

## Disparities in teaching practice corrective feedback among university teaching practice assessors in Tanzania: Implications on pre-service professional practices

**Erasto Joseph Kano**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6047-541X>

The University of Dodoma, Tanzania

*erastokano@gmail.com*

### **Abstract**

*This study examines disparities in teaching practice corrective feedback among university assessors in the Tanzanian context: Implications on pre-service professional practices. A mixed-method research design was employed to bring together different strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative methods. The purposive sampling technique was used to get 120 undergraduate pre-service teachers from three colleges involved in the study. Questionnaire, interview and documentary reviews were used to collect data and analyzed descriptively to provide summaries in terms of numerical counts and frequencies. The study revealed that teaching practice assessors have conflicting suggestions and non-consensus in supporting pre-service teachers when dealing with similar issues. Conflicting suggestions might pose anomalies on the course of action to be undertaken by pre-service teachers who are trying to grow professionally. The study recommends the formulation of inter-institutional consensual supervisory guidelines that could inform synergy among university teaching practice assessors and supervisors.*

**Keywords:** *Assessors, disparities, teaching practice, corrective feedback, pre-service teachers.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Quality education is pegged upon many factors that intersect in the whole teaching and learning process (Nilsson, 2008; Blazar, 2015). Predictors of teacher quality have classically included class size, certification, types of qualification, degree earned or years of experience (Blazar, 2015). Less studies indicate pedagogical knowledge of teachers as the quality indicator (Henning, 2000). The notable principle in the context of quality education is the pre-employment training, teaching practice (TP), which is a compulsory requirement for the award of any certificate, diploma or

degree pursued in teacher education (Fry, Ketteridge & Marshall, 2009). Teaching requires expert knowledge and specialized skills acquired and maintained through rigorous and continuing study (Etkina, 2010).

As a pre-service scheme, persons aspiring to become teachers gain the initial exposure to the classroom realities of teaching through information on contents, methods, materials, experiences, models and useful tools (Avalos, 2011; Lee, 2011). Cooperative and interactive guidance from veteran teachers ensure that pre-service teachers conform to prescribed guidelines, rules and standards of teaching profession (Tang & Chow, 2007; Grossman *et al.*, 2009; Aglehart, 2009; Kardos & Johnson, 2010; Kimani, 2014; Jansen & Merwe, 2015). Teaching practice in education is compared with the novices who go through prescribed pre-service training for would-be doctors, lawyers, engineers and pharmacists (Ogonor & Badmus, 2006; Adeoye, *et al.*, 2008; Kimani, 2014; Jansen & Merwe, 2015). Opportunities to practice under the supervision of an experienced teacher help to improve the quality of teaching (Cuenca, 2012). As educational architects, university lecturers, have the role of guiding and assessing pre-service teachers objectively to synchronise their understanding towards professional growth and development (Cuenca, 2012; Ngara, Ngwarai & Ngara, 2013; Ngwenya, 2015). TP assessors are expected to provide confirmative and corrective feedback in their area of expertise in order to flourish in the key curriculum dimensions of teaching (Adeoye, *et al.*, 2008; Fry, Ketteridge & Marshall, 2009). Where specialists in specific subject areas are not available, instructors in other subject areas are subcontracted to serve as TP assessors under instructions of the field guidebook describing the core elements of effective teaching.

At the abstract level, the field guidebook is seen as a starter kit for thinking about effective content and pedagogical skills, presumably designed to guarantee fairness in the delivery of educational services. However, attributes of the field guidebook are open to wide and different interpretations regarding quality teaching observed in the classroom. Corrective feedback which needs to be specific, detailed and informative enough to make TP a quality tool in teacher preparation, calls for attention to areas of improvement (Hooton-Kurtoglu, 2016; Menaa *et al.*, 2016; Ngara & Ngwarai, 2013; Hooton-Kurtoglu, 2016). Despite the presence of the field guidebook describing the core elements of effective

teaching, and concerted efforts to identify characteristics correlated with teaching effectiveness, corrective feedback falls short of the ideal.

There are some hints supported by anecdotal evidence that TP assessors have conflicting suggestions and non-consensus in supporting pre-service teachers when dealing with similar issues (Ogonor & Badmus, 2006; Adeoye *et al.*, 2008; Cabaroglu & Tillema, 2011; Jansen & Merwe, 2015). The lack of specificity in comments given by TP assessors reflects a gap in pre-service teachers' conviction on the course of action to undertake. The pedagogical and content knowledge dynamics in the teaching profession pose significant anomalies towards new understanding (Boikhutso, 2010; Frith, 2020; Hobson *et al.*, 2009; Pandey, 2009; Çimen & Komur, 2019; Frith, 2020; Kremer-Hayon & Tillema, 2002; Tillema, 2005; Cabaroglu & Tillema, 2011; Jansen & Merwe, 2015; McIntyre & Hobson, 2016). If the business-as-usual scenario remains in effect without mandated interventions, the anticipated quality of pre-service teachers will not be realized. This study aims at unravelling disparities in corrective feedback that pose barriers for aspiring teachers in the teaching profession.

### **Theoretical Framework**

This study was guided by Social Constructionist Framework by Vygotsky, (1978). Vygotsky asserts that the most fruitful experience in learners' education is the collaboration with more skilled partners who provide intellectual scaffold to the less experienced learners. TP assessors and heads of educational institutions were regarded as more knowledgeable and experienced in navigating through the task of a level of difficulty with the pre-service teachers' zone of proximal development (Borich, 2007). The University of Dodoma through college of education attach pre-service teachers in various educational institutions for continuous 8-weeks liaising with heads of institutions through coordinated partnership between school personnel and instructors.

Mentoring pre-service teachers features mutual support, technical advice and classroom management tips to meet teacher-centered concerns of survival (Henning, 2000; Nilsson, 2008; Lee, 2011; Watanabe, 2013). A good teacher must among other important things, display the four elements of composure; enthusiasm, confidence, warmth, and support (Anderson, & Radencich, 2012). TP assessors as educational lodestars, need to harmonize their comments to pre-service teachers to ameliorate

the subsequent teaching (Harden & Crosby, 2000; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Grossman *et. al.*, 2009; Kimani, 2014; Sethusha, 2014; Ngwenya, 2015; Komorowska, 2016). A frequent criticism of teacher preparation programme is the lack of adequate provision for transfer of training from university to school classrooms though field experience. Developing teaching skills appears to be less a result of practice or experience than a result of instruction and intervention (Anderson, & Radencich, 2012). If TP corrective feedbacks are confused look, pre-service teachers might be frustrated clinging to persistent teaching dilemmas (Khun-inkeeree *et. al.*, 2019).

## **METHODOLOGY**

A mixed research approach was used to bring together the differing strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative methods. The principle of sequential methodological triangulation was applied where the quantitative phase preceded and led to the selection of suitable individuals for participation in the qualitative phase (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003; Seidman, 2006; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2009; Creswell, 2014; Mertens, 1998). The combination of two research methods followed the model of dominant-less dominant design, with dominant model being quantitative and findings from the two datasets were merged during the interpretation phase (Guest, 2012).

To ensure the transferability of the findings to other settings, purposive sampling was deemed proper for this study (Tobin & Begley, 2004; Bitsch, 2005). A sample of 120 third-year undergraduate pre-service teachers from the University of Dodoma was selected on the basis of the homogeneity of their degree programmes with educational-related studies. The university offers field placement in educational institutions after the second semester-based instructions and examinations. Eligibility criteria required students who participated in their TP during 2020/2021 and 2021/2022 academic year from three university Colleges-College of Education (55), College of Humanities and Social Sciences (39) and College of Natural and Mathematical Sciences (26) student teachers. These three groups represented the range of undergraduate pre-service teachers who participated in the TP session. As seniors, these pre-service teachers were in the position to reflect on TP supervision mechanisms. Furthermore, as finalists, were assumed to have freedom of expression of views on TP since they have no room to do again, hence, no blockage of information was anticipated.

### **Data collection tools**

A hybrid of data collection tools was used to attain a valid description of disparities in TP corrective feedback. Data were collected from three sources; questionnaires, structured interviews and document review. Closed-ended questionnaires were relatively free from bias as they had predetermined response categories (Bordens & Abbott, 2011; Creswell, 2014). A single-item scale consisting variation or no variation statement about TP aspects was used in detecting differences in TP corrective feedback among supervisors. Interviews were conducted to ten selected TP supervisors at the College of education to produce an alternative set of findings (Brown *et. al.*, 2021). Additionally, interviews were used to get feedback from a different pool of informants to cross-validate the statistical results provided through the questionnaire. Results from the documentary review were used to enhance the trustworthiness of the study from the two sets of data.

### **Data analysis**

Quantitative data were subjected to numerical counts and percentages to provide simple summaries. Frequencies and percentages of the respondents according to disparity variables were computed. Subsequently, the analysis yielded disparities in PT corrective feedback differentials concerning categorical variables of variation or non-variation responses.

In addition to the key quantitative variables described and analyzed, TP assessors were interviewed about opinions in relation to disparities in TP corrective feedback among supervisors. Because qualitative research is labour-intensive, a small sample of 10 participants was invited for structured interview (Shah & Corley, 2006). The responses gathered were screened and categorized in various themes for analysis. Qualitative data analysis involved scrutinizing and transcribing interview responses into statements that belonged together around the major themes of the interview (Keppel & Wickens, 2004; Braun & Clarke, 2006; Stangor, 2011). Provision of quotations drawn from participants' original data and correct interpretation of views add to the credibility placed in the truth of the study findings. Systematic analysis of the content of relevant documents - lesson plan, schemes of works, lesson notes and portfolio records were used as the evidence of comments by TP supervisors. Furthermore, assessment kits were utilized to get feedback on what needs intervention for improvement. Ethical clearance approval was sought

from the Research, Publications and Consultancy authority. Participants remained anonymous in the presentation of the research findings to ensure non-traceability to anyone with dishonest intentions. Participation was voluntary, therefore; the participants had the option to opt out of the study with no consequence whatsoever.

## **FINDINGS**

In this study, TP components were sieved out of various factors affecting the quality of the teaching and learning process. 15 aspects were infiltrated around specific instructional dimensions and expounded for in-depth analysis. Redundant items were knocked out for lack of merit meaning or found interwoven in such a way that they were likely to threaten the internal validity. The 15 coded questions on corrective feedback aspects were: supervisor's directives on the format and components of the lesson plan, comments on stages of the lesson plan, formulation of specific objectives in terms of components; audience, behavioural change, conditions and the degree of performance and in terms of objective characteristics; specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-bound.

Other aspects were suggestions on the innovation of teaching and learning aids, the improvisation on teaching and learning using locally available resources, remarks on schemes and records of works, amount of time devoted to supporting pre-service teachers, frequency of visits made by supervisors, supervisor's expertise in the area of subject taught, grading procedures and indications of performance. Furthermore, portfolio records, reflection about teaching, recommendations on statement of evaluation and remarks, settings for TP and relevance of materials and teaching notes were scrutinized. Key domains in terms of variation and no variation were classified.

The findings are presented in the light of 15 deduced TP components. Responses to supervisor's directives on the format of the lesson plan were distributed unevenly. Data on pre-service teachers 96 (80%) had a common view that there were variations in corrective feedback. Only 24 respondents (20%) were appreciative that there were no variations characterizing this aspect. In the next domain of practical variations on stages of lesson plan, 90 respondents (75%) opined that variation existed among supervisors and the rest 30 respondents (25%) felt that there was no variation. Formulation of specific objectives based on SMART criteria

results suggested that 63 (52.5%) of respondents opined variation in corrective feedback. There were consistently keeping the value almost balanced judgements tapering this aspect. 69 pre-service teachers (57.5%) admitted that there were no considerable variations in terms of corrective feedback on the formulation of specific objectives.

Data related to reflection on teaching revealed that 80 respondents (66.6%) favoured variation response. But no consistency was seen in the opinion, as 40 respondents (33.4%) favoured no variation response in this domain. These findings are consistent with those reported by Underson and Radencich (2012) who observed that pre-service teachers need reflection with feedback to learn from key aspects of their field experience. The distribution of opinions on grading procedures revealed that most of the respondents, 81 (67.6%) were confirming the opinion of variation among supervisors. The discrepancy of 39 respondents (32.4%) opined no variation in corrective feedback among supervisors. Corrective feedback related to the indication of excellent performance, a high percentage of the feedback (65.9%) with 78 respondents was evidence-based remarks made by supervisors and the remaining 42 individuals (34.1%) pinpointed no variation among supervisors. Based on portfolio records, most of the pre-service teachers 81 (67.5%) were stable on the opinion of variation response and the remaining 39 respondents (32.5%) were held up at response of no variation.

Notable among these precepts, emerged the corrective feedback on the supervisor's expertise in the area of subject taught. 85 respondents (70.9%) had reservations that there is association between expertise in the area taught and supervision. There was considerable variation in respect of the innovation of teaching and learning aids where by 75 (64.5%) and no variation in the responses of 45 students (35.5%). Remarks on schemes and records of work had a variation of 86 (71.7%) and a non-variation of 34 (28.3%). Under the domain a written evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses remarks, a significantly higher proportion of respondents 95 (i.e., 79.2%) indicated variation in corrective feedback while the rest 25 (20.8%) illustrated the nature of the feedback in the domain did not vary. Therefore, pre-service teachers indicated little correspondence between marks and remarks made. Settings for TP which had 82 (68.4%) variation and 38 (31.6%) of no variation. In the final part of the survey respondents were asked to indicate whether remarks on the relevance of materials and teaching notes existed. Regarding this item, 82 respondents (68.3%) out

of 120 expressed their views that variation existed among supervisors while 40 (31.7%) seem to hold the opinion that there was no variation in comments regarding the relevance of materials.

## **DISCUSSION**

From the analysis, the general picture that emerges is that pre-service teachers were strongly oriented in the belief that supervisors lacked consensus in dealing with similar issues. Overwhelmingly, TP featured a supervisor-dominated feedback pattern with greater variations. Only four aspects of TP including frequencies of visits made by supervisors, reflection on teaching practice, statement of evaluation and remarks and setting for TP indicated a significant relationship among categorical variables. Findings in this study are in general confirmatory by Käpylä et al., (2009), Bishop et.al., (2011) who observed that pre-service teachers have inadequate content and pedagogical knowledge about teaching. Pedagogical knowledge has been characterized as piecemeal, less structured and having more inaccuracies (Nezvalová, 2011). Furthermore, pre-service teachers might transfer their misconceptions to their students during classroom instructions. This fieldwork dilemma requires informed decisions to avoid negative implications for students' learning as expressed by Cranton (2009). This was a significant factor in the common failure of service delivery at TP centres.

Drawing from qualitative interviews with 10 supervisors, variation results stemmed not only from the quantitative aspects. A common view amongst interviewees was that TP supervisors had a belittling nature of comments. Lack of commitment to TP directives and instructional mechanisms designated might lead to low efficiency, equitable service delivery and accountability. Furthermore, informants expressed the belief that TP supervision reports were illegible and biased compromising on the quality of teaching and so were of little help to pre-service teachers. Documents provided rich information which was not revealed through interviews and questionnaires, especially marks and remarks disparities. Documents reviewed included institutional report from regional coordinators, assessment forms, guidelines from the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) and TP committee members' reports. Moreover, the study evaluated pre-service teachers' lesson plans, schemes of work and assessments as commonly used classroom artefacts in the teaching and learning process.



Scrutinizing from the documents, it appears that no universal guide for various schooling levels such as primary schools, secondary schools and teachers' training colleges. The documentary reviewed revealed variations in different aspects including the language to be used in writing reflection reports between Kiswahili English subjects. From the examination of additional qualitative remarks provided, it is apparent that there was little correspondence between marks in various TP aspects and remarks made. These results imply that TP supervisors applied independent judgement and relied on their discretion and there is a need to change the asymmetrical power relations between supervisor and supervisee.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The chief concern of this paper was to identify the implications of disparities in TP corrective feedback among pre-service teachers. Corrective feedback among supervisors significantly attracts a disjointed teaching and learning output. Uncertainty expressed by supervisors in making judgments points to the importance of developing a shared assessment criterion within the community of supervisors. Recent studies have reported that teachers working collaboratively in content and pedagogical knowledge is the panacea of enhancing supervisors with limited pedagogical practices. Central to the entire teaching profession standards is the concept of formulating the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (Brown et. al., (2021). Given the conclusions drawn from the study objectives, inter-institutional consensual supervisory guidelines to inform synergy among supervisors is vital.

## **REFERENCES**

- Adeoye, F.A., Okonkwo, U.M., Osuji, U.S.A., & Salawu, I.O. (2008). *Teaching practice manual I*. National Open University of Nigeria.
- Anderson, N.A. & Radencich, M.C. (2001). The value of feedback in an early field experience: peer, teacher and supervisor coaching. *Action in Teacher Education*, 23, (3), 66-74.
- Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(1), 10-20.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2009). Addressing educational disparities facing Māori students in New Zealand. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 734-742.

- Bitsch, V. (2005). Qualitative research: A grounded theory example and evaluation criteria. *Journal of Agribusiness*, 23(1), 75-91.
- Blazar, D. (2015). Effective teaching in elementary mathematics: Identifying classroom practices that support achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 48, 16-29.
- Boikhutso, K. (2010). The theory into practice dilemma: Lesson planning challenges facing Botswana student-teachers. *Improving Schools*, 13(3), 205-220.
- Bordens, K.S. & Abbott, B.B. (2011). *Research design and methods: A process approach* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Mc-Graw Hall Companies.
- Borich, G.D. (2007). *Effective teaching methods, Unit and lesson planning* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Pearson.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Brown, C.P., Puckett, K., Barry, D.P. & Hui Ku, D. (2021). The double-voiced nature of becoming a teacher in the era of neoliberal teaching and teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 1, 1-17.
- Cabaroglu, N. & Tillema, H.H. (2011). Teacher educator dilemmas: a concept to study pedagogy. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 17(5), 559-573.
- Çimen, Ş. S. & Kömür, Ş. (2019). Dilemma situations in teaching practice: What do student teachers Reflect? *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 18, 168-177.
- Cranton, P. (2011). A transformative perspective on the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Higher Education Research and Development* 30(1):25-86.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). SAGE.
- Cuenca, A. (2012). *Supervising student teachers: Issues, perspectives and future directions*. Sense
- Etkina, E. (2010). Pedagogical content knowledge and preparation of high school physics teachers. *Physical Review Special Topics - Physics Education Research*, 6(2), 020110-020136.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055.
- Frith, H. (2020). Undergraduate supervision, teaching dilemmas and dilemmatic spaces. *Psychology Teaching Review*, 26(1), 6-17.

- Fry, H.; Ketteridge, S. & Marshall, S. (2009). *A handbook for teaching and learning in higher education: Enhancing academic practice*. Routledge.
- Gess-Newsome, J. (2002). Pedagogical content knowledge: An introduction and orientation. *Examining pedagogical content knowledge*, 6,3-17.
- Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E. & Williamson, P.W. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teacher and College Record*, 111(9), 2055-2100.
- Guest, G. (2012). Describing mixed methods research: An alternative to typologies. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 7(2) 141–151.
- Harden, R. M., & Crosby, J. R. (2000). AMEE education guide No 20: The good teacher is more than a lecturer - the twelve roles of the teacher. *Medical Teacher*, 22(4), 334-347.
- Henning, E. (2000). Walking with "barefoot" teachers: An ethnographically fashioned casebook. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(1), 3-20.
- Hobson, A. J., Ashby, P., Malderez, A., & Tomlinson, P. D. (2009). Mentoring beginning teachers: What we know and what we don't. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(1), 207-216.
- Jansen, C. and Merwe, P. (2015). *Teaching practice in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Emerging trends, challenges and opportunities*. Horizontal Research Publishing.
- Käpylä, M., Heikkinen, J. P., & Asunta, T. (2009). Influence of content knowledge on pedagogical content knowledge: The case of teaching photosynthesis and plant growth. *International Journal of Science Education*, 31(10), 1395-1415.
- Kardos, S. M., & Johnson, S. M. (2010). New teachers' experiences of mentoring: The good, the bad, and the inequity. *Journal Education Change*, 11(1), 23-44.
- Kaya, Z. & Akdemir, S. (2016). *Learning and teaching: Theories, approaches and models*. Pegem Publication
- Keppel, G. & Wickens, T. D. Z. (2004). *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook*. Pearson.
- Khun-inkeeree, H., Dali, P. D., Daud, Y., Fauzee, M. S. O., & Khalid, R. (2019). Effects of teaching and learning supervision on teacher's attitudes to supervision at secondary school in Kubang Pasu District, Kedah. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 1335-1350.

- Kimani, E.N. (2014). Challenges in quality control for postgraduate supervisors. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education*, 1(9), 63-70.
- Komorowska, H. (2016). Dilemmas in language teaching and teacher education. *Glotta Didaktica*, 63(1), 81-95.
- Lee, Y. C. (2011). Enhancing pedagogical content knowledge in a collaborative school-based professional development program for inquiry-based science teaching. *Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching*, 12(1), 1-29.
- McIntyre, J. & Hobson, A.J. (2016). Supporting beginner teacher identity development: External mentors and the third space. *Research Papers in Education*, 31(2), 133-158.
- Menea J, García M, Clarke A, & Barkatsasc, A. (2016). An analysis of three different approaches to student-teacher mentoring and their impact on knowledge generation in practicum settings. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 53-76.
- Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Sage Publications.
- MoEST. (2017). *A report of the joint education sector review working session*. Education Sector Development Committee.
- Mugenda, O. & Mugenda, A. (2003). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Nairobi Acts Press.
- Nezvalová, D. (2011). Researching science teacher pedagogical content knowledge. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 35, 104-118.
- Ngara, R., Ngwarai, R. & Ngara, R. (2013). Teaching practice supervision and assessment as a quality assessment tool in teacher training: Perceptions of prospective teachers at Masvingo teacher training colleges. *European Social Sciences Research Journal*, 1(1), 126-135.
- Ngwenya, V.C. (2015). The factors which motivate Zimbabwean teachers amid the economic challenges the country is confronted with. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 1-15.
- Nilsson, P. (2008). Teaching for understanding: The complex nature of pedagogical content knowledge in pre-service education. *International Journal of Science Education*, 30(10), 1281-1299.
- Ogonor, B.O. & Badmus, M.M. (2006). Reflective teaching practice among student teachers: The case in tertiary institution in Nigeria.

- Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(2),  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2006v31n2.2>
- Pandey, S. (2009). Barefoot teachers and the millennium goal EFA 2015: The dilemma of developing countries. *International Forum of Teaching and Studies*, 5(1), 52-61.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Sethusha, M.J. (2014). Exploring teaching practice supervisors' experiences of student support in an open, distance and e-learning institution. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 18(8), 1-13.
- Shah, S.K. & Corley, K.G. (2006). Building better theory by bridging the quantitative-qualitative divide. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(8), 1821-1835.
- Stangor, C. (2011). *Research methods for behavioural sciences* (4th ed.). Wards worth.
- 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.
- Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. SAGE.
- Tobin, G. A., & Begley, C. M. (2004). Methodological rigour within a qualitative framework. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 48(4), 388-396.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Watanabe, K. (2013). Teaching as a dynamic phenomenon with interpersonal interactions. *Mind, Brain, and Education*. 7(2), 91-100.
- Financial Times (2019). Amazon clinches top spot in world's most valuable brand ranking. Available at: <https://www.ft.com/content/9dac0724-789f-11e9-b0ec-7dff87b9a4a2>
- Fu, X., Kang, J., Hahm, J. J., & Wiitala, J. (2020). Investigating the consequences of theme park experience through the lenses of self-congruity and flow. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 32(3):1181-1199 DOI 10.1108/IJCHM-06-2019-0522

- Gerlich, R. N., Drumheller, K., Clark, R., Baskin, M. B. (2018). Mechanical Turk: Is it just another convenience sample? *Global Journal of Business Disciplines*, 2(1): 45 – 55.
- Gilmore, J. H. (2003, Autumn). Frontiers of the experience economy. *Batten Briefings*, 2003, 1-7.
- Girish, V. G. & Lee, C. (2019). The relationships of brand experience, sports event image and loyalty. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 20(4): 567 – 582. DOI 10.1108/IJSMS-08-2017-0095.
- Gomez-Suárez, M., & Veloso, M. (2020). Brand experience and brand attachment as drivers of WOM in hospitality. *Spanish Journal of Marketing*, 24(2): 231-246. DOI 10.1108/SJME-12-2019-0106
- Guo, Y., & Hsu, F. C. (2023). Branding Creative Cities of Gastronomy: the role of brand experience and the influence of tourists' self-congruity and self-expansion. *British Food Journal*, 125(8): 2803-2824 DOI 10.1108/BFJ-05-2022-0434
- Han, S. H., Ekinci, Y., Chen, C. S. & Park, M. K. (2019): Antecedents and the mediating effect of customer-restaurant brand identification. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, DOI: 10.1080/19368623.2019.1603129
- Haobin, Y. B., Huiyue, Y., Peng, L. & Fong, L. H. N. (2021): The impact of hotel servicescape on customer mindfulness and brand experience: The moderating role of length of stay. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, DOI: 10.1080/19368623.2021.1870186
- Hassan, S.M., Z. Rahman, & Paul, J. (2022). Consumer ethics: A review and research agenda. *Psychology & Marketing*, 39(1): 111–130.
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Addison-Wesley, Reader, MA.
- Huang, C. & Chen, S. (2021). Establishing and Deepening Brand Loyalty through Brand Experience and Customer Engagement: Evidence from Taiwan's Chain Restaurants. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, DOI: 10.1080/1528008X.2020.1864565
- Hunt, S. D. (2002). *Foundations of marketing theory: Toward a general theory of marketing*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Hussein, A. S. (2018). Effects of Brand Experience on Brand Loyalty in Indonesian Casual Dining Restaurant: Roles of Customer Satisfaction and Brand of Origin. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 24(1): 119 – 132 <https://doi.org/10.20867/thm.24.1.4>

- Hwang, J., & Hyun, S.S. (2012). The antecedents and consequences of brand prestige in luxury restaurants. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 17(6), 656 - 683.
- Jimenez-Barreto, J., Rubio, N., Campo, S. & Molinillo, S. (2020). Linking the online destination brand experience and brand credibility with tourists' behavioral intentions toward a destination. *Tourism Management*, 79:104101 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104101>
- Kang, J., Manthiou, A., Sumarjan, N., & Tang, L. (2017). An Investigation of Brand Experience on Brand Attachment, Knowledge, and Trust in the Lodging Industry. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 26(1):1–22. Doi:10.1080/19368623.2016.1172534
- Khan, I. & Fatma, M. (2021). Online destination brand experience and authenticity: Does individualism-collectivism orientation matter? *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 20: 100597 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2021.100597>
- Khan, I., & Rahman, Z. (2017). Brand experience anatomy in hotels: An interpretive structural modeling approach. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 58(2): 165-178.
- Kim, E.G., Chhabra, D., & Timothy, D. J. (2022). Towards a Creative MICE Tourism Destination Branding Model: Integrating Heritage Tourism in New Orleans, USA. *Sustainability*, 14, 16411. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142416411>
- Krishna, A. (2012). An integrative review of sensory marketing: Engaging the senses to affect perception, judgment and behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22(3): 332–351.
- Kumar, V. & Kaushik, A. K. (2017). Destination brand experience and visitor behavior: The mediating role of destination brand identification. *Journal of Travel Tourism Marketing*, 35: 649–663 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2017.1401032>
- Kumar, V. & Kaushik, A. K. (2020). Does experience affect engagement? Role of destination brand engagement in developing brand advocacy and revisit intentions, *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 37(3): 332-346, DOI: 10.1080/10548408.2020.1757562
- Kwon, J. & Boger, C. A. (2020): Influence of brand experience on customer inspiration and pro-environmental intention. *Current Issues in Tourism*, DOI: 10.1080/13683500.2020.1769571

- Legendre, T. S., Cartier, E. A., & Warnick, R. B. (2019). The impact of brand experience on the memory formation. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 38(1): 15-31. Doi. 10.1108/MIP-02-2019-0109
- Lemon, K. N., & Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. *Journal of Marketing*, 80: 69-96.
- Levinson, D. J. & Amar, S. (1999). The importance of a good database", *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 8(4). <https://doi.org/10.1108/dpm.1999.07308dab.001>.
- Liu, K. & Hu, C. (2021). Investigating the Impacts of Hotel Brand Experience on Brand Loyalty: The Mediating Role of Brand Positioning. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, DOI: 10.1080/15256480.2021.1905585
- Liu, K., Tsai, T., Xiao, Q. & Hu, C. (2020): The impact of experience on brand loyalty: Mediating effect of images of Taiwan hotels, *Journal of China Tourism Research*, DOI: 10.1080/19388160.2020.1777238
- Lv, X. & Wu, A. (2021). The role of extraordinary sensory experiences in shaping destination brand love: an empirical study. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 38:2, 179-193, DOI: 10.1080/10548408.2021.1889447
- Lv, X., Li, C., & McCabe, S. (2020). Expanding theory of tourists' destination loyalty: The role of sensory impressions. *Tourism Management*, 77(2), 104026. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.104026>.
- Mandler, T., B. Sezen, J. C., & Özsoyer, A. (2021). Performance consequences of marketing standardization/adaptation: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 125: 416–435.
- Martins, H., Carvalho, P., & Almeida, N. (2021). Destination Brand Experience: A Study Case in Touristic Context of the Peneda-Gerês National Park. *Sustainability*, 13, 11569. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132111569>
- Mehrabian, A., & Russell, J. A. (1974). *An approach to environmental psychology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mody, M. A., Suess, C., & Lehto, X. (2017). The accommodation experiencescape: a comparative assessment of hotels and Airbnb. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(9): 2377–2404.
- Mohamed, M. E. A., Hewedi, M. M., Lehto, X., & Maayouf, M. (2020). Egyptian food experience of international visitors: a



- multidimensional approach. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 32(8): 2593 – 2611, Doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-02-2020-0136
- Morgan-Thomas, A., & Veloutsou, C. (2013). Beyond technology acceptance: Brand relationships and online brand experience. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(1): 21-27.
- Morrison, S., & Crane, F. G. (2007). Building the service brand by creating and managing an emotional brand experience. *Journal of Brand Management*, 14: 410-421.
- Mutsikiwa, M., Zvavahera, P. & Pasipanodya, S. (2020). Brand Experience and Intentions to Stay at Hotels in Zimbabwe: An Application of Khan and Rahman's Hotel Brand Experience Scale. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 9(3)215-230. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46222/ajhtl.19770720-14>
- Narimane, G., & Lahcen, A. (2021). The Effect of Brand Experience on Brand Loyalty with the Mediating Role of Brand Trust. *Journal of Studies in Economics and Management*, 4(1): 884 – 903.
- Nysveen, H., Pedersen, P. E. & Skard, S. (2013). Brand experiences in service organizations: Exploring the individual effects of brand experience dimensions. *Journal of Brand Management*, 20(5): 404 – 423.
- Odor, B. C. (2020) Brand experience and customers repurchase intentions in upscale restaurants in port Harcourt, South-South Nigeria: Mediating role of customer satisfaction. *Transatlantic Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(3): 1- 29. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4054065
- Pascoe, J. (1998). Adding generic contextual capabilities to wearable computers. In Digest of papers. Second international symposium on wearable computers (cat. no. 98ex215), 92–99. IEEE.
- Paul, J., & Rosado-Serrano, A. (2019). Gradual internationalization versus born-global/international new venture models: A review and research agenda. *International Marketing Review*, 36(6): 830–858.
- Paul, J., Lim, W. M., O'Cass, A., Hao, A. W., & Bresciani, S. (2021). Scientific procedures and rationales for systematic literature reviews (SPAR-4-SLR). *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 45(5): 1147–1147.
- Pham, H.L., Pham, H.T. and Nguyen, T.T. (2022). Value co-creation in branding: A systematic review from a tourism perspective. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 32, 3203 Doi: <https://doi.org/10.54055/ejtr.v32i.2597>

- Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (1998). Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(4), 97-105.
- Praswati, A. N., Wardani, N. M., & Rohim, M. (2021). The Impact of Online Destination Brand Experience, Destination Brand Authenticity and Tourist Destination Image on Behavioral Intentions. *Journal of Indonesian Tourism and Development Studies*. 9(3): 145 – 152, Doi: 10.21776/ub.jitode.2021.009.03.01
- Rahman, M. S., Fattah, F. M. A., Hussain, B., & Hossain, M. A. (2021). An integrative model of consumer-based heritage destination brand equity. *Tourism Review*, 76(2): 358 – 373.
- Rather, R. A (2018). Customer experience, memories and loyalty in Indian Hospitality Sector. *International Journal of Marketing and Business Communication* 7 (3): 36-48.
- Rather, R. A., Najjar, A. H. & Jaziri, D. (2020). Destination branding in tourism: insights from social identification, attachment and experience theories. *Anatolia, An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 31: 229–243  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2020.1747223>
- Rezaei, S., Mazaheri, E., & Azadavar, R. (2017). Determinants of experienced tourists' satisfaction and actual spending behavior: A PLS path modelling approach. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11(2): 157-181. DOI 10.1108/IJCTHR-09-2015-0107
- Rodrigues, C., & Brandão, A. (2021). Measuring the effects of retail brand experiences and brand love on word of mouth: A cross-country study of IKEA brand. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 31(1): 78-105.
- Savage, D. A. & Torgler, B. (2021). Methods and Insights on How to Explore Human Behavior in the Disaster Environment. In: *Economic Effects of Natural Disasters: Theoretical Foundations, Methods and Tools* (Chaiechi, T., Editor) p.191 -209.
- Schmitt, B. H. (1999). *Experiential Marketing: How to Get Customers to Sense, Feel, Think, Act, Relate to Your Company and Brands*. New York: The Free Press.
- Seehanam, N., Akkarangoon, S., & Ungpannsattawung, S. (2018). An Analysis of Brand Equity Components in the Context of Cultural Festivals. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(6): 59 - 68.
- Šerić, M. (2016). Content analysis of the empirical research on IMC from 2000 to 2015. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 24(7): 647-685.

- Shang, W., Yuan, Q., & Chen, N. (2020). Examining Structural Relationships among Brand Experience, Existential Authenticity, and Place Attachment in Slow Tourism Destinations. *Sustainability*, 12, 2784 Doi: 10.3390/su12072784
- Shimul, A. S. (2022). Brand attachment: a review and future research. *Journal of Brand Management*, 29:400–419
- Singh, R. & Mehraj, N. (2019). Evaluating the Influence of Destination Brand Experience on Tourist Behavioral Intention. *Enlightening Tourism. A Pathmaking Journal*, 9(2): 199-227.
- Srivastava, S., Madan, P., Dey, B., Qadir, A. & Mathew, J. (2022). Impact of destination brand experience on destination advocacy: Trust and loyalty as moderators. *Consumer Behavior in Tourism and Hospitality*, 17(4): 576 – 590. DOI 10.1108/CBTH-01-2022-0002
- Stam, H. (2007). *Theoretical psychology*. In *The international handbook of psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stratton, S. J. (2021). *Population Research: Convenience Sampling Strategies*. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, 36(4): 373–374.
- Taherdoost, H. (2022). What are Different Research Approaches? Comprehensive Review of Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Research, Their Applications, Types, and Limitations. *Journal of Management Science & Engineering Research*, 5(1): 53 – 63.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson- Hall.
- Tang, J., Wang, J., Zhang, M. and Huang, W. (2023). How destination brand experience influences tourist citizenship behavior: Testing mediation of brand relationship quality and moderation effects on commitment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 080457 Doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.108045
- Thomas, J. E. (2017). Scholarly Views on Theory: Its Nature, Practical Application, and Relation to World View in Business Research. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 12(9): 230 -240.
- Torres-Moraga, E. & Barra, C. (2023). Does destination brand experience help build trust? Disentangling the effects on trust and trustworthiness. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 27, 100767 Doi: 10.1016/j.jdmm.2023.100767

- Tran, L-A. P., & Chang T-Y. (2022). Constructing loyalty through brand innovativeness in online-booking services: The mediating effect of online brand experience. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Innovation in Hospitality and Tourism*, 11(1): 219–239.
- Wang, J., Choe, Y. & Song, H. (2020). Brand Behavioral Intentions of a Theme Park in China: An Application of Brand Experience. *Sustainability*, 12, 4500; Doi: 10.3390/su12114500
- Wang, J., Choe, Y., & Song, H. (2020). Brand Behavioral Intentions of a Theme Park in China: An Application of Brand Experience. *Sustainability*, 12(11): 4500. doi:10.3390/su12114500.
- Wen, H., & Wong, I., Kim, S., Badu-Baiden, F., & Ji, K. (2021). A multilevel synthesis of subjective and objective measures of foodservices in the experience process. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 99, Article 103059. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2021.103059>.
- Wiedmann, K.-P., Labenz, F., Haase, J., & Hennigs, N. (2017). The power of experiential marketing: exploring the causal relationships among multisensory marketing, brand experience, customer perceived value and brand strength. *Journal of Brand Management*, 25(2): 101–118. Doi: 10.1057/s41262-017-0061-5
- Zha, D., Melewar, T., Foroudi, P., & Jin, Z. (2020). An assessment of brand experience knowledge literature: Using bibliometric data to identify future research direction. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 22(3): 287-317. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12226>.