Research and Development Journal Of Education
Vol. 12, No. 2, Oktober 2026, Pp: 540 – 548
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30998
Available online at https://journal.lppmunindra.ac.id/index.php/RDJE

p–ISSN 2406-9744
e–ISSN 2657-1056

INVESTIGATING PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS' PREFERENCES FOR THE TIMING AND DELIVERY OF ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN MICROTEACHING CONTEXT

Abdullah Kafabih[1(*)], Rozanah Katrina Herda[2], Kiki Juli Anggoro[3]
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia[12]
Walailak University, Tha Sala, Thailand[3]
abdullahkafabih.2022@student.uny.ac.id[1], katrinaherda@uny.ac.id[2], kiki.an@mail.wu.ac.th[3]

Received: 03 September 2025
Revised: 17 Januari 2026
Accepted: 14 Juni 2026

Abstract

Oral corrective feedback (OCF) plays a significant role in the professional development of pre-service teachers, especially within microteaching sessions that simulate real classroom experiences. The effectiveness of OCF depends not only on what is communicated but also on when and how it is delivered. This study aimed to explore pre-service English teachers' preferences regarding the timing and delivery of OCF, as well as their affective responses to different feedback strategies in microteaching. Using a quantitative descriptive design, the study involved 64 undergraduate students from an English Language Education program at a public university in Indonesia. Data were collected through a 26-item Likert-scale questionnaire and analysed using descriptive statistics, including mean scores and standard deviations. The findings revealed a strong preference for delayed feedback provided after teaching performances, particularly when accompanied by explicit explanations. Although immediate feedback was accepted under specific conditions, real-time correction in front of others was often perceived as uncomfortable. Peer feedback and observational learning were viewed as helpful, while self-correction was considered less effective. Overall, participants responded positively to feedback that was delivered in a constructive and emotionally supportive manner. This study recommends the adoption of emotionally and cognitively responsive feedback practices in English teacher education to foster reflective and confident future educators.

Keywords: Affective Response; EFL Context; Microteaching; Oral Corrective Feedback; Student Preference; Teacher Training

(*) Corresponding Author: Kafabih, abdullahkafabih.2022@student.uny.ac.id

How to Cite: Kafabih, A., Herda, R. K., & Anggoro, K. J. (2026). INVESTIGATING PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH TEACHERS' PREFERENCES FOR THE TIMING AND DELIVERY OF ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN MICROTEACHING CONTEXT. *Research and Development Journal of Education*, 12(2), 540-548.

INTRODUCTION

Microteaching remains a vital element in teacher education programs, providing pre-service teachers with a structured opportunity to practice teaching skills in a simulated classroom environment. Through microteaching, student-teachers are encouraged to deliver short teaching segments, receive feedback from peers and supervisors, and reflect critically on their own performance. This practice not only enhances instructional techniques but also builds self-confidence and prepares future educators to manage authentic classroom settings (Mishra, 2024). The presence of timely and constructive

feedback is widely recognized as a key factor in optimizing the benefits of microteaching sessions (Fki, 2023).

Among the various types of feedback provided during microteaching, oral corrective feedback (OCF) plays a particularly significant role. OCF refers to spoken responses aimed at addressing errors in teaching language use, instructional clarity, or pedagogical execution (Li, 2021). In the context of English language teaching, where spontaneous spoken performance is central, the accuracy and appropriateness of OCF can directly affect learning outcomes (Lyster et al., 2013). Lyster and Ranta's (1997) The typology of corrective feedback consisting of explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition continues to inform classroom-based research on how oral feedback should be delivered.

While the type of corrective feedback is important, the timing of its delivery has also emerged as a critical concern. Immediate feedback, when delivered tactfully, may help correct mistakes on the spot and improve real-time awareness (Li et al., 2025). However, for many student-teachers, real-time correction, especially when done publicly can be emotionally challenging or embarrassing. By contrast, delayed or post-activity feedback is often perceived as less threatening and more conducive to reflection and improvement (Shintani & Aubrey, 2016; Zilka, 2020). These emotional and psychological factors are especially relevant in microteaching, which serves not only as a technical rehearsal but also as a space where student-teachers develop their professional identity.

Despite the growing research interest in corrective feedback in second language acquisition, few studies have specifically explored how pre-service teachers perceive both the timing and delivery of OCF within the microteaching context. A previous study by Wati and Prawiro (2019) examined pre-service English teachers' perceptions and actual practices in providing oral feedback during their teaching practicum. Their findings indicated that although participants acknowledged the importance of oral feedback, particularly in addressing pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary errors, they often did not apply it consistently in practice. When feedback was given, it tended to focus primarily on linguistic form, with less attention paid to content-related issues. This focus on the feedback provider's perspective differs from the present study, which shifts attention to pre-service teachers as recipients of oral corrective feedback in microteaching sessions. The current research investigates their preferences regarding the timing and delivery of feedback and considers the affective dimensions that accompany these preferences. In a formative context like microteaching, poorly timed or poorly delivered feedback may inhibit experimentation, reduce motivation, and undermine pedagogical confidence (Asregid et al., 2023; Holstein et al., 2022). Therefore, understanding how student-teachers prefer feedback to be given, both cognitively and emotionally is necessary for improving instructional training practices.

This study aims to investigate student-teachers' preferences for the timing (immediate, delayed, or post-activity) and delivery type (explicit correction, recasts, public vs private feedback) of oral corrective feedback during microteaching. By identifying their emotional responses and pedagogical expectations, this research seeks to offer practical insights for teacher educators on how to deliver feedback that supports both technical competence and emotional well-being. The findings may contribute to enhancing feedback practices in English language teacher education programs, particularly in Indonesian universities where microteaching remains a central component of the curriculum.

Research Questions:

1. What are pre-service English teachers' preferences for the timing of oral corrective feedback (OCF) during microteaching sessions?

2. What are pre-service English teachers' preferences for the delivery of OCF during microteaching sessions?

METHODS

This study employed a quantitative descriptive design using a survey to investigate student preferences regarding the timing and delivery of oral corrective feedback (OCF) in microteaching contexts. A descriptive design was deemed suitable as it allows researchers to collect quantifiable data and identify trends or patterns in participants' perceptions without manipulating variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2022). A total of 64 undergraduate students from an English Language Education program at a public university in Indonesia participated in the study. They were selected through purposive sampling, as all had previous experience with microteaching sessions that formed part of a compulsory course prior to undertaking their teaching practicum. The microteaching course consisted of 16 meetings in which each student took turns simulating the role of a teacher, while their peers acted as students. These sessions typically involved preparing lesson plans, delivering short teaching segments, managing simulated classroom interactions, and receiving feedback from both the course instructor and fellow participants. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained before distributing the instrument.

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire developed by the researchers and validated by two experts in English Language Teaching (ELT). The instrument consisted of 26 5-point Likert scale items that aimed to measure students' preferences related to feedback timing (immediate, delayed, and post-session) and feedback delivery types (explicit correction, recast, elicitation, peer feedback, and written summary). A pilot test was conducted with ten students to assess the clarity and reliability of the instrument. The final version of the questionnaire was distributed online through Google Forms for a period of one week, and all responses were collected anonymously. Descriptive statistical analysis, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, was used to summarise and interpret the data (Ary et al., 2018). The findings were presented using a table to support readability and understanding.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Results

The quantitative findings of this study reveal a range of preferences and emotional responses among pre-service teachers regarding oral corrective feedback (OCF) in microteaching. The results indicate that delayed correction is more preferred than real-time feedback. The item coded as T2, which refers to feedback delivered after a teaching performance, had a high mean score ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 0.68$), implying that most participants favoured feedback when the pressure of performance had passed. On the other hand, item T1, referring to feedback during the teaching activity, recorded a significantly lower mean ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 1.40$), suggesting that correction in real time was often perceived as disruptive or demotivating. This interpretation is further reinforced by item T3 ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 1.22$), indicating that being corrected publicly can be discouraging. However, the item T5, which measures appreciation of immediate correction, yielded a moderate mean ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.12$), suggesting that some learners are open to feedback while teaching, depending on the manner in which it is delivered.

In terms of how feedback is delivered, participants clearly valued explanation-based correction and collaborative learning. The highest-rated item in the entire dataset was D3 (M = 4.72, SD = 0.54), which indicated strong agreement with the idea that correction is more meaningful when accompanied by an explanation. Furthermore, peer-assisted learning and observation were also seen as beneficial, with high mean scores for D2 (M = 4.17, SD = 0.84) and D6 (M = 4.48, SD = 0.66). These results highlight the social dimension of learning in microteaching. In contrast, D5, which reflects a belief in the superiority of self-correction, had the lowest mean in this category (M = 2.48, SD = 1.10), suggesting that most students still rely heavily on feedback from instructors or peers rather than trusting their own awareness.

Affective responses to oral correction were generally positive, reinforcing the importance of feedback in teacher development. Item A1, on motivation from correction, and A2, on belief in improvement due to correction, both recorded high means (M = 4.59 and M = 4.63, respectively), illustrating that oral feedback is perceived as essential to progress. Participants also showed a high degree of reflection and responsibility following feedback, with items such as A4 (M = 4.48), A5 (M = 4.58), and A12 (M = 4.53). Moreover, they expressed that feedback helped them set learning goals (A10, M = 4.47), feel respected by peers even when making mistakes (A6, M = 4.45), and increased their readiness for real classroom communication (A11, M = 4.42). While there was a moderate preference for positive over critical feedback (A7, M = 3.98), this did not appear to undermine their receptiveness to constructive input. These findings point to a psychologically safe learning environment in which oral correction serves both instructional and motivational purposes.

Tabel 1.
Result of Statistic Descrptive

Code	Item(s)	Mean	ST. Deviation
T1	I prefer the instructor to correct my mistakes during the activity	2.64	1.40
T2	I prefer a teacher to correct my mistakes after I finish presenting	4.52	0.68
T3	I feel discouraged when my mistakes are corrected in front of others	2.69	1.22
T4	I feel nervous when I expect to be corrected during oral activities	3.14	1.18
T5	I appreciate immediate correction while I am teaching	4.00	1.12
D1	I can explain why a correction was made to my performance	4.30	0.70
D2	Peer correction helps me understand my mistakes better	4.17	0.84
D3	I understand better when corrections are followed by explanations	4.72	0.54
D4	I feel comfortable when my classmates correct my speaking skill	4.14	0.77
D5	Self-correction is more effective than being corrected by others	2.48	1.10
D6	I learn from observing how others are corrected during microteaching	4.48	0.66
A1	I feel motivated when I receive oral correction	4.59	0.61
A2	I believe oral correction helps me improve my teaching	4.63	0.65
A3	I feel more confident after receiving oral correction	4.30	0.80
A4	I reflect on the oral corrections I receive during microteaching	4.48	0.64

A5	I try to avoid repeating the same mistakes after being corrected	4.58	0.61
A6	I feel that my classmates respect my effort when I make mistakes	4.45	0.66
A7	I benefit more from positive feedback than from criticism	3.98	1.10
A8	I notice patterns in my mistakes when I receive regular corrections	4.09	0.82
A9	I actively seek feedback to improve my performance in teaching	4.34	0.71
A10	I now view oral correction as a helpful part of learning, not as criticism	4.47	0.68
A11	I feel more prepared for real classroom communication because of oral correction	4.42	0.63
A12	I take responsibility for improving after being corrected	4.53	0.59
A13	I learn better when I work with classmates to solve teaching problems	4.28	0.74
A14	I understand more when a teacher gives support and then allows me to try on my own	4.55	0.61
A15	I improve more when corrections are discussed in context rather than as rules	4.66	0.54

Discussion

This study investigated pre-service teachers' preferences and emotional responses to oral corrective feedback (OCF) within microteaching contexts, highlighting how the timing and delivery of such feedback affect learning experiences. The findings suggest a pronounced preference for delayed feedback, particularly after the completion of teaching performance (T2), which aligns with established literature indicating that learners benefit from reflection opportunities when feedback does not interrupt performance (Bacotti et al., 2021; Lefevre & Cox, 2017). Pre-service teachers often find public correction during teaching to be emotionally challenging and potentially discouraging, especially when it disrupts the natural flow of their instructional delivery. These emotional risks associated with immediate, on-the-spot feedback are well-documented in the work of (Khan, 2023), who argues that learners' affective filters can hinder their receptivity to correction when it is delivered intrusively. In this sense, the preference for delayed feedback represents not only a pedagogical preference but also a coping strategy that allows student-teachers to process information in a psychologically safe environment.

Although delayed feedback was preferred, the study also revealed that immediate feedback (T5) is not entirely unwelcome. A moderate level of agreement with its usefulness suggests that, when delivered with sensitivity, immediate correction can still contribute positively to the learning process. This finding supports (Kutasi, 2023), who emphasizes that the impact of feedback is determined not only by its content and timing but also by its tone and relational delivery. Learners in this study appeared to accept immediate correction when it was framed as constructive and non-judgmental, indicating that the manner in which feedback is delivered can mediate its emotional effects. Carless and Boud (2018) similarly asserts that the affective dimension of feedback is crucial for ensuring its uptake. Hence, the challenge for educators lies in developing responsive strategies that are attuned to learners' emotional states while remaining pedagogically effective (Kafabih et al., 2025, 2026).

In terms of delivery modes, the most highly rated item involved feedback accompanied by explanation (D3), reinforcing the view that feedback must be cognitively informative to be meaningful. This supports the findings of Ellis and Shintani (2013), who

argue that metalinguistic explanation fosters deeper understanding and long-term improvement in both language and teaching competencies. Particularly in the context of teacher education, feedback that explains why a correction is necessary helps learners internalize pedagogical reasoning, not just surface-level correctness. Furthermore, high scores for peer feedback (D2) and observational learning (D6) underscore the social dimension of learning in microteaching settings. These results resonate with Vygotsky's (1978) theory of mediated learning, where cognitive development is enhanced through social interaction and guided participation. Studies by Nguyen and Ngo (2018)also highlight how peer collaboration facilitates critical reflection and strengthens teaching identity in pre-service education.

By contrast, the low preference for self-correction (D5) suggests that pre-service teachers may not yet possess the metacognitive skills or professional confidence to self-regulate effectively. Farrell (2022) notes that beginning teachers often struggle to identify their own errors, especially without external scaffolding. This aligns with the findings of Kim (2018), who observed that teacher candidates rarely engage in productive self-correction unless they receive explicit feedback or prompts. Although autonomous reflection is a desirable goal in teacher education, it appears to require more structured support in the early stages of development. The implication here is that teacher educators must design reflective tasks and feedback systems that gradually build students' capacity to monitor and evaluate their own teaching practices with increasing independence.

The affective responses captured in the study further affirm the value of oral corrective feedback when it is delivered thoughtfully. High mean scores on items related to motivation (A1), perceived improvement (A2), and growing confidence (A3) indicate that participants view feedback not as punitive but as a vital tool for professional growth. Wilcoxen and Lemke (2021) suggests that when feedback is framed positively and delivered in a supportive manner, it contributes significantly to the emotional resilience and pedagogical confidence of pre-service teachers. Importantly, participants demonstrated a strong sense of feedback literacy, as shown in their tendency to reflect on feedback (A9), set learning goals (A10), and assume responsibility for improvement (A12). These behaviours align with Vaughan and Uribe (2024) model of feedback literacy, which involves the active engagement, interpretation, and application of feedback. The findings suggest that feedback practices in this microteaching program do not merely correct errors but foster critical thinking, autonomy, and professional identity development.

At the same time, the preference for positive feedback over critical commentary (A7) warrants attention. While it is natural for novice teachers to seek affirmation, an overreliance on praise can limit opportunities for growth if it discourages engagement with constructive critique. Hunter and Springer (2022) note that early-career teachers often experience vulnerability around feedback, and without sufficient emotional scaffolding, critical feedback can be perceived as personal failure. Encouragingly, the data also show that participants valued peer support (A14) and collaborative reflection (A15), indicating that emotionally safe feedback environments, such as those involving peer dialogue—may buffer against negative affect. Rowe (2017) reported similar findings, showing that emotionally sensitive feedback fosters openness to critique and deeper engagement in professional learning. It is through such supportive contexts that pre-service teachers may develop not only technical competence but also the emotional strength to confront and learn from their weaknesses.

Altogether, these findings suggest that oral corrective feedback in microteaching must be approached as both a pedagogical and relational practice. Feedback is not merely a transmission of information, but a dialogic process shaped by timing, delivery, and affective climate. As Charalampous and Darra (2024) argue, effective feedback in teacher

education must account for the social-emotional dimensions of learning, not just cognitive outcomes. This study contributes to that conversation by offering empirical support for responsive, human-centered feedback practices that prioritize learner voice, psychological safety, and reflection. It also emphasizes the need to treat microteaching not just as performance, but as a formative space for dialogic learning, identity construction, and professional transformation. These insights hold practical implications for the design of teacher education curricula that seek to cultivate reflective, resilient, and feedback-literate educators.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated pre-service teachers' preferences and emotional responses to oral corrective feedback during microteaching in an English language teacher education context. The findings indicated a clear tendency among participants to prefer feedback that is given after the completion of their teaching performance, rather than during the activity. This reflects a concern for maintaining the fluency of their teaching process and preserving emotional comfort while performing in front of peers and instructors. Although immediate feedback was acknowledged as useful under certain conditions, it was often viewed as disruptive when delivered in real time. The preference for delayed feedback suggests that student-teachers value opportunities for private reflection and post-performance analysis that support deeper professional growth.

In addition, participants expressed a strong preference for feedback that includes explanations, rather than mere identification of errors. This indicates a desire for cognitively rich input that not only informs but also develops pedagogical reasoning. Peer feedback and learning through observation were also viewed positively, reinforcing the importance of collaborative learning environments. However, self-correction was rated as less effective, which may suggest that novice teachers still rely heavily on external input and have yet to develop the metacognitive skills needed for autonomous evaluation. Emotional responses to feedback were largely constructive when the feedback was framed positively and respectfully, supporting learners' confidence, motivation, and willingness to engage with their own development.

These findings provide valuable implications for the design of feedback practices in teacher education, particularly in microteaching contexts. Teacher educators should consider not only what kind of feedback is given, but also when and how it is delivered, to ensure it supports both pedagogical understanding and emotional well-being. Further research is recommended to explore how feedback preferences may differ across cultural and institutional contexts, and how feedback literacy evolves over time as student-teachers transition into professional roles. The study contributes to the growing body of knowledge that views feedback as an interactive and human-centered component of teacher development, one that requires both instructional sensitivity and emotional awareness to be truly effective. While this study offers valuable insights into pre-service teachers' preferences for the timing and delivery of oral corrective feedback in microteaching, its scope is limited to a specific group of participants within a single institutional context. Therefore, the interpretations should be viewed in light of this context, and further research in more diverse settings would help strengthen and broaden the applicability of the findings.

REFERENCES

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Irvine, C. K. S., & Walker, D. (2018). *Introduction to Research in Education* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Asregid, D., Mihiretie, D. M., & Kassa, S. A. (2023). Teacher educators use of feedback to facilitate reflective practice among pre-service teachers during microteaching. *Cogent Education*, *10*(2), 2257121. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2257121

Bacotti, J. K., Grauerholz-Fisher, E., Morris, S. L., & Vollmer, T. R. (2021). Identifying the relation between feedback preferences and performance. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *54*(2), 668–683. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaba.804

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(8), 1315–1325. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354

Charalampous, A., & Darra, M. (2024). The impact of teacher feedback on non-cognitive aspects of student's performance in higher education: A Review of research. *International Research in Education*, *12*(2), 13–38. https://doi.org/10.5296/ire.v12i2.22001

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2013). *Exploring Language Pedagogy through Second Language Acquisition Research*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203796580

Farrell, T. S. C. (2022). *Reflective Practice in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009028783

Fki, N. (2023). Towards more effective feedback strategies to enhance microteaching for pre-service teachers at ISEAH Mahdia. *Studies in Applied Linguistics & TESOL*, *23*(2), 150–201. https://doi.org/10.52214/salt.v23i2.12090

Holstein, A., Weber, K. E., Prilop, C. N., & Kleinknecht, M. (2022). Analyzing pre- and in-service teachers' feedback practice with microteaching videos. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *117*, 103817. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103817

Hunter, S. B., & Springer, M. G. (2022). Critical feedback characteristics, teacher human capital, and early-career teacher performance: A mixed-methods analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *44*(3), 380–403. https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737211062913

Kafabih, A., Herda, R. K., & Jee, L. J. (2026). A study on the key factors affecting speaking fluency in Indonesian higher education settings. *Journal of English Language and Language Teaching*, *10*(1), 37–53. https://doi.org/10.36597/jellt.v10i1.18977

Kafabih, A., Herda, R. K., & Monteza, A. M. M. (2025). Classroom praxis of applied oral communication strategies in enhancing English speaking skills in Indonesian secondary school. *Research and Innovation in Applied Linguistics (RIAL)*, *3*(2), 195–214. https://doi.org/10.31963/rial.v3i2.5526

Khan, S. S. (2023). Reflections of Krashen's affective filter hypothesis in language classroom : A study amongst undergraduates. *British Journal of Arts and Humanities*, *5*(3), 142–149. https://doi.org/10.34104/bjah.02301420149

Kim, J. H. (2018). Recasts and prompts in dyadic interaction: Explicitness of feedback and learner proficiency. *English Teaching*, *73*(4), 3–28. https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.73.4.201812.3

Kutasi, R. (2023). Feedback: Unveiling its impact and enhancing its effectiveness in education. *Revista de Pedagogie/ Journal of Pedagogy*, *2*, 7–32. https://doi.org/10.26755/RevPed/2023.2/7

Lefevre, D., & Cox, B. (2017). Delayed instructional feedback may be more effective, but is this contrary to learners' preferences? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *48*(6), 1357–1367. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12495

Li, S. (2021). Oral Corrective Feedback. In H. Mohebbi & C. Coombe (Eds.), *Research Questions in Language Education and Applied Linguistics: A Reference Guide* (pp. 353–357). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79143-8_63

Li, S., Ou, L., & Lee, I. (2025). The timing of corrective feedback in second language learning. *Language Teaching*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444824000478

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(1), 37–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, *46*(1), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365

Mishra, R. (2024). Utilizing online micro teaching as the main technique in education practice. *2024 1st International Conference on Sustainable Computing and Integrated Communication in Changing Landscape of AI (ICSCAI)*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSCAI61790.2024.10866844

Nguyen, H. T. M., & Ngo, N. T. H. (2018). Learning to reflect through peer mentoring in a TESOL practicum. *ELT Journal*, *72*(2), 187–198. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx053

Rowe, A. D. (2017). Feelings About Feedback: The Role of Emotions in Assessment for Learning. In D. Carless, S. M. Bridges, C. K. Y. Chan, & R. Glofcheski (Eds.), *Scaling up Assessment for Learning in Higher Education* (pp. 159–172). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3045-1_11

Shintani, N., & Aubrey, S. (2016). The effectiveness of synchronous and asynchronous written corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy in a computer-mediated environment. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*(1), 296–319. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12317

Vaughan, M., & Uribe, S. N. (2024). Re-examining our feedback model: Strategies for enhancing student learning and cultivating feedback literacy through formative assessments. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *49*(5), 711–723. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2323468

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: Development of Higher Psychological Processes* (M. Cole, V. Jolm-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (eds.)). Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4

Wati, A., & Prawiro, I. Y. (2019). Pre-service EFL teachers' perceptions and actual practices of giving oral feedback in apprenticeship program: An exploratory study. *Wiralodra English Journal*, *3*(2), 303–313. https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v3i2.63

Wilcoxen, C. L., & Lemke, J. (2021). Preservice teachers' perceptions of feedback: The importance of timing, purpose, and delivery. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, *18*(8). https://doi.org/10.53761/1.18.8.13

Zilka, G. C. (2020). The experience of receiving and giving public oral and written peer feedback on the teaching experience of preservice teachers. *Proceedings of InSITE 2020: Informing Science and Information Technology Education Conference*, *4502*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.28945/4502.