How A Teacher Educator in the Field of the Education of Hearing-Impaired Children provides Feedback to a Student Teacher

Hasan Gürgür
Anadolu University, Turkey, hasangurgur@anadolu.edu.tr

How A Teacher Educator in the Field of the Education of Hearing-Impaired Children provides Feedback to a Student Teacher

Hasan Gurgur
Anadolu University
Turkey

Absract: The aim of this article was to investigate how an experienced teacher educator (TE) specialized in the education of hearing-impaired children provides feedback to a student teacher regarding a planned, one-to-one conversation activity. This case study was conducted at Anadolu University, Education and Research Centre for Hearing-Impaired Children with the participation of a TE, a student teacher, and a hearing-impaired student. Based on the study results, main aspects relating to the TE's activities before, during, and after the conversation and his feedback were identified. The study findings were discussed in light of the current literature, and various recommendations were proposed.

Keywords: Teacher training, teacher educators, feedback process, hearing-impaired children, one-to-one conversation.

Introduction

Hearing-loss in children is known to delay the development of their language and communication skills (Clarke & Stewart, 1986; Cole & Flexer, 2007; Kretschmer, 1994). For this reason, group classes are organized with hearing-impaired children in order to support their academic needs, to promote the development of their language and communication skills, and to contribute to their learning of verbal language and vocabulary (Pakulski, 2011; Tannen, 2007). The literature also mentions that informal and formal (planned) one-to-one conversations are important for the development of verbal language and communications skills during the education of hearing-impaired children (Clarke & Stewart, 1986; Cole & Flexer, 2007; Kretschmer, 1994; Lloyd, Lieven & Arnold, 2001; Mahon, 2009; Paatsch & Toe, 2013). In a general sense of the term, formal conversation can be defined as the sharing of events, information, and meanings between the teacher and students, with the intention of forming an orally interactive environment (Clarke & Stewart, 1986; Kretschmer, 1994; Paatsch & Toe, 2013; Spencer & Marschark, 2006). Studies in the literature also mention that planned one-to-one conversations provide hearing-impaired children the opportunity to assume the role of both speaker and listener, and that such conversations contribute favourably to the development of their verbal language and communication skills (Clarke & Stewart, 1986; Cole & Flexer, 2007; Girgin, 2003; Kretschmer, 1994; Lloyd et al., 2001; Mahon, 2009; Paatsch & Toe, 2013). For this reason, it is necessary for teachers involved in the education of hearing-impaired children to possess the necessary skills to adequately perform planned one-to-one conversations (Cole & Flexer, 2007; Easterbrooks, 2011; Johnson, 1997; Luetke-Stahlman, 1993; Pakulski, 2011; Tye-Murray, 1994). Skills that such teachers must possess include the ability to plan (e.g., select

materials and set objectives), implement (e.g., give the child the opportunity to express opinions and expand the subject), and evaluate (e.g., to reflect his/her and the child's thoughts) activities according to the language level of the child. The necessary skills and competencies for the conduct of planned one-to-one conversations are taught to student teachers during the course of their pre-service teacher training programs, within the context of teaching practice activities (Easterbrooks, 2011; Girgin, 2003; Luetke-Stahlman, 1993; Pakulski, 2011; Schirmer, 2008).

Teacher educators (TE) are responsible for conducting and supervising activities that aim to develop the applied skills of teachers. Main roles assumed by TEs include monitoring the activities of student teachers, assisting their development, collecting information regarding the skills/competencies that student teachers need to develop, and providing written and verbal feedback to student teachers based on the observations they make (Brinko, 1993; Bunton, Stimpson & Lopez-Real, 2002; Murray, Swennen & Shagrir, 2008; Spear, Lock & McCulloch, 1997; Tang & Chow, 2007; VanLooy & Vrijsen, 1998; White, 2007; Wilkins-Canter, 2010).

Literature review

In this context, there is an important relationship between the feedback provided by supervising TEs and the effective acquisition of teaching skills by student teachers (Copland, 2010; Hyland & Margaret, 2006). Various studies have been conducted to date to evaluate how TEs provide feedback to student teachers while supervising. Such studies have shed light on many important aspects relating to the supervision of student teachers (e.g.; Copland, 2010; Murray, Swennen & Shagrir, 2008). The findings of these studies have highlighted the importance of implementing a planned and systematic approach while supervising (Copland, 2010; Tang & Chow, 2007; Wilkins-Canter, 2010). These studies have also indicated the necessity for TEs to provide verbal or written feedback to student teachers based on accurate information they collect regarding these candidates' activities (Spear et al., 1997). Furthermore, these studies also emphasized the importance of focusing on concrete and specific skills, behaviours and competencies when providing such feedback (Brinko, 1993; Scheeler, Ruhl & McAfee, 2004).

These studies also mentioned that to ensure the continued motivation of student teachers, it is necessary to assume a balanced approach towards the positive and negative aspects of these candidates' traits and performance (Brandt, 2008; Hyland & Margaret, 2006). In addition, these studies indicated that assessing the competencies of student teachers one-by-one, in a step-wise fashion, and in accordance with the individual development and learning rate of the student teachers, is more effective than evaluating all areas of competence together and at once (Spear et al., 1997; Tang & Chow, 2007; Wilkins-Canter, 2010). Studies in the literature demonstrated that the timing and frequency of TE feedback are important as well (Scheeler et al., 2004; Wilkins-Canter, 2010). With regards to timing, feedback is described as being the most effective when provided immediately after the student teacher activities (Scheeler et al., 2004). It was also asserted that the frequency of feedback has a positive correlation with the effective development of competencies in student teachers (Wilkins-Canter, 2010). In sum, these studies all suggest that when conducting teaching practice activities, TEs must frequently provide verbal and written feedback by using accurate information, considering different competence areas separately, and in a step-wise fashion (rather than considering them together as a whole), by focusing on concrete and specific competencies, and by balancing positive and negative feedback.

A review of the literature indicates that studies in Turkey have generally not focused on the supervision of student teachers by TEs and on how TEs provide feedback. Turkish studies on the pre-service aspects of teacher education mostly evaluate the conduct of teacher activities, and the opinions of student teachers and TEs regarding such activities (Durukan & Maden, 2011; Sasmaz-Oren, Sevinc, & Erdogmus, 2009; Yildirim, 2013). However, numerous studies in the international literature evaluate the role of TE supervision and feedback on the raising of qualified teachers. Thus, the need for, and the importance of assessing the effect of TE supervision and feedback in the training of teachers in Turkey have been highlighted.

Reason of the study

The author of this article participated in the Anadolu University Division of Education for Hearing-Impaired Students in the 2008-2009 academic year as a new teacher educator (Gurgur, 2012). It must be noted that the author did not have any previous training on teaching practices, and that he did not receive any instructive supervision from his colleagues on this subject. However, the literature emphasises that new teacher educators need support from experienced colleagues for their professional development in areas such as communication with student teachers, the monitoring of student teacher activities, the collection of information during monitoring, and the provision of feedback (Harrison, & McKeon, 2008; Murray, 2005). The literature also emphasizes that new teacher educators must pass through a development and training process. It is thus possible to state that, as a new teacher educator, the author was in need of improvement with regards to the monitoring of teaching practices used at the department; the methods used for monitoring student teachers; and the time and manner with which feedbacks was provided (Gurgur, 2012).

Based on these needs, a development and training process in which an experienced TE from the department would supervise the author was planned. The first stage of this process involved the observation of the TE's activities by the author. In this context, the main tasks of the author was to observe how the TE provided feedback during teaching practices; to collect data while observing the TE; and to analyse the collected data in order to transform them into information which he could then transfer and include into her own experiences. In light of the requirements listed in the previous paragraph, an analysis of how the TE provides feedback might potentially contribute to an understanding of how TEs support the training and professional development of qualified teachers. Furthermore, this study might also serve as a guide for TEs who are new to their profession, demonstrating how they can conduct activities with student teachers. The author assumes that this article might contribute to the professional development of TEs, and provide important information regarding the necessary skills for the training of teachers.

Purpose of the study

Based on its main reasons and rationale, the current study aimed to evaluate how the TE provided feedback during a planned one-to-one conversation performed by a student teacher. In this context, answers were sought to the questions below:
1. What are the main activities performed by the TE prior to providing verbal feedback to the student teacher?

2. How did the TE provide verbal feedback to assist the development of the student teachers' competencies in conducting planned one-to-one conversations?

Method

The study was designed as a case study in order to describe in detail how the TE provided feedback to the student teacher. Case studies involve the detailed evaluation and description of an individual, event, institution, or community with respect to a particular characteristic or activity (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Hancock & Algozzine, 2006).

Participants

The participants of this study included the experienced TE, the student teacher, and the hearing-impaired student. The TE works at the Division of Education for Hearing-Impaired Children and Centre for Education and Research for Hearing-Impaired Children (ICEM), and is the coordinator of courses related to teaching activities since 1985. The TE's role in this study was to supervise and provide feedback to the student teachers. The student teacher supervised by the TE had completed seven semesters of undergraduate education. At the time of the study during the 2008-2009 academic year, the student teacher was in the eighth semester and last year of the educational program. The hearing-impaired child participating in the one-to-one conversation was six years old and attending the pre-school second grade of ICEM at the time of the study. The child's hearing loss was identified when he was seven months old, and the child underwent surgery to receive a left ear cochlear implant (Nucleus Esprit 3G) when he was one year old. The child also used a behind-the-ear hearing aid (Danovax) in his left ear. Informal records held by the classroom teacher regarding the child's language level identified that the child was able to describe events in two-word sentences and to list two or three simple events. On the other hand, it was observed that the child had difficulties in associating events with his/her own life, in making predictions, and in establishing connections between events. The classroom teacher also described that the child as having difficulties in listing events correctly and in identifying cause-and-effect relationships.

It must also be noted that the participants voluntarily took part in the study process. Prior to the study; the teacher education, the student teacher and the child's family were all informed regarding the study, and signed informed consents were obtained from all of them. The actual names of the participants are not provided in study report.

The study location and the teaching practices

The study was conducted at the Anadolu University ICEM. At ICEM, education for hearing-impaired children starts after diagnosis at an audiology clinic, device implantation, and family education. Starting from the age of four, children can begin education at pre-school grades 1, 2, or 3, and later attend the elementary and high school classes of the institution. In addition, various activities related to teacher training have been conducted at the Anadolu University ICEM since 1986. The main objective of teaching practice activities performed at the division is to plan, conduct, and evaluate courses and one-to-one conversations for student teachers.

At ICEM, teaching practice activities are performed during the seventh and eighth semesters. Student teachers participate in the applied practice activities by attending normal classes performed at ICEM two days a week. Each semester, the teaching practice activities last a total of 14 weeks. During their seventh semester, the student teachers also determine a conversation plan, which they conduct with a student of their choosing on one of the days they spend at ICEM. A committee of four instructors organizes the teaching practice activities performed in the division. One of these instructors is responsible for planning. At the beginning of each week, this instructor determines the TE who will conduct and supervise the activities, and also the location and time of which activities will be performed. The TE provides verbal feedback regarding the planned one-to-one conversations performed by the student teachers at his own office (*Researcher's journal*, 25 April 2009, p. 26).

Data collection techniques

Within the scope of this study, a researcher's journal, voice recordings, and document evaluation techniques were employed for data collection purposes (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Creswell, 2005). The researcher's journal allowed the recording of observations and evaluations made regarding the conversation process during the study, and served as a data source for further analyses. Throughout the study, the author recorded nearly 150 pages of information on the journal. However, within the context of this study, data analysis was performed by only including the section of the journal covering the date in which feedback was provided (31 March 2009, pp. 16-17). Digital voice recordings were also taken for further detail analysis of the TE's verbal feedback. In this process, 94 records/notes were taken regarding the TE's feedback, and the data to be analysed were randomly selected from these records. To support the obtained data, documents such as the one-to-one conversation plan of the student teacher, the materials used during the conversation, and the "One-to-One Conversation Evaluation Form" completed by the TE were also collected. Due to problems related to legal permissions and copyrights, the originals of the said documents are not directly provided within this article, but are instead described below in detail. The "One-to-One Conversation Plan" prepared by the student teacher consisted of three pages. This document, which was used within the context of teaching practice activities conducted at the division, included information regarding the students' name and surname, the materials to be used during the conversation, the conversation objectives, and the conversation methods (*Researcher's journal*, 15 December 2009, p. 59).

Materials used the during planned one-to-one conversations performed within the scope of teaching practice activities included ordered cards, single cards with pictures, and story books (*Researcher's journal*, 15 December 2009, p. 59). The student teacher supervised by the TE used the storybook entitled *Zerrin and Zeren are Visiting their Friend* as conversation material. The storybook is about two children, Zerrin and Zeren, visiting a friend who has fallen ill.

The *One-to-One Conversation Evaluation Form* completed by the TE while supervising the student teacher was also used as a source of data for the current study. While supervising student teachers, TEs used the empty reverse-side of the evaluation form to write notes regarding the verbal feedback they would later provide. The front of the form was used to assign scores to the student teacher. The front of the form, which contained conversation-related items, consisted of two main sections. The first of these sections included information such as a date and time of the conversation, and the names of the student and student teacher participating in the conversation. The second section of the form-listed items

that assessed the skills and competencies used during the conversation (such as interacting with the student, giving the student the opportunity to express him/herself, listening skills, question types, etc). For each item, there was a range of scores that was marked by the TE according to the student teacher's performance (*Researcher's journal*, 01 November 2009, p. 40).

Data analysis

Data collected during the study were analysed by using an inductive approach (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Creswell, 2005). Based on this approach; pages from the researcher's journal describing the verbal feedback provided by TE to the student teacher were evaluated (pp. 16-17). Codes developed in accordance to the study questions were then applied to the information from these pages. The TE's voice recording regarding his feedback was also transferred into writing. This written record and the documents used as sources of data (including the TE's notes on the reverse-side of the conversation form) were evaluated. The evaluation of these sources was performed according to a previously defined coding, and the study data were categorized in accordance to these codes. Two dossiers were formed from the data categorized according to the said codes, and various aspects were combined based on a data analysis performed by an expert in the field. Following this, separate aspects and sub-aspects were defined through evaluations performed by the researcher and the TE. Based on all these analyses, two aspects were identified relating to: (1) the TE's approach and activities before, during and after the conversation, and (2) on how he provided verbal feedback.

1. Findings regarding the TE's approach and activities before, during, and after the conversation, and the verbal feedback he provided to the teacher candidate
2. Findings regarding the feedback provided by TE to support the teacher candidates' conversation skills
   2.1. Feedback on how the teacher candidate reflected on his own practice and approach
   2.2. Feedback regarding the positive aspects of the conversation performed by the teacher candidate
   2.3. Feedback regarding the opportunities provided by the teacher candidate to the student to express his opinions
   2.4. Feedback regarding the objective on the fluency of speech in the conversation plan, and the approach and measures used by the teacher candidate for achieving this objective
   2.5. Feedback regarding the questions in the conversation plan that were used during the conversation

Table 1 Aspects and sub-aspects identified based on the analysis results.

As can be seen in Table 1, two main aspects were identified, along with several sub-aspects associated with the second aspect. These aspects were evaluated and discussed in light of information from the literature.

Results

This section of the article includes the results, aspects, and sub-aspects (see Table 1) obtained from the analysis of the study data.

Findings regarding the TE's approach and activities before, during, and after the conversation, and the verbal feedback he provided to the student teacher

On March 31, 2009, a TE at the Division of Education for Hearing-Impaired Children invited the student teacher and the student to his room for a conversation activity scheduled at 08:40 AM. The candidate then started the conversation. While the student teacher conducted the conversation with the student, the TE evaluated the conversation plan prepared by the candidate (*Researcher's journal*, 31.03.2009, p.16). During the conversation, the TE wrote notes on the reverse-side of the conversation evaluation form regarding the student teacher's performance (*Evaluation Form*, 31 March 2009). The one-to-one conversation of the student teacher was completed in 11 minutes. After completing the conversation, the TE scheduled a meeting with the student teacher for 10:30 PM on the same day. The TE then provided verbal feedback to the student teacher for a total of 11 minutes and 43 seconds (*Researcher's journal*, 31 March 2012, p. 16).

Findings regarding the feedback provided by the TE to support the student teachers' conversation skills

Findings regarding the areas of competence covered by TE when providing feedback, and his approach when discussing these competencies are described below.

Feedback on how the student teacher reflected on their practice and approach

The TE first asked the student teacher to reflect on her performance. She thus asked the student teacher: "What could you have done that would have made the conversation better?" (*Voice recording*, 31 March 2009, line 3). The student teacher responded: "…I did not allow the child enough time to answer, I did not elaborate sufficiently on my questions; the child did not understand my questions, and I could not get him to repeat sentences." (*Voice recording*, 31 March 2009, line 11-17). The TE then commented that such self-evaluations were insufficient to develop teaching skills, and that the student teacher's self-evaluation should be based more on explaining the techniques he chose to employ during the conversation (as well as the ones he chose not to employ), and his reasons for doing so. In this context, the TE said: "You should be able to better assess yourself… you should ask yourself what you could do to improve the conversation …" While providing verbal feedback to the student teacher, the TE also scored the item on the front-side of the evaluation form regarding the candidate's self-evaluation ability (*Researcher's journal*, 31 March 2009, p. 16).

Feedback regarding the positive aspects of the conversation performed by the student teacher

Immediately after the TE commented on the self-evaluation (reflection) made by the student teacher, he described the positive aspects of his conversation. Thus, prior to giving verbal feedback on specific competence areas, the TE made positive comments regarding the

student teacher's performance, such as: "You spent an adequate amount of time," "You made good plans," "You prepared your material well," and "You showed good effort." (*Voice recording*, 31 March 2009, lines 57-58).

Feedback regarding the opportunities provided by the student teacher to the student to express his opinions

An important point is that, during the conversation with children, teachers have to consider that they should provide enough time and opportunity to the hearing-impaired student to express him/herself (Mahon, 2009; Tye-Murray, 1994*)*. To this end, the teacher should wait for the child to organize his/her thoughts and words after each question, and avoid interrupting the child while he/she is speaking (Luetke-Stahlman, 1993; Lloyd et al., 2001; Mahon, 2009; Murray, 1994; Tye-Murray, 1994*)*. It is also important for the teacher to be aware that this "waiting period" can vary from one child to another (Tye-Murray, 1994).

Notes taken by the TE during the conversation concerning the amount of time the student teacher allowed the child to answer the conversation questions were: "Wait after asking your question," and "Slower; let the child think." (*Evaluation form*, 31 March 2009). Parallel to his notes, the TE expressed in his feedback that the student teacher did not give sufficient time for the child to express himself by saying: "You are not giving the child enough time; you interrupt as soon as you get a single word from him, and think that this is enough." (*Evaluation form*, 31 March 2009). Emphasizing that the student teacher should take the child's characteristics into account, the TE further said: "… now, you known that this child is able to answer, but that he takes some time to do so. So you must give the child some time to express himself" (*Voice recording*, 31 March 2012, lines 8-10). Finally, as a recommendation, the TE said: "The child is actually trying to form two-word sentences. You understand that? So you should wait, and give the child the opportunity to say what he wants to say. If you don't wait, and accept 'single words' as answer, the child will limit himself to expressing only single-word answers until the end of this academic year... Give him time, and he will be able to think and answer your questions with two-word sentences" (*Voice recording*, 31 March 2009, lines 20-24).

Feedback regarding the objective on the fluency of speech in the conversation plans, and the approach and measures used by the student teacher for achieving this objective

The literature reports that fluency of speech is important for making speech understandable and interactive, and that hearing-impaired children commonly experience problems with regards to fluency – especially in the proper use of syntax and suffixes (Elbenbein, 1994; Mohan, 2009; Tannen, 2007; Wood, 2001). For this reason, one of the main objectives of planned, one-to-one conversations is to improve fluency in hearing-impaired children (Fey, Long & Finestack, 2003; Luetke-Stahlman, 1993; Mohan 2009). Objectives in conversation plans regarding fluency generally involve having the child repeat words or sentences consisting of different number of words. This enables them to acquire new experiences through the "role model" technique. More importantly, this approach improves the development of spoken language among hearing-impaired children, and favourably affects the fluency of their speech (Camarata, Nelson, Gillum & Camarata, 2009; Fey et al., 2003; Luetke-Stahlman, 1993; Nicholas, Lightbown & Spanda, 2001; Mahon, 2009; Tannen, 2007).

Consistent with the literature, the TE evaluated the fluency-related objective described in the conversation plan, and observed whether the candidate implemented it. During the

conversation, next to the objective "rhythmically repeat three-word sentences" in the conversation plan, the TE wrote: "Did the child repeat them?" as a note (*Conversation plan*, 31 March 2009, p. 1). In addition to this note, the TE wrote: "You did not perform any repeats," on the backside of the evaluation form (*Evaluation form,* 31 March 2009). In line with the notes he took while watching the student teacher during the conversation, the TE said the following when providing verbal feedback: "… you wrote this objective into the plan, but you did not implement it. You did not make any repetitions with the child. So… what did you actually accomplish?" (*Sound recording*, 31 March 2009, lines 8-9). After saying this, the TE continued to provide verbal feedback without giving the student teacher the opportunity to answer this question (*Researcher's journal*, 31 March 2009, p. 17).

Feedback regarding the questions in the conversation plan that was used during the conversation

Asking questions in communicative and interactive environments has an important effect on improving children's ability to form concepts, identify cause and effect relationships, and engage in continued interactions (Duncan, 1999; Tough, 1977). However, hearing loss renders it more difficult for hearing-impaired children to ask questions and to develop comprehension strategies (Kretschmer, 1994; Tye-Murray, 1994). Such difficulties can delay the development of children's language and communication skills, and may also result in poor academic performance (Duncan, 1999; Kretschmer, 1994; Tye-Murray, 1994). For this reason, questions asked during planned one-to-one conversations should focus on allowing children to express their thoughts accurately, to identify cause and effect relationships, and to gain experiences on spoken language (Mahon, 2009; Teo & Paatsch, 2010). As such, questions asked during conversations should be suitable for the child's language level, and encourage the child to use different types of language (reflection, anticipation, reporting, and reasoning). These questions should also be diverse (e.g., questions with: "Why?" and "How?"), and that require different types of answers (Kretschmer, 1994; Lloyd et al., 2001; Tough, 1977).

The TE evaluated the questions in the student teacher's conversation plan, as well as those the candidate used during the conversation. During this evaluation, the TE underlined and placed question marks next to the following questions of the conversation plan: "What are the girls doing?" "Where did they go?" "What did they bring with them?" "What was in their hands?" "How do the girls feel?" The TE similarly underlined and placed question marks next to the following notes in the conversation plan regarding the potential answers that might be given by the child: "Answers on where the girls are going; answers on what they are doing together; answers on how they made cake; answers on what will they do with the cake, answers on why they go to the kitchen". Next to this section he underlined, the TE wrote: "Be careful with your questions." (*Conversation plan,* 31 March 2009, p. 2). Parallel to these notes, the TE also wrote: "Be careful with your questions, and the variety of questions you ask," on the backside of the evaluation forms. In addition, he wrote examples such as: "What are they doing?", "Why are they doing it?", and "What are they doing while making cake?" (*Evaluation form,* 31 March 2009, p. 2).

Based on the notes he took on the conversation plan and the back-side of the evaluation form, the TE provided feedback to the student teacher by asking questions such as: "Why were the questions not suitable for the child's level? Were you not sufficiently prepared? Or did you not find the opportunity to ask suitable questions?" (*Voice recording*, 30 March 2009, lines 1-2). The TE also said to the candidate: "Look at the questions. Look at the questions in your plan. Now, are these questions suitable for the child's level?" (*Voice*

recording, 31 March 2009, line 33). During his feedback, the TE also explained, by mentioning the examples he wrote on the backside of the evaluation form: "… the variety of questions you ask during an conversation is very important. The questions you asked in your conversation were too difficult for the child's level. You realized this during the conversation. For instance, you asked, "How do you make cake?" How was the child supposed to answer that? Was he supposed to say: "Oh! First you scramble eggs, and then add flour and sugar! Or were you expecting an odd one-word answer from the child, like 'scramble'?" (*Voice recording*, 31 March 2009, lines 79-82). After this feedback regarding the student teachers' questions, the TE provided the following examples and advice on how conversations suitable for children's level should be planned: "… before you are going to use a story in a conversation with a child; start by reading the story from its cover page, and take note on small pieces of paper all the possible questions that come to your mind. After you have finished reading the story book, look back at all these potential questions noted on the pieces of paper, and ask yourself which ones you can use during the conversation with the child." (*Voice recording*, 31 March 2012, lines 47-49).

Discussion

In this article evaluating how the TE, who specializes in the education of hearing-impaired children, provides feedback to student teachers, the study findings were organized under two main aspects. The first of these aspects focused on the approach and activities of the TE before, during, and after the conversation. The second aspect, on the other hand, was related to how the TE provided feedback to support the development of the student teachers' conversation skills.

The study findings organized under the first aspect indicated that the TE determined and planned beforehand the location and time at which the student teacher would be supervised and monitored. Parallel to this observation, studies in the literature often emphasize the importance of planned and supervised activities in enabling student teachers to effectively acquire targeted skills and competencies (Copland, 2010; Tang & Chow, 2007; Wilkins-Canter, 2010). Another finding of this study was that the TE preferred to supervise the student teacher's activities in his own office, and to provide verbal feedback within the context of an individualized, face-to-face meeting. Similarly, studies in the literature that focus on supervision processes of student teachers also describe that providing feedback within the context of one-to-one individual meetings allow the personal development and requirements of the candidates to be better considered, and thus enable the targeted teacher competencies to be acquired and developed more effectively by the candidates (Brandt, 2008; Brinko, 1993; Hyland & Margaret, 2006).

Previous studies evaluating the activities that TEs perform when supervising student teachers highlighted the importance of collecting information systematically, and of providing verbal feedback based on concrete examples and information (Brandt, 2008; Schelfhout, Dochy, Janssens, Struyven, Gielen & Sierens, 2006; Sempowicz and Hudson, 2011; Spear et al., 1997; Wilkins-Canter, 2010). Parallel to the literature, the TE also took notes, gathered information, and marked the conversation -related materials, all with the intention of using them to provide verbal feedback to the student teacher. And it is possible to conclude that, in a manner similar to what is recommended in the literature (Brinko, 1993; Scheeler et al., 2004), the TE focused on collecting concrete information regarding the specific skills, behaviours, and competencies of the student teacher prior to giving any feedback.

Another important finding of this study was that the TE provided verbal feedback almost immediately after the conversation. Studies in the literature emphasize that providing verbal feedback soon after the completion of an activity is an effective way of enabling student teachers to acquire and develop the necessary teaching behaviours, since rapid feedback allows candidates to become aware of their mistakes and to immediately correct them (Brandt, 2008; Brinko, 1993; Scheeler et al., 2004).

The second aspect identified in this study data was regarding the way in which the TE provided feedback to student teachers. During the study, the TE first gave the student teacher the opportunity to self-evaluate his conversation. Self-evaluation (or reflection) can be described as assessments performed by student teachers and teachers regarding their own activities, with the intention of improving their professional development (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Jay & Johnson, 2002; Tang & Chow, 2007). At this point, it must be emphasized that the TE made an important attempt to provide the student teacher the opportunity to perform a reflection that would increase her awareness regarding her practices. On the other hand, it was also observed that the TE considered the student teacher's self-evaluation and reflection as insufficient; in this context, he made several recommendations as to how constructive self-evaluations could be performed. The student teacher's self-evaluation was deemed inadequate by the TE, since the candidate did not describe any specific skills and competencies that were poorly performed, nor did he consider the underlying reasons for the shortcomings he displayed. In other words, the TE asked the student teacher to evaluate his conversation performance in a more technical way, by considering the skills and competencies he must satisfy during this activity, and by taking a more constructive approach. Parallel to the TE's strategy, the literature describes that although student teachers can contribute to their own development through self-evaluations, TEs can ensure that candidates evaluate themselves in a manner that allows for greater self-improvement (Schelfhout et al., 2006; Tang & Chow, 2007). On the other hand, the literature emphasizes that it is not sufficient for student teachers to use constructive reflection only for the mistakes they committed or the technique they misused, and that they should also use reflection to consider how they could plan and implement their practices differently (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Schelfhout et al., 2006). Thus, from this perspective, it is possible to state that the TE did not follow a good strategy when providing feedback for the student's reflection. The TE provided adequate feedback concerning the errors in the student teacher's reflection, requesting her to be more technical in her approach; however, the TE failed to provide any feedback that would allow the student teacher to reconsider her practices through reflection and to better internalize professional competencies.

Thus, when students are performing reflection, a strategy based on increasing their awareness concerning their practices and on informing them on what they could do differently should be followed. The literature describes that, when such a strategy is employed, providing student teachers the opportunity to express their own views and allowing them to gain an awareness of their areas of improvement can assist the development of their competencies (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Schelfhout et al., 2006; Tang & Chow, 2007).

After asking the student teacher to perform a self-evaluation, the TE continued his feedback by commenting on the positive aspects of the conversation. On the other hand, it is possible to observe that TE's positive comments were of a rather general nature, and not related to any specific skill or competence. This observation reflected an aspect of TE's approach that was not adequate. Based on this observation, it is possible to state that the TE should have followed an approach that focused more on contributing to the student teacher's development, and on guiding her through positive comments not about general and

unspecific areas, but instead about specific competencies. The literature describes that maintaining a high level of motivation among student teachers is important for ensuring their continued receptiveness to feedback, and that candidates can be motivated by first informing them of the positive aspects of their performance (Brandt, 2005; Brinko, 1993; Hyland & Margeret, 2006; Tang & Chow, 2007; White, 2007). However, to effectively motivate student teachers through feedbacks, it is necessary for these feedbacks to cover and mention the specific aspects of their performance that were positive.

After sharing general positive comments with the student teacher, the TE then proceeded to inform the candidate about his observations and notes on the conversation. In this context, the TE's verbal feedback demonstrated the way in which he evaluated the different skills and areas of competence of the student teacher. For every area of competence, the TE first discussed the mistakes he observed during the conversation. In addition, it was observed that the TE discussed and provided corrective recommendations for only some of the mistakes performed by the student teacher during the interview. Data from this study thus indicates that the TE provided feedback according to information collected during the conversation, and that the TE's feedback addressed the candidate's individual needs by sharing actual examples and feasible recommendations. The literature similarly emphasizes that TEs should provide feedback based on real information, and focus on specific skill/competence areas. The literature also describes that it is important for such feedback to include examples and recommendations (Brinko, 1993; Scheeler et al., 2004; Sempowicz & Hudson, 2011; Wilkins-Canter, 2010). However, it was considered noteworthy that while giving feedback the TE did not provide the student teacher the opportunity to express her opinions regarding the mistakes she committed and their possible reasons/causes. As it can be seen in the study results, the TE mentioned the mistakes committed by the student teacher, but did not allow the student teacher to describe her own view and inferences, or to provide explanations for the reasons/causes of her mistakes. The findings of studies from the literature indicate that, in order to contribute to the professional development of student teachers through feedbacks; TEs must specifically discuss the different areas of competencies of the student teachers, and provide them the opportunity to explain how they planned and implemented their teaching practices (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Jay & Johnson, 2002). The results of this study indicate that the TE followed a rather one-sided approach when communicating with the student teacher. When considered together with the findings of the literature, it is possible to state that TE did not follow a strategy that contributed to the professional development of the student teacher, since this TE did not provide her the opportunity to express her own views and opinions.

In addition to the one-sided communication the TE established with the student teacher, it was also observed that the feedback process was also kept very short by the TE. As such, the feedback process lasted for 11 minutes. Studies in the literature mention that the duration of verbal feedback is important, and that this duration should generally be about 30 minutes (Brinko, 1993; Copland, 2010; VanLooy & Vrijsen, 1998). Based on the study results and the findings in the literature, it is possible to state that the TE's approach had a limited contribution of the student teacher's development, and that the feedback process was kept very brief. In addition, it was noted that there was actually sufficient time available for the TE to allow the student teacher to express her views; however, the TE instead chose to speak briefly and to quickly complete the feedback process.

It is necessary to consider the answer to the question: "Did the TE consider all areas of competence related to one-to-one conversations?" It should be noted that the answer to this question is, "no." The reason is that according to the study observations, the TE chose to focus on the areas of competence in which the student teacher needed to improve, rather than

focusing on all areas of competence of the candidate simultaneously. Thus, areas of competence relating to the one-to-one conversations that were not considered by the TE included: fluency of speech; correction and repetition of the child's expressions; identification of interrelationships between events; and providing explanations. Similar to the approach demonstrated by the TE in this study, the literature also emphasizes that, instead of considering all areas of competence at once, it is more effective to provide feedback by considering the student teacher's individual characteristics (level of performance, learning requirement, learning rate, etc…) and proceeding in a step-wise fashion (Tang & Chow, 2007; Wilkins-Canter, 2010). At this point, it is possible to state that the TE's approach and feedback process (which constitutes the subject of our analysis) did not allow the student teacher to improve her in the relevant competency areas, or to internalize any input concerning those areas. It is therefore very likely that the student teacher will once again encounter similar problems in the same competency areas during her future interviews.

Conclusion

This study investigated how a TE, who specializes in the education of hearing-impaired children, provided verbal feedback to a student teacher within the context of a teaching practice activities in order to assist the development of this candidate's competencies relating to planned one-to-one conversations. Concerning the TE's feedback process, it is possible to observe some parallels in the study results with regards to their effectiveness. It was observed that both during and after the conversations, the TE followed a very planned and systematic approach in determining feedback. In addition, the TE focused on specific competencies and utilized examples and information that supported his feedback. Another approach demonstrated by the TE was his particular focus on competencies in which student teacher needed assistance. Another important observation was that the TE provided feedback almost immediately after the conversation was complete.

On the other hand, it was observed that the TE followed a feedback strategy of questionable benefit to the student teacher, and which did not favourably contribute to her competencies. One problematic aspect of this strategy was concerning the reflection the student teacher performed. The TE criticized the student teacher's reflection, asking her to perform evaluations of a more technical nature. However, the TE did not request the student teacher to question how she could have performed her activities differently (the ability to perform such self-evaluations are actually indicative of the extent to which student teachers have internalized the relevant competency areas). Another aspect of the TE's strategy that was questionable was the lack of any motivating feedbacks regarding the student teacher's competencies. The fact that the TE only used general/vague statements when discussing the positive aspects of the student teacher's activity possibly had a discouraging effect on the student teacher. Therefore, the TE focused only on the student teacher's mistakes. Another noteworthy point was that the TE provide corrective recommendations for very few of these mistakes committed by the student teacher. Furthermore, although the TE mentioned the student teacher's mistakes, she did not allow the student teacher to express her views or to provide explanations for these mistakes. In this context, it is possible to state that the TE ignored the fact that both participants (the TE and the student teacher) are entitled to express their opinions; and that the TE did not endeavour to build an effective and constructive communication environment.

When evaluating these positive and negatives aspects, it is important to bear in mind that the study involves the evaluation of only one conversation process, and of the feedback provided by the TE to only one student teacher. In addition, both the student teacher and the hearing-impaired child were from the same educational environment as the TE and the researcher/author. In this respect, it is possible that some of the mistakes committed by the student teacher and the hearing-impaired child might have stemmed from the educational environment (despite the researcher's participation as an observer).

Implications

Based on the observations made during this study; it is possible to recommend the TE to focus more on specific competencies when discussing the positive aspects of the student teacher's approach and activities, and to provide the student teacher with more time to express her views and opinions during the feedback process. In this respect, instead of focusing on providing immediate feedbacks following the evaluation/assessment of student teachers, the department in question should focus more on providing a longer and more comprehensive feedback process.

In addition, it is possible to state that at a national level, TEs should follow the feedback-related approaches and skills described in this study. These approaches/skills may even be used to define national standards for the characteristics and competencies that TEs must possess. To achieve this, seminars could be organized at a national level for TEs, in which the characteristics and competencies in question would be discussed. Such measures could potentially contribute to the development of the necessary skills among TEs in Turkey. Taking existing international standards into consideration could further develop the abovementioned standards. Moreover, engaging in collaborative activities at an international level on this subject could further contribute to improving and refining such standards.

Finally, the results may have a guiding influence on teacher training process for those countries on the way to developing their own systems. The aforementioned countries may refer to the results of the present study in terms of questioning and searching new alternatives for improvement of their teacher training process.

Limitation and directions for future research

The results of this study were based on the verbal feedback provided by a TE to only a single student teacher regarding a conversation activity. Therefore, in order to better describe the TE's approach in teaching practice activities, it might be necessary to also evaluate how the TE provides feedback to other student teachers. Such a study might demonstrate how the TE's feedback varies from one student teacher to another, depending on their different levels of individual development and competence. In addition, this study only evaluated feedback regarding conversation activities performed for the training of teachers on the education of hearing-impaired children. Teaching practice activities at ICEM also focus on training student teachers regarding the planning and implementation of group activities/courses for hearing-impaired children. In this respect, focusing on how a TE supervises these group activities/courses might also provide information that will help improve the training of qualified teachers for hearing-impaired children. Furthermore, evaluating the teaching activities of TEs in fields and areas outside the education of hearing-impaired children might also assist in improving the quality of teaching practice activities in other educational fields.

This study provides a framework that can be useful in undertaking further research about questioning and searching new alternatives for improvement of teacher training processes at international level.

References

Brinko, K. T. (1993). The practice of giving feedback to improve teaching: What is effective? *The Journal of Higher Education, 64*(5), 574-593. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2959994

Brandt, C. (2008). Integrating feedback and reflection in teacher preparation. *ELT Journal, 62*(1), 37-46. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm076

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bunton, D., Stimpson, P., & Lopez-Real, F. (2002). University tutors' practicum observation notes: Format and content. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 10*(3), 233-252. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1361126022000037060

Clarke, B.R., & Stewart, D.A. (1986). Reflections on language programs for the hearing impaired. *The Journal of Special Education, 20*(2), 153-165. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002246698602000203

Camarata, S., Nelson, K.E., Gillum, H., & Camarata, S. (2009). Incidental receptive language growth associated with expressive grammar intervention in SLI. *First Language, 29*(1), 51-63. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0142723708098810

Cole, E., B., & Flexer, C. (2007). *Children with hearing loss: Developing listening and talking.* San Diego, CA: Plural Pub.

Copland, F. (2010). Causes of tension in post-observation feedback in pre-service teacher training: An alternative view. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26,* 466-472. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.06.001

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Duncan, J. (1999). Conversational skills of children with hearing loss and children with normal hearing in an integrated setting. *Volta Review, 101*(4), 193-211.

Durukan, E., & Maden, S. (2011). Turkish pre-service teachers' views about Turkish teaching undergraduate curriculum. *Kastamonu Egitim Dergisi, 19(2),* 555-566.

Easterbrooks, S. R. (2011). Knowledge and skills for teachers of individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing. *Communication Disorders Quarterly, 30*(12), 12-36.

Elbenbein, J. L. (1994). Oral communication skills of children who are hard of hearing. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 37*(1), 216-228. http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3701.216

Fey, M.E., Long, S., H., & Finestack, L. H. (2003). Ten principles of grammar facilitation for children with specific language impairments. *American Journal of Speech-Language Phatalogy, 12*(1), 3-15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360(2003/048)

Girgin, U. (2003). One to one and group lessons with hard of hearing children. Tufekcioglu, U. (Ed.). *Education of children with hearing loss, language disability and visual disability* (pp. 26-50*).* Eskisehir: Anadolu Universitesi, Acikogretim Fakultesi Yayınlari.

Gurgur, H. (2012). Examining the training process of a new teacher educator in the field of the education of the hearing impaired. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 12*(2), 945-970.

Hancock, D. R., & Algozzine, B. (2006). *Doing case study research: A practical guide for beginning researchers*. New York, NY: Teacher College Press.

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

Harrison, J., & McKeon, F. (2008). The formula and situated learning of beginning teacher educators in England: Identifying characteristics for successful induction in the transition from workplace in schools to workplace in higher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 31*(2), 151-168. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02619760802000131

Hyland, F., & Margaret, M.L. (2006). Examining interaction in the teaching practicum: Issues of language, power and control. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 14*(2), 163-186. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13611260500493535

Jay, J.K., & Johnson, K.L., (2002). Capturing complexity: A typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*, 73–85. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00051-8

Johnson, C. E., (1997). Enhancing the conversational skills of children with hearing impairment. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 28*, 137-145. http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461.2802.137

Kretschmer, R.R. (1994). Issues in the development of school and interpersonal discourse for children who have hearing loss. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services, 28*, 374-383. http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461.2804.374

Lloyd, J., Lieven, E., & Arnold, P. (2001). Oral conversations between hearing-impaired children and their normally hearing peers and teachers. *First Language, 21*, 83-107. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014272370102106104

Luetke-Stahlman, B. (1993). Research-based language intervention strategies adapted for deaf and hard of hearing children. *American Annals of the Deaf, 138*(5), 404-410. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/aad.2012.0283

Mahon, M. (2009). Interaction between a deaf child for whom English is an additional language and his specialist teacher in the first year at school: Combining word and gestures. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics, 23*(8), 611-629. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699200802491140

Murray, J. (2005). Re-addressing the priorities: new teacher educators and induction into higher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 28*(1), 67-85. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02619760500040108

Murray, A., Swennen, A., & Shagrir, L. (2008). Understanding teacher educators' work and identities. In A. Swennen & M. Van Der Klink (Eds.), *Becoming a teacher educator: Theory and Practice for Teacher Educators* (pp. 29-43). Dordrecht: Springer.

Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P.M., & Spanda, N. (2001). Recast as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning, 51*(1), 719-758. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00172

Paatsch, L., E., & Toe, D., M. (2013). A comparison of pragmatic abilities of children who are deaf or hard of hearing and their hearing peers. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 29*(1), 1-19.

Pakulski, L.A. (2011). Addressing qualified personnel shortages for children who are deaf or hard of hearing with an interdisciplinary service learning program. *American Journal of Audiology, 20*, 203–219. http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/1059-0889(2011/11-0005)

Sasmaz-Oren, F., Sevinc, Ö. S., & Erdogmus, E. (2009). Assessing teacher candidates' attitudes and views towards school experience course. *Educational Administration and Planning, 15(58),* 217-246.

Scheeler, M.C.; Ruhl, K.L., & McAfee, J.K. (2004). Providing performance feedback to teachers: A review. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 27*(4), 394-407. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/088840640402700407

Schelfhout, W., Dochy, F., Janssens, S., Struyven, K., Gielen, A., & Sierens, E. (2006). Educating for learning-focused teaching in teacher training: The need to link learning content with practice experiences within an inductive approach. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22,* 874-897. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.003

Schirmer, B. R. (2008). How effectively are we preparing teacher educators in special education? The case of deaf education. *American Annals of the Deaf, 153*(4), 411-419. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/aad.0.0056

Sempowicz, T., & Hudson, P. (2011). Analysing mentoring dialogues for developing a preservice teacher's classroom management practices. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *36*(8), 1-16. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2011v36n8.4

Spear, M., Lock, N.D., & McCulloch, M. (1997). The written feedback mentors give to student teachers. *Teacher Development, 1*(2), 269-280. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13664539700200019

Spencer, P.E., & Marschark, M. (2006) *Advances in the spoken language development of deaf and hard-of-hearing children*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Tang, S.Y.F., & Chow, A.W.K. (2007). Communicating feedback in teaching practice supervision in a learning-oriented field experience assessment framework. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23,* 1066-1085. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.07.013

Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511618987

Teo, D.M., & Paatsch, L.E. (2010). The communication skills used by deaf children and their hearing peers in a question and answer game context. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 15*(3), 228-241. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enq006

Tough, J. (1977). *The development of meaning: A study of children's use of language.* New York, NY: Wiley.

Tye-Murray, N. (1994). *How to guide to develop and expand conversational skills of children and teenagers who are hearing impaired*. Washington, DC: Alex Graham Bell Association for Deaf.

Yıldırım, A. (2013). Teacher education research in Turkey: Trends, issues and priority areas. *Educational and Science, 38*(169), 175-191.

VanLooy, L., & Vrijsen, M. (1998). *A multi-dimensional analysis of feedback by tutors and teacher educators to their students.* Research Report (Ed 418 963).

White, S. (2007). Investigating effective feedback practices for pre-service teacher education students on practicum. *Teaching Education, 18*(4), 299-311. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10476210701687591

Wilkins-Canter, E. A. (2010). The nature and effectiveness of feedback given by co-operating teachers to student teachers. *The Teacher Educator, 32*(4), 235-249. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08878739709555150

Wood, D. (2001). In search of fluency: What is it and how can we teach it? [Electronic version]. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(4), 573-589. http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.4.573