, such as Sabita and Binaya, highlight how collaborative feedback can lead to a profound change in their attitudes and behaviors. These students moved beyond a superficial engagement with teaching tasks to a more meaningful and intentional practice. This shift is vital, as it suggests that motivation is not merely a product of external validation but is deeply connected to the process of self-improvement facilitated by feedback.

The study further reveals that the collaborative feedback process empowered students to become autonomous learners and critical thinkers. Engaging in feedback chain not only allowed students to address their teaching challenges but also encouraged them to take responsibility for their learning. This finding resonates with the work of Kapoor and Jordan (2009) and Kemmis, McTaggart, and Nixon (2014), who emphasize the importance of learner autonomy in educational settings. The ability to engage critically with feedback and to make informed decisions about teaching practices reflects a deeper level of engagement and suggests that the students were developing essential skills for their future roles as teachers.

Likewise, the enhancement of presentation skills observed in this study lines up with Kluger and DeNisi's (1996) emphasis on the role of feedback in performance enhancement. The gradual improvement in voice projection, classroom movement, and student engagement underlines the

importance of feedback in refining teaching techniques. The autonomy-supportive environment, as discussed by Barkley, Cross, and Major (2014), played a crucial role in this process, enabling students to take control of their learning and to implement feedback effectively. This not only improved their presentation skills but also contributed to their overall teaching effectiveness.

The development of evaluation skills among the students further underscores the impact of collaborative feedback. The ability to critically assess their own performance and that of their peers fostered a culture of self-reflection and continuous progression. This finding supports the work of Chen, Gully, and Eden (2001), who argue that collaborative feedback has a stronger impact on learning outcomes compared to individual feedback. Multiple perspectives received through the feedback process enhanced the students' evaluation skills, enabling them to approach self-assessment with greater criticality and depth.

These findings clearly reflect that collaborative feedback is a powerful tool in teacher education. The reduction in role-distance and the enhancement of teaching skills observed in this study suggest that feedback, when delivered in a structured and supportive manner, can lead to significant improvements in teaching performance. This aligns with the broader literature on feedback and educational practices, reinforcing the importance of incorporating regular, reiterative feedback into teacher training programs.

As a researcher as well as a practitioner, I find that these results not only validate the principles of Kluger and DeNisi's (1996) 'Feedback Intervention Theory' but also offer practical insights into how

feedback can be effectively integrated into teaching practice program as well as in other normal classes. The positive outcomes observed in this study point to the need for a more widespread adoption of collaborative feedback mechanisms in broader educational settings. By doing so, we can better support the professional development of prospective teachers, ensuring that they are equipped with the skills and confidence needed to excel in their teaching roles.

Conclusion

This study contributes to deeper understanding of the role of feedback in teacher education and underscores the significance of collaborative, iterative feedback processes in promoting teaching skills. As a researcher and teaching professional, one key realization from this PAR was that trainee teachers often struggle with transferring theoretical knowledge into practical teaching and classroom presentation. One of the major challenges I observed during teaching practice was the lack of confidence and coherence in students' presentations and appropriate use of materials. The teaching of linked to a superficial understanding of content. This issue was mitigated by providing focused, practicable feedback through systematic collaborative feedback sessions, which encouraged trainee teachers to reflect more deeply on their performance. These sessions not only enhanced their instructional skills but also developed their sustained engagement with the learning process. One of the implications of these findings might be that systematic feedback sessions should be an integral part of teacher training, as they not only develop teaching skills of trainee teachers but also promote their deeper engagement with the learning process. Future research might explore the long-term impact of such interventions and experiment how they can be adapted to different educational settings to maximize their effectiveness.

References

- Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. (2014). *Collaborative learning techniques: A handbook for college faculty* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological bulletin*, *117*(3), 497-529.
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *80*(2), 139-148.
- Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (1985). *Reflection: Turning experience into learning*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1987). *Developing critical thinkers: Challenging adults to explore alternative ways of thinking and acting*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, *4*(1), 62-83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810141004>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge; Taylor & Francis Group.
- Cooperrider, D. L., & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In W. P. Fisher & J. A. Oswick (Eds.), *Theories of organizational behavior* (pp. 129-169). Sage.
- Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2004). Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, *1*(1), 3-31.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81-112.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford University Press.
- Henderson, L. (2017). Someone had to have faith in them as professionals: An evaluation of an action research project to develop educational leadership across the early years. *Educational Action Research*, *25*(3), 387-401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2016.1173566>
- Kapoor, D., & Jordan, S. (Eds.) (2009). *Education, Participatory Action Research, and Social Change*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/9780230100640.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2000). Participatory action research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 567-605). Sage.
- Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2014). *The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research*. Springer.
- Kluger & DeNisi (1996). The Effects of Feedback Interventions on Performance: A Historical Review, a Meta-Analysis, and a Preliminary Feedback Intervention Theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *119* (2), 254-284. DOI:10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254

- MacIntyre, P. D., Gregersen, T., & Mercer, S. (2016). Language teachers' coping strategies during the Covid-19 conversion to online teaching: Correlations with stress, wellbeing and negative emotions. *System, 94*, 102352.
- McKinsey & Company. (2010). 360-degree feedback. *McKinsey on Organizational Health*, (3), 3-9.
- Nguyen, H. T. (2019). The effect of peer feedback on pre-service teachers' teaching skills. *Journal of Education and Practice, 10*(29), 84-93.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science, 18*(2), 119-144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714>
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411>
- Stokes, J. (2004). *Feedback for learning: A developmental approach*. University of California, Berkeley.
- Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*(3), 179-200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.00>