

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Peer Feedback (PF) plays a central role in motivating students and assisting them in identifying areas for improvement (Chand Dayal & Alpana, 2020). In microteaching, it allows students as Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs) to self-evaluate and improve their weaknesses in teaching (Thangaraju & Medhi, 2023), including lesson planning, teaching delivery skills, classroom management, personal appearance, and language competency (Diasti, 2020). It is typically delivered in either oral or written form. While Oral Peer Feedback (OPF) facilitates free discussion and quick responses, Written Peer Feedback (WPF) provides more flexible timing and a long-lasting record of information (Vida Tayebi et al., 2017). Written Peer Feedback (WPF) minimizes personal conflicts between students (Aimah et al., 2023) since they were physically separated, so that students can effectively focus and refine their comments (Cohen Zilka, 2020). Therefore, it creates a more supportive learning environment that may address communication barriers, a lack of self-confidence, anxiety, and potential misunderstandings.

However, it is important to reflect on whether the Written Peer Feedback (WPF) is helpful. This is because effective feedback should provide information on how to realize the desired result (Lipsch-Wijnen & Dirkx, 2022), which is frequently referenced and applied in educational practice (Arts et al., 2021). Hattie and Timperley (2007) highlight key components of feedback levels. They stated that effective feedback should answer these three questions: “*Where am I going?*” (*Feed-up*), “*How am I going?*” (*Feedback*), and “*Where to next?*” (*Feed-forward*) (Asregid et al., 2023). Following this, they indicated that feed-up, feedback, and feed-forward can be given at four levels of feedback: task (correct or incorrect the task of teaching is), process (strategies and methods used), self-regulation (self-monitoring and evaluation), and self (praise). Feedback at the self-regulation and process levels is usually most effective for raising achievement (Arts et al., 2016),

whereas self-level feedback is the least effective (Carless, 2019; Lipnevich & Panadero, 2021; Wisniewski et al., 2020).

Although effective feedback can be defined through its feedback levels, the impact ultimately depends on how students perceive it. In educational contexts, it can be categorized into three key aspects related to the cognitive function of feedback: perceived fairness, usefulness, and acceptance (Strijbos et al., 2021). Perceived fairness refers to the extent to which feedback is considered justified and unbiased (Lizzio & Wilson, 2008; Struyven et al., 2005, as cited in Playfoot et al., 2025). Usefulness refers to the degree to which feedback is perceived as meaningful and informative (Altstaedter & Doolittle, 2014). Acceptance refers to the extent to which students are willing to acknowledge and act upon it (Azarnoosh, 2013; Chou, 2014; Prins et al., 2005, as cited in Kerman et al., 2023).

Previous studies have examined the level of feedback in written feedback from various educational contexts, using Hattie and Timperley's (2007) theoretical framework. Kastberg et al. (2016) analyze the written peer feedback produced by Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs) in the United States. They found that PSTs tended to provide feedback at the task, process, and self-levels. On the other hand, Arts et al. (2016) examined the quality of written feedback from teachers by analyzing feedback levels and the students' perceptions. They reported that fourth-year biology teacher-education students in the Netherlands received feedback from teachers primarily at the task level, with self-level feedback occurring the least frequently. In the microteaching course, Nam & Binh (2015) investigated feedback levels and reflection from Vietnam Teacher-educators (Teds) and Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs) during post-lesson discussions. They found that feedback from Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs) and Teacher-educators (Teds) in Vietnam remained at the task level and was mostly descriptive. Regarding perceptions, Jacobsen et al. (2025) found that Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs) generally perceived peer feedback as useful, fair, and acceptable, especially when the feedback was specific and constructive.

Building on this, previous studies have investigated the level of written peer feedback generated by pre- or in-service teachers. Although Kastberg et al. (2016) and Nam & Binh (2015) identified the most common feedback levels in the international education context, they did not investigate how Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs) interpreted or used the feedback they received. Similarly, (Arts et al., 2016) focused on teacher-generated written feedback rather than feedback from PSTs. Therefore, two significant gaps remain. First, the previous studies that apply Hattie and Timperley's (2007) framework to analyze feedback levels have been conducted in non-Indonesian contexts (Arts et al., 2016; Kastberg et al., 2016; Nam & Binh, 2015). This gap matters because the Indonesian microteaching context in this study is shaped by a distinct genre-based curriculum (*Kurikulum 2013*), in which Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs) are expected to guide students through structured pedagogical stages, including Building Knowledge of the Field (BKOF), Modelling of the Text (MOT), Joint Constructions of the Text (JCOT), and Individual Constructions of the Text (ICT). In other words, the focus and expectations of peer feedback in Indonesian classrooms may differ from those previously studied. Second, they have tended to examine feedback levels without linking them to Pre-Service Teachers' (PSTs) perceptions of written peer feedback in the context of microteaching in Indonesia. This separation raises the question of whether, when feedback is dominated by a particular level, such as the task level, Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs) perceive a gap between what they receive and what they need.

To address these gaps, the present study aims to identify the levels of Written Peer Feedback (WPF) from English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) students as Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs) in the microteaching course at the public university in Jakarta, and to explore English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) students' perceptions of the Written Peer Feedback (WPF) they have received. By investigating the levels and perceptions of English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) students' Written Peer Feedback (WPF), this study contributes to the improvement of feedback practices aimed at enhancing teaching skills in the microteaching course. Furthermore, this also supports the

development of a more structured written peer feedback framework that can be used by lecturers in guiding PSTs during their teaching practice.

1.2 Research Questions

Based on the background of the study above, this study is conducted to answer the following questions:

1. What levels of feedback do ELESF students provide in their written peer feedback in microteaching?
2. How do ELESF students perceive the written peer feedback they receive in microteaching?

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study are as follows:

1. To identify the levels of feedback provided by ELESF students in their written peer feedback in microteaching.
2. To explore how ELESF students perceive the written peer feedback they receive in microteaching.

1.4 Scope of the Study

This study will analyze the content of written peer feedback provided by English Language Education Study Program (ELESF) students as Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs). (1) The researcher focuses on identifying the levels of written peer feedback in the microteaching course, and (2) the researcher also explores English Language Education Study Program (ELESF) students' perceptions of the written peer feedback they have received in the microteaching course. Participants in this study will be limited to English Language Education Study Program (ELESF) students currently enrolled in the microteaching course in their 6th and 8th semesters at the public university in Jakarta. One class comprising 28 students will be involved in completing the Peer Observation Sheet (POS). As they completed

the Peer Observation Sheet (POS) in pairs, the class produced a total of 14 POSs. These 14 POSs will be selected as the research sample, and their feedback will serve as the primary data source.

To analyze the levels of written peer feedback, this study applies Hattie and Timperley's (2007) theoretical framework. They categorize feedback into four levels: task-level feedback (accuracy and quality of work), process-level feedback (strategies and methods used), self-regulation feedback (self-monitoring and evaluation), and self-level feedback (personal praise). Furthermore, to explore ELESP students' perceptions regarding the written feedback they receive from peers in the microteaching course, this study conducted semi-structured individual interviews focused on perceptions of fairness, usefulness, and acceptance, adopting the framework proposed by Strijbos et al. (2021).

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study is expected to be useful for future researchers interested in exploring the use of written peer feedback in the microteaching course, particularly for English Language Education students. This study serves as a meaningful insight into the levels and perceptions of written peer feedback in microteaching. It aims to potentially benefit both lecturers and students of the English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) by offering strategies that can help enhance the written peer feedback practices in the microteaching course. It is believed that this study will assist English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) students in developing the skills necessary to provide more specific, constructive, and reflective feedback. A well-structured written feedback process will enable students to better evaluate their peers' teaching abilities, which also contributes to their development as future teachers.

1.6 State of the Art

Studies on written peer feedback in teaching practices have contributed significantly to development. In the context of feedback levels in Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs) education, research has applied Hattie and Timperley's (2007) framework, from in-service teachers in the Netherlands (Arts et al., 2016), to PSTs on mathematics tasks (Kastberg et al., 2016), and a microteaching course in Vietnam (Nam & Binh, 2015). Although there are differences in context and feedback providers, their findings show a consistent pattern in which task-level feedback predominates (Arts et al., 2016; Kastberg et al., 2016; Nam & Binh, 2015). On the other hand, research has examined how feedback is perceived. Jacobsen et al. (2025), for example, examined how peer feedback was identified in a VR-based microteaching and real-world context using a mixed-method quasi-experimental design. The study analyzed multiple dimensions of feedback quality, including specificity, explanation, suggestions for improvement, interaction, and thought-provoking questions. The findings suggested that peer feedback was perceived as useful, fair, and acceptable, especially when the feedback was specific and constructive.

Building on this, previous studies have supported the enhancement of pre- and in-service teachers in giving feedback to students or peers (Arts et al., 2016; Kastberg et al., 2016; Nam & Binh, 2015), specifically in the international educational context. A study of written peer feedback from Indonesian students as Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs) appears to warrant further analysis. Microteaching is an effective strategy for enhancing teaching abilities (Amran et al., 2023), but feedback practices provided by students are often not specific and not systematic, so it is less optimal in encouraging the development of reflective skills (Cendani & Purnamaningwulan, 2023). Therefore, further exploration of the content of Written Peer Feedback (WPF) is significant to enhance feedback practices and learning outcomes.