



Proceedings of the Informing Science + Information Technology Education Conference

An Official Publication
of the Informing Science Institute
InformingScience.org

InformingScience.org/Publications

Online July 7-8, 2020

THE EXPERIENCE OF RECEIVING AND GIVING PUBLIC ORAL AND WRITTEN PEER FEEDBACK ON THE TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF PRESERVICE TEACHERS

Gila Cohen Zilka

Bar-Ilan University and
Achva Academic College, Israel

gila.zilka@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Aim/Purpose | This study examined how peer feedback, received and given face-to-face and on the course site, shapes the teacher's image, from the student's point of view as the one providing and receiving feedback. |
| Background | This study examined the effect of receiving and giving peer feedback, face-to-face and on the course site, on forming the teacher's image, from the student's point of view as someone who provides and receives feedback. |
| Methodology | The research question was, "How do preservice teachers experience giving and receiving public, oral and written, peer feedback on the teaching experience?" This is a qualitative study. Two hundred fifty-seven preservice teachers educated in teacher training institutions in Israel participated in the study. |
| Contribution | The study attempted to fill the missing pieces in the experience of providing and receiving peer feedback in the process of training for a teaching certificate. The topic of feedback has been extensively researched, but mostly from the point of view of experts providing feedback to the student, whereas this study examined peer feedback. In addition, many studies have examined the topic of feedback mainly from the point of view of the recipient. By contrast, in this study, all the students both gave and received feedback, and the topic was examined from the perspective of both the feedback recipient and the feedback provider. It was found that receiving feedback and providing feedback are affected by the same emotional and behavioral influences, at the visible, concealed, and hidden levels. |
| Findings | It was found that in oral feedback given by students face-to-face they took into account the feelings of the recipient of the feedback, more so than when feedback was given in writing on the course site. It was found also that most students considered it easier to provide feedback in writing than orally, for |

Accepted by executive review by Editor Michael Jones | Received: November 8, 2019 | Revised: January 27, 2020 | Accepted: June 12, 2020.

Cite as: Zilka, G. C. (2020). The experience of receiving and giving public oral and written peer feedback on the teaching experience of preservice teachers. In M. Jones (Ed.), *Proceedings of InSITE 2020: Informing Science and Information Technology Education Conference*, pp 1-13. Informing Science Institute. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4502>

(CC BY-NC 4.0) This article is licensed to you under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). When you copy and redistribute this paper in full or in part, you need to provide proper attribution to it to ensure that others can later locate this work (and to ensure that others do not accuse you of plagiarism). You may (and we encourage you to) adapt, remix, transform, and build upon the material for any non-commercial purposes. This license does not permit you to use this material for commercial purposes.

two reasons: first, it allowed them to edit and focus their feedback, and second, because of the physical distance from the student to whom the feedback applied. About 45% noted that the feedback they provided to others reflected their own feelings and difficulties. It was found that both giving and receiving feedback was influenced by the same emotional and behavioral layers: visible, concealed, and hidden.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Recommendations for Practitioners | When an expert gives feedback, the expert has more experience than the students and wants to share this experience with others. This is not the case with peer feedback, where everybody is in the process of training, and the feedback is not necessarily expert. Therefore, clarification and discussion of feedback are of great importance for the development of both feedback provider and recipient. |
| Recommendations for Researchers | About 45% of preservice teachers noticed that the feedback they provided to others stemmed from their own internal issues, and therefore dialogic feedback stimulated a sense of learning, empowerment, and professional development. Dialogic feedback may clarify for both provider and recipient what their habits, needs, and difficulties are and advance them in their professional development. |
| Impact on Society | People must ask themselves whether they are in a position of conducting a dialogue or in a position of resistance to what is happening in the lesson. A sense of resistance to what is happening in the lesson may cause one to feel attacked and in need of defending oneself, and therefore to criticize. It is difficult to establish fruitful and enriching dialogue in a state of resistance, and with the desire to defend oneself and go on attack. |
| Future Research | Knowledge of virtual feedback needs to be deepened. Does the feedback stem from the desire to advance the student who taught the lesson? Does the feedback stem from anger? etc. |
| Keywords | preservice teachers, written feedback, oral feedback, peer feedback, social emotional learning (SEL), public feedback, virtual feedback |

INTRODUCTION

The importance of feedback in the pedagogical process of preservice teachers and the effect of feedback on the formation of their professional and personal identity has been increasingly recognized. Therefore, it is important to accept and give effective feedback that advances learning (Bransford et al., 2000; Maier et al., 2016; Muis et al., 2015). One of the instructional practices found to be useful in cultivating social-emotional skills is the giving and receiving of feedback after a teaching practice, during the students' education as preservice teachers. In this study, all feedback, oral and written, was public, given by peer preservice teachers. The feedback related to professional knowledge (concepts, facts), methodics (teaching methods), interactions in class and the use of verbal language (forthcoming, distancing, tagging, shaping, reprimanding, clarifying words), and body language (movement around the classroom, use of voice, looking, facial expressions). Oral feedback was given after the student had finished teaching. Written feedback was given to the student in a special forum that was opened on the course site for each student, following each lesson taught. The students practiced providing dialogic feedback—orally in class and in writing on the course site. Students responded to other students, deepened one another's feedback, addressed other students' responses, asked clarification questions, and so forth. The feedback can strengthen the recipient of the feedback and bring

about a sense of value and meaning, but it can also weaken the recipient. The feedback allows experiencing visibility, and in some situations it may create a sense of exposure, criticism, and potentially harm the recipient's feeling of self-worth (Brown et al., 2016; Butler & Winne, 1995; Dempsey et al., 1993; DeNisi, 2015; Duchaine et al., 2011; Llorens et al., 2016; Poulos & Mahony, 2008; White et al., 1993; Witzel et al., 2014).

SOCIAL EMOTIONAL LEARNING (SEL)

Participating students studied according to the Social Emotional Learning (SEL) approach. Researchers (Husaj, 2016; Maurice & Harriett, 2006; Zins, 2004) have argued that teaching according to the SEL method focuses on five sets of interrelated skills: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, management of interactions, and taking responsibility. The researchers' assumption (Husaj, 2016; Maurice & Harriett, 2006; Zins, 2004) was that social-emotional skills are acquired skills and therefore can be learned and practiced. Emphasis has been placed on conducting social-emotional discourse among preservice teachers; their sense of ability to conduct an emotional-social discourse; their awareness of their own feelings and the feelings of others, while promoting the ability to conceptualize and express emotions; skills needed to conduct a respectful discussion with preservice teachers who practice teaching and watch their peers practice teaching; fostering empathy and acceptance of the other by preservice teachers who practice teaching and watch their peers practice teaching; nurturing a sense of confidence in their personal identity and the emerging professional identity of preservice teachers who practice teaching and watch their peers practice teaching (Husaj, 2016; Maurice & Harriett, 2006; Zins, 2004).

Students learned how to provide feedback orally (at the end of the lesson) and in writing (on the course site) and how to analyze the feedback they received. Participants also learned what aspects of their behavior to observe, such as the nature of interactions with their pupils, use of words that increase or decrease distance, the way they taught a concept or a phenomenon, how they moved around the classroom, how they used their voice (spoke quietly, loudly, etc.), how they made eye contact with pupils, and more.

In the course of their studies, preservice teachers should be exposed to emotional-social learning and experience. As future teachers, preservice teachers should use these skills in their interaction with pupils and the school staff and nurture these skills in their own pupils. SEL learning and experience in the course of their studies toward a teaching certificate is an arena that serves as a "training ground" for students' social-emotional development—an inseparable part of their mental wellbeing, cognitive development, and the expansion of their knowledge space. It is important to provide preservice teachers with an enjoyable learning process and experience. Enjoyment is not a luxury but a deep psychological need (Branden, 1989, 1994); the absence of enjoyment and a state of emotional suffering prevent people from experiencing and realizing dreams. They must learn and teach how to focus on the process because the process is likely to lead to a change in behavior (Emmons & McCullough, 2004; Watson, 2002). To make a change, individuals must understand their own needs and those of others, observe and investigate, be able to better understand emotional and social situations, try to identify the various pressures faced by themselves and by others, and how these pressures affect them and others, and their respective positions. This increases the chances that empathy for oneself and others would develop, together with an understanding of the reasons behind their own behavior and the behavior of others. As noted above (Husaj, 2016; Maurice & Harriett, 2006; Zins, 2004), social-emotional skills are acquired and can be learned and practiced. It is advisable to practice giving compliments, reinforcement, or both. One of the teaching practices found to be useful for cultivating social-emotional skills is videotaping students' lessons in the course of their teacher training.

FEEDBACK

DeNisi (2015) and Kluger and DeNisi (1996) define feedback as information given to a person performing a task regarding various aspects of task performance. Feedback provides learners with information allowing them to validate, correct, reconstruct interdisciplinary or metacognitive knowledge, and change perceptions of themselves, cognitive tactics, and strategies (Butler & Winne, 1995; Ching & Hsu, 2016; King, 2016). Differences in feedback depend on the way feedback is conveyed to the recipient (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). Studies show that feedback is likely to result in a feeling of empowerment in the recipient or in a feeling of humiliation and regression in the performance of tasks (Brown et al., 2016; Butler & Winne, 1995; Dempsey et al., 1993; DeNisi, 2015; Duchaine et al., 2011; Llorens et al., 2016; Poulos & Mahony, 2008; White et al., 1993; Witzel et al., 2014).

According to researchers (Hattie, 2012; Wiggins, 2012), measurement, assessment, and feedback are three interrelated components. We measure, evaluate, and then give feedback; feedback that helps growth and progress derives from the goal and refers to it. Therefore, the feedback provider must focus on a particular goal, so that the feedback can help the recipient grow and develop.

Feedback can help both the receiver and the provider stimulate self-awareness in different aspects and patterns of behavior. Giving feedback usually happens on the same three planes as receiving feedback: visible, concealed, and hidden.

At the visible level, the person is aware of the emotions, qualities, and needs expressed in one's behavior. There is an overlap between individuals' perception of themselves and the perception of the environment of their behavior. At the concealed layer, people are aware of the feelings, qualities, and needs that they choose to conceal from the environment, either because of fear of criticism or because of fear of undermining their image. The hidden layer is referred to by some researchers as the "blind spot," a behavior that is visible to the environment but which the individual does not notice. At times, the environment allows a person to continue to be unaware in order to avoid hurting or insulting the person, and also to avoid confrontation, because on occasion individuals express opposition to being told about their behavior at the hidden layer. Effective, dialogue-based feedback could expand the visible plane of the recipient and of the provider of feedback and reduce the concealed and the hidden planes. It may help feedback providers acknowledge their own behavior patterns in different areas, find out what bothered them, and whether the difficulty in question reflects on their own difficulty (Hattie, 2008, 2012; Marzano et al., 2001; Mazur, 2009; Sutton et al., 2012; William, 2011).

FACE-TO-FACE FEEDBACK AND WRITTEN FEEDBACK ON THE COURSE SITE

The process of teaching-learning face-to-face is based on verbal and nonverbal communication, such as facial expressions and gestures. In recent years, several studies focusing on the feedback process on virtual course sites have been conducted (Magill et al., 2015; Twigg, 2015). Face-to-face interaction allows recognition of verbal and nonverbal cues, whereas a virtual learning environment is characterized by absence of nonverbal cues such as facial expressions and gestures (Clark & Mayer 2016; Garrison, 2012; Yeager & Dweck, 2012). In written feedback on the course site, the clues are in the writing style: writing in a style that increases or decreases distance, labels or shapes, lectures or reprimands, questions, etc. (Birch, 2016; Bruff et al., 2013; Francis & Shannon, 2016; Leners & Sitzman, 2006; Olivier, 2016; Poon, 2013; Tan, 2016; Tempelaar et al., 2015; Zeichner & Zilka, 2016; Zilka et al., 2018; Zilka & Zeichner, 2017).

This study aims to close the gaps in knowledge in the field of peer feedback, regarding the role that the reception and giving of peer feedback face-to-face and on the course site plays in forming the teacher's character. It examined the process of accepting and giving peer feedback face-to-face and on the course site, on forming the teacher's image from the preservice teacher's point of view. The research questions were: How do preservice teachers experience, receive, and give public, oral, and

written peer feedback on teaching experience? Is it easier to receive and provide feedback in writing on the course site, or orally, or face-to-face?

METHOD

The research is a qualitative study. Discourse analysis was performed on the findings that were obtained, based on the approach described by Adler and Adler (2008), Atkinson and Delamont (2006), and Hammersley (2008).

SAMPLE

The sample included 257 preservice teachers who study in academic institutions for teacher training in Israel to be teachers of social sciences: 77.8% women, 22.2% men; 47.6% aged 20-30; 34.9% aged 30-40; and 17.5% aged 40 and over.

Data collection was conducted during 2016-2017.

The students were in their last academic year of study toward a teaching certificate. All of them had a BA, and some of them a MA (32%) and a PhD (20%) degrees.

RESEARCH TOOLS

The research tools below were derived from previous studies (Zeichner & Zilka, 2016; Zilka, 2017; Zilka et al., 2019; Zilka & Zeichner, 2017, 2019). The research data were of two kinds:

1. Receiving feedback, orally and in writing
2. Giving feedback, orally and in writing

RECEIVING FEEDBACK

In your opinion, is the feedback you received important for your personal growth and did it become a resource for your personal growth and that of the feedback providers?

Did you feel that the feedback you received from other preservice teachers was useful, challenging, professional, related to professional knowledge, to methodology, to interactions with pupils, and related to verbal or body language?

As a result of the verbal or written feedback you received, did you feel reinforced or weakened?

As a result of the feedback you received, did you decide to change your teaching methods?

What did you feel when reading the feedback written by other students in the course?

Which type of feedback is easier to face: written or oral?

PROVIDING FEEDBACK

In your opinion, was the feedback you gave important and did it become a resource for your personal growth and that of the feedback recipients?

Did you feel that the feedback you provided to other preservice teachers was useful, challenging, professional, related to professional knowledge, to methodology, to interactions with pupils, and related to verbal or body language?

As a result of the verbal or written feedback you provided, did you feel reinforced or weakened?

As a result of the feedback you provided, did you decide to change your teaching methods?

Is it easier to give feedback orally or in writing?

RESEARCH PROCESS

Participants in the study were students enrolled in 15 courses; approximately 20 students were enrolled in each course. In every course, about 20 preservice teachers participated, teaching classes and watching their colleagues teach classes. Each student taught lessons, which were recorded with a digital video camera. The feedback provided orally to the student at the end of the lesson was also recorded, and the recording was provided to the student on a flash drive. Written feedback was provided by students on the course website. Both written and verbal feedback were public.

FINDINGS

This section presents the findings regarding receiving/giving oral and written feedback and general findings on receiving and giving oral and written feedback.

RECEIVING FEEDBACK AND PROVIDING FEEDBACK**Table 1: Did you feel that the feedback you received was ...**

| | Receiving feedback | | Providing feedback | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-----|--------------------|-----|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Effective | %75 | %25 | %75 | %25 |
| Challenging | %60 | %40 | %70 | %30 |
| Professional | %60 | %40 | %60 | %40 |
| Related to professional knowledge | %70 | %30 | %70 | %30 |
| Related to teaching methods | %65 | %35 | %65 | %35 |
| Related to interactions with learners | %85 | %15 | %80 | %20 |
| Related to verbal language | %40 | %60 | %30 | %70 |
| Related to body language | %50 | %50 | %45 | %55 |

Table 2: Following the feedback you received / gave ...

| | Receiving feedback | | Providing feedback | |
|---|--------------------|-----|--------------------|-----|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Did you feel strengthened by the oral feedback? | %75 | %25 | %75 | %25 |
| Did you feel weakened by the oral feedback? | %15 | %85 | %15 | %85 |
| Did you feel strengthened by the written feedback? | %70 | %30 | %75 | %25 |
| Did you feel weakened by the written feedback? | %15 | %85 | %15 | %85 |
| Did you decide to make a change in your teaching methods following the feedback you received? | %75 | %25 | %75 | %25 |

QUOTATIONS OF PRESERVICE TEACHERS REGARDING FEEDBACK FROM THEIR PEERS

In your opinion, is the feedback you received important for your personal growth and did it become a resource for your personal growth and that of the feedback providers?

It is possible to learn from feedback how to improve what was good, and how to retain and strengthen it.

They see you as their equal and want you to succeed.

It gives different perspectives and exposes how pupils experience us during the lesson.

It makes transparency possible. Students can shed light and point out additional tools for improving teaching abilities.

Their point of view as future teachers is meaningful.

It allows you to see how others feel and think when watching you.

It sharpens points that I must strengthen as a future teacher.

The feedback was constructive, corrective, giving more perspective.

They can see things I didn't pay attention to. For example, body movements.

Peer feedback enables you to get feedback from many people at once and from people who also understand where you are, as they are teachers in training, like you.

Providing peer feedback enables you to learn directly and indirectly about the good and not so good things to do when teaching a lesson.

I think it helps because they see things a little differently from myself, and some advice I took and I think it's right to act along these lines.

I received the feedback as a learning task for professional development.

What did you feel when reading the written feedback provided by other students in the course?

There were a few feedbacks on my weaknesses that I found difficult to accept, but eventually I learned from them and improved myself.

At first, I was a little surprised, but then the general feeling was good, the students put up a mirror in front of me, brought to the surface things I have to pay attention to.

There were things that I didn't see even while repeatedly watching the recording of the lesson I taught. I learned a lot from the written feedback I received.

From the feedback I learned things about myself that I was not aware of.

Which feedback was easier to deal with, written or oral?

22.2% oral feedback

60.3% written feedback

17.5% the two complemented each other

PROVIDING FEEDBACK

About 45% of preservice teachers noted that the feedback they provided to others reflected their own feelings and difficulties. It was found that the respondents' attitudes toward providing feedback were related to their own feelings, their own difficulties, and to the fact that they were giving feedback to other students regarding aspects that they had not yet clarified for themselves. Therefore,

Receiving and Giving Public Oral and Written Peer Feedback

many noted that the dialogue between feedback providers and feedback recipients was important in building their professional identity as teachers.

Is it easier to provide feedback in writing or orally?

It is easier to provide feedback orally: 24.6%

It is easier to provide feedback in writing: 62.3%

The two complemented each other: 13.1%

It has been found that it is easier to provide oral feedback about positive aspects, but weaker points are easier to point out in writing. In writing, it is easier to get down to details, and it is less embarrassing for feedback provider. Written feedback is more accurate than oral feedback because at the time the oral feedback is provided students feel affected by the way their feedback may be accepted by the feedback receiver and by others.

Do you feel that you have provided significant feedback to other students?

I think that relatively speaking I tried to be precise and convey the main messages in the feedback, so I hope that it was meaningful.

I have always tried to provide both feedback and suggestions for improvement, so that the student would know what is good and what is not so good.

I felt that in my feedback to the students I was referring especially my weakness, my difficulty with interaction.

I realized that the feedback I received from some of the students was about things that were difficult both for them and for me, and this is interaction with the learners during the lesson.

I tried to give positive feedback. Sometimes it was hard for me to give feedback orally, but I managed to give feedback in writing. I wrote some things to keep and some to improve.

I felt that I was giving feedback about things I was still unsure about, which bothered me personally.

When I read the written feedback provided by the students, at first I felt that they were “getting even” with me, that they were writing back things that I had written to them before. But when I looked in-depth at what the students wrote to me, and in addition after another round of watching the recording of my lesson, I realized that my difficulty in managing interactions during the lesson made me give feedback to other students about issues related to classroom interactions. It made me look at my behavior and my way of giving and receiving feedback from others. I think this experience was one of the most important lessons I learned in the course of my studies toward a teaching certificate.

GENERAL

In your opinion, what is the difference between written and oral feedback?

There are things that people perhaps didn't feel comfortable saying but they put them in writing.

Written feedback is more honest.

In writing, one feels more at ease expressing oneself.

In oral feedback, one tries to be more delicate, choosing words not to hurt. Sometimes it's unpleasant to tell the truth “in your face.”

In oral feedback, people are usually more careful about what they say, and the feedback may be less truthful. In writing, people tend to be more honest, and in writing, the dialogue is deeper and leads to a deeper understanding of what is being communicated.

Oral feedback is more stressful both for the recipient and for the provider of feedback.

It is easier to write because you're not facing the person to whom you give your feedback. In addition, there is time to think about constructive and empowering formulations, and to go deeper.

In my opinion, it is harder to accept oral feedback because one always thinks about how the feedback will be perceived not only by the student who teaches but by the entire group.

Face-to-face feedback is more complicated for the feedback provider because it requires dealing with the person who receives the feedback. For the recipient, face-to-face feedback is more complicated because you have to behave politely and graciously even if the feedback makes you angry, is insulting, weakens you, etc.

DISCUSSION

This study attempted to fill gaps in the knowledge area of peer feedback, of accepting and providing oral feedback face-to-face, and of written feedback related to the shaping of the teacher's character. The study examined the acceptance and giving of peer feedback orally, in person, and in writing. The examination was carried out from the perspective of preservice teachers who provided and received feedback.

It was found that in oral peer feedback, provided face-to-face, the students took into account the feelings of the recipient of the feedback more so than when feedback was provided in writing. It was found that generally, the students' feedback was characterized as positive with respect to behavior that was meant to be retained, keep and as negative for behavior meant to be improved. In-depth feedback and in-depth dialogue were more characteristic of feedback provided in writing than orally.

There was a connection between the students' experiences receiving and giving feedback. It was found that the students related to the feedback given and received on the same planes, emotional and behavioral visible, concealed, and hidden. For example, a student who felt that it was difficult for him to conduct meaningful interactions during the lessons he had taught provided feedback to others focusing on interactions in the classroom and addressed at length the feedback given to him about interaction management.

Although written feedback was public, it was more focused than oral feedback from the point of view of in-depth engagement with respect to a particular point. It was easier for most students to provide written feedback than oral feedback for two reasons: (a) writing allowed them to shape and focus their feedback; (b) physical distance between themselves and the receiver of feedback allowed students to express their opinions more clearly and openly than in oral feedback. This finding is consistent with reports in studies that examined differences in face-to-face behavior vs. behavior in a virtual environment (Birch, 2016; Bruff et al., 2013; Francis & Shannon, 2016; Leners & Sitzman, 2006; Olivier, 2016; Poon, 2013; Tan, 2016; Tempelaar et al., 2015; Zeichner & Zilka, 2016; Zilka et al., 2018; Zilka & Zeichner, 2017).

The findings show that most preservice teachers felt that the feedback they received and the feedback they gave was useful, challenging, related to professional knowledge, teaching methods, and interactions with learners. Most of them felt that both written and oral feedback, received and given, strengthened and did not weaken them.

PROVIDING FEEDBACK

About 45% of preservice teachers noted that their feedback to others reflected their own feelings and difficulties. They provided feedback to other students regarding aspects about which they had not been sure themselves yet. Many noted that the dialogue between providers and recipients of feedback was important in the process of building their professional identity as teachers.

Many noted that it was easier for them to provide feedback in writing than orally, to be able to get into greater detail. In addition, written feedback was less embarrassing for the receiver. Students stated that when giving oral feedback, they felt affected by the way feedback was accepted by the recipient. It was found that giving feedback to others led to self-reflection by the providers of feedback regarding their own behavior and feelings.

About 45% of preservice teachers noticed that the feedback they provided to others stemmed from their own internal issues, and therefore dialogic feedback stimulated a sense of learning, empowerment, and professional development. Dialogic feedback may clarify for both provider and recipient what their habits, needs, and difficulties are and advance them in their professional development. When an expert gives feedback, the expert has more experience than the students and wants to share this experience with others. This is not the case with peer feedback, where everybody is in the process of training, and the feedback is not necessarily expert. Therefore, clarification and discussion of feedback are of great importance for the development of both feedback provider and recipient.

About 47% of students stated that the feedback given was about the characteristics and behavior of the feedback provider. Feedback in writing allowed them to observe their own behavior and what disturbed them in the behavior of the preservice teacher conducting the lesson. If, when providing feedback, students feel anger or discomfort with the behavior of the preservice teacher who taught a class, they should look at these reactions as a mirror that reflects their own anger or discomfort. When individuals are angry because of someone else's behavior, they must look at the anger itself and use the anger that arose as a path for discovering their own inner life, so that they can begin working with pupils from a cleaner and healthier starting place. The anger "helped" the anger arise, but the anger developed inside the angry person. One's self is measured by one's ability to attain self-esteem and recognition, develop a fruitful communication with the environment, and accept those around as a mirror of one's own self. A dialogue that can promote awareness in the other is a dialogue that creates a reflection, gently and politely placing a "mirror," so that the other would be aware of the chosen behavior, with high sensitivity to the other's ability to contain. Anything beyond the capacity of the other to accept will lead to withdrawal and avoidance of meaningful interaction. Students noted that they were angry with the preservice teacher who conducted the lesson, wanted to give some blunt feedback, but remembered that they had to understand where their feedback was coming from. Does the feedback stem from the desire to advance the student who taught the lesson? Does the feedback stem from anger? If the feedback is prompted by anger, it is advisable to look at the anger and see why it developed, because probably the anger was already in them, and the behavior of the student just brought it to the surface. Thus, the feedback was actually self-feedback, stemming from self-reflection and self-awareness of those who wanted to give feedback to others.

People must ask themselves whether they are in a position of conducting a dialogue or in a position of resistance to what is happening in the lesson. A sense of resistance to what is happening in the lesson may cause one to feel attacked and in need of defending oneself, and therefore to criticize. It is difficult to establish fruitful and enriching dialogue in a state of resistance, and with the desire to defend oneself and go on attack.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY

The study attempted to fill the missing pieces in the experience of providing and receiving peer feedback in the process of training for a teaching certificate. The topic of feedback has been extensively researched, but mostly from the point of view of experts providing feedback to the student, whereas

this study examined peer feedback. In addition, many studies have examined the topic of feedback mainly from the point of view of the recipient. By contrast, in this study, all the students both gave and received feedback, and the topic was examined from the perspective of both the feedback recipient and the feedback provider. It was found that receiving feedback and providing feedback are affected by the same emotional and behavioral influences, at the visible, concealed, and hidden levels.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P.A., & Adler, P. (2008). Of Rhetoric and Representation: The Four Faces of Ethnography. *The Quarterly Sociological*, 49(1), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2007.00104.x>
- Atkinson, E., & Delamont, S. (2006). In the roiling smoke: Qualitative inquiry and contested fields. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(6), 747-755. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390600975974>
- Birch, H. J. (2016). Feedback in online writing forums: Effects on adolescent writers. *The Journal of Writing Teacher Education*, 5 (1), 1-15
- Branden, N. (1994). *The Six Pillars of Self-Esteem*. Bantam Books.
- Branden, N. (1989). *The Virtue of Selfishness*. New American Library.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and schools*. National Academy Press.
- Brown, M., Kulik, C. T., & Lim, V. (2016). Managerial tactics for communicating negative performance feedback. *Personnel Review*, 45(5), 969-987. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-10-2014-0242>
- Bruff, D. O., Fisher, D. H., McEwen, K. E., & Smith, B. E. (2013). Wrapping a MOOC: Student perceptions of an experiment in blended learning. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 9(2), 187-200.
- Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulation learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 65(3), 245-281.
- Ching, Y. H., & Hsu, Y. C. (2016). Learners' interpersonal beliefs and generated feedback in an online role-playing peer-feedback activity: An exploratory study. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v17i2.2221>
- Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2016). *E-learning and the science of instruction: Proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning*. John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119239086>
- Dempsey, J. V., Driscoll, M. P., & Swindell, L. K. (1993). Text-based feedback. In J. V. Dempsey & G. C. Sales (Eds.), *Interactive instruction and feedback* (pp. 21-54). Educational Technology.
- DeNisi, A. S. (2015). Some further thoughts on the entrepreneurial personality. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(5), 997-1003. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12168>
- Duchaine, E. L., Jolivet, K., & Fredrick, L. D. (2011). The effect of teacher coaching with performance feedback on behavior-specific praise in inclusion classrooms. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 34(2), 209-227. <https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2011.0009>
- Emmons, R.A., & McCullough, M.E. (2004). *The psychology of gratitude*. Oxford University Press.
- Francis, R., & Shannon, S. J. (2016). Engaging with blended learning to improve students' learning outcomes. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 38(4), 359-369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2013.766679>
- Garrison, D. R. (2012). Article review - Social presence within the community of inquiry framework. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 13(1), 250-253.
- Hammersley, M. (2008). *Questioning qualitative research: Critical essays*. Sage.
- Hattie, J. (2008). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203887332>
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.

Receiving and Giving Public Oral and Written Peer Feedback

- Husaj, S. (2016). Social Emotional Learning (SEL). *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(3), 168-171.
- King, P. E. (2016). When do students benefit from performance feedback? A test of feedback intervention theory in speaking improvement. *Communication Quarterly*, 64(1), 1-15.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2015.1078827>
- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: Historical review, a meta-analysis and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 254-284.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254>
- Leners, D. W., & Sitzman, K. (2006). Graduate student perceptions: Feeling the passion of caring online. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 27(6), 315-319.
- Llorens, A. C., Vidal-Abarca, E., & Cerdán, R. (2016). Formative feedback to transfer self-regulation of task-oriented reading strategies. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 32(4), 314-331.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12134>
- Magill, C., Money, J., Walsh, B., & Nixon, S. (2015). Can a blended learning approach enhance students' transition into higher education? A study to explore perceptions, engagement and progression. *International Journal of Advancement in education and Social Sciences*, 3(2), 1-7.
- Maier, U., Wolf, N., & Randler, C. (2016). Effects of a computer-assisted formative assessment intervention based on multiple-tier diagnostic items and different feedback types. *Computers & Education*, 95, 85-98.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.12.002>
- Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. ASCD.
- Maurice J. E., & Harriett A. (Eds.). (2006). *The educator's guide to emotional intelligence and academic achievement social-emotional learning in the classroom*. Sage Corwin Press.
- Mazur, E. (2009, January 2). Farewell, lecture? *Science*, 323, 50-51.
- Muis, K. R., Ranellucci, J., Trevors, G., & Duffy, M. C. (2015). The effects of technology-mediated immediate feedback on kindergarten students' attitudes, emotions, engagement and learning outcomes during literacy skills development. *Learning and Instruction*, 38, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2015.02.001>
- Olivier, B. (2016). The impact of contact sessions and discussion forums on the academic performance of open distance learning students. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17(6).
<https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v17i6.2493>
- Poon, J. (2013). Blended learning: An institutional approach for enhancing students' learning experiences. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 9(2), 271.
- Poulos, A., & Mahony, M. J. (2008). Effectiveness of feedback: The students' perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(2), 143-154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930601127869>
- Sutton, R., Hornsey, M. J., & Douglas, K. M. (Eds.). (2012). *Feedback: The communication of praise, criticism, and advice*. Peter Lang.
- Tan, K. E. (2016). Using online discussion forums to support learning of paraphrasing. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 48(6), 1239-1249. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12491>
- Tempelaar, D. T., Rienties, B., & Giesbers, B. (2015). In search for the most informative data for feedback generation: Learning analytics in a data-rich context. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 47, 157-167.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.05.038>
- Twigg, C. A. (2015). Improving learning and reducing costs: Fifteen years of course description. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 47(6), 6-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2015.1089753>
- Watson, D. (2002). Positive affectivity: The disposition to experience pleasurable emotional states. In C.R. Snyder & S.J. Loper (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 106-119). Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195187243.013.0019>

- White, J. A., Troutman, A. P., & Stone, D. E. (1993). Effects of three levels of cognitive feedback and two cognitive levels of tasks on performance in computer-directed mathematics instruction. *Journal of Computer-Based Instruction*, 18(4), 130-134.
- Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven keys to effective feedback. *Educational Leadership* 70(1), 10-16.
- William, D. (2011). *Embedded formative assessment*. Solution Tree.
- Witzel, B. S., Riccomini, P. J., Fries, K. M., & Kanyongo, G. Y. (2014). A meta-analysis of algebra interventions for learners with disabilities and struggling learners. *Journal of the International Association of Special Education*, 15(1), 36.
- Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Mindsets that promote resilience: When students believe that personal characteristics can be developed. *Educational Psychologist*, 47(4), 302-314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.722805>
- Zeichner, O., & Zilka, G. (2016). Feelings of challenge and threat among pre-service teachers studying in different learning environments – Virtual vs. blended courses. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 13 (1), 7-19. <https://doi.org/10.26634/jet.13.1.6014>
- Zilka, C.G. (2017). Awareness of ICT capabilities, digital literacy, and use of reflective processes in children who received their first home computer. *Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 9(1), 80-98.
- Zilka, C. G., Cohen, R., & Rahimi, D. I. (2018). Teacher presence and social presence in virtual and blended courses. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 17, 103-126. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4061>
- Zilka, C.G., Rahimi, D.I., & Cohen, R. (2019). Sense of challenge, threat, self-efficacy, and motivation of students learning in virtual and blended courses. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 33(1), 2-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2019.1554990>.
- Zilka, G. & Zeichner, O. (2017). Forums and critical factors involved in feelings of challenge and threat among preservice teachers studying VCs and BCs. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 13(4), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.26634/jet.13.4.12397>
- Zilka, C.G., & Zeichner, O. (2019). Factors necessary for engaging preservice teachers studying in virtual and blended courses. *International Journal of Mobile and Blended Learning (IJMBL)*, 11(1), 42-57. DOI: 10.4018/IJMBL.2019010104
- Zins, J. E. (Ed.). (2004). *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say? (The series on social emotional learning)*. Teachers College Press.

BIOGRAPHY



Gila Cohen Zilka, Ph.D., Director of the Department for Teaching Social Studies and Communication at Bar-Ilan University; Head of the program for training mentors to work with children at risk, Achva Academic College, Israel.

Zilka's research focuses mainly on ICT, children in the digital environment, and communication in the diversified media.

Integration of ICT in academic teaching. Zilka's research deals with feelings of challenge and threat, self-efficacy, motivation, and emotional-social skills of students in virtual and blended courses in multicultural campuses.