AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE LEVELS OF FEEDBACK AND REFLECTION DURING PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' MICRO-TEACHING PRACTICES

Nguyen Thi Hong Nam and Vo Huy Binh

School of Education, Can Tho University, Vietnam

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Both feedback and reflection were well-investigated in many studies; however, the relationship between the two, especially micro-teaching practices of pre-service teachers (PreTs) has remained underexplored. This paper reports the results of an investigation into the levels of feedback and reflection during micro-teaching practices. Five subject-specific teacher educators (TEds) and PreTs in a school of teacher education at a university in the Mekong Delta participated in the study. Research instruments included observation of the five micro-teaching classes and interviews of the research participants. Data of minutes of micro-teaching observation and interviews was qualitatively analyzed. The research indicated two findings: (1) feedback mostly given by TEds supported the reflective process of PreTs and both primarily focused on teaching method-related issues; (2) reflective thinking generated by PreTs was limited at technical level and descriptive in general. The research contributed to bridging the gap in knowledge about the correlation between feedback and reflection and suggesting an urging need of fostering reflective capacity for PreTs based on broader and deeper focuses of feedback used during post-lesson discussions.

Cited as: Nam, N.T.H. and Binh, V.H., 2015. An investigation into the levels of feedback and reflec-tion during pre-service teachers' micro-teaching practices. Can Tho University Journal of Science. 1: 116-124.

1 BACKGROUND

Micro-teaching is currently a compulsory course in the four-year teacher training program. PreTs registered for this course in semester 1 of year 4 prior to their teaching practice in high schools. In micro-teaching classes, PreTs are divided into groups of 15-20 students, and each group is given two times of micro-teaching practice. TEds organized post-lesson analyses where PreTs are offered opportunities to look back what they have done. These occasions are somehow shaping reflective perspectives for PreTs; however, whether feedback encourages PreTs to reflect on what is most crucial for their teaching effectiveness has remained unknown. As a results, this research attempted to investigate the focus of feedback and reflection in order to provide both TEds and PreTs with insights into the existing issues occurring in the post-lesson analyses for reflection and further improvements.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, four major issues: objectives of micro-teaching, reflection, feedback and the relationship between feedback and reflection during micro-teaching practice of PreTs are reviewed.

2.1 Objectives of micro-teaching

Micro-teaching model has been perceived and implemented contextually differently in teacher education programs. Nonetheless, the objectives of micro-teaching are almost the same. Belt (1967), at Brigham Young University, indicated five objectives of micro-teaching as listed below

− To provide the trainee contact with the referents-teaching, role development, and behavior analysis.

− To provide the trainee with teaching practice in a controlled situation.

− To provide the trainee with immediate feedback on his performance.

− To provide the trainee with an opportunity to observe himself in action in a teaching situation and to discuss his observations with a supervisor and with the pupils he has taught.

− To provide the trainee with an opportunity to plan for correction of specific weaknesses and to carry out these plans in practice and re-teaching sessions in the miniature classroom (p. 2)

The last three above-mentioned objectives highlight the significance of feedback and reflective thinking during micro-teaching.

2.2 Feedback

Feedback exists as a taken-for granted part in all professions and practice. Nevertheless, the nature of feedback is far more sophisticated than our usual beliefs. Drawing a conclusion on what is feedback, Price et al. (2010) conceptualized it as *'a product as well as a process; and has a content as well as a relational dimension'*.

As complex in its nature, the definitions of feedback are also various. Among these, from feedback receiver–centred perspective, several authors defined feedback with the focus on its functions for facilitating the learning process of feedback receivers for further enhanced practice. Feedback was figuratively addressed as *"...the oil that lubricates the cogs of understanding"* (Brown, 2007, p. 1). As noted by Nicol (2007), feedback empowers students to *"...learn to monitor, manage and take responsibility for their own learning"* (p. 4). Likely, Gibbs and Simpson (2004/5) indicated that feedback assists learners to *"...correct errors, develop understanding through explanations, generate more learning by suggesting further specific study tasks, promote the development of generic*

skills by focusing on evidence of the use of skills" (p. 20-21).

Feedback can be more broadly defined and perceived in varied circumstances. In the context of education, however, learning-orientated feedback contains several distinctive characteristics such as *'informative and supportive to encourage positivity towards learning; timely, allowing feedback to be used to inform other learning and work; frequent and specific enough to guide students learning and work'* (CurtinUniversity, 2012 , p. 1).

Similar to the previous position but more specific, Hattie and Timperley (2007) proposed three questions that should be included in learning-orientated feedback: *'Where am I going? (the goals) (Feed up), How am I going? (Feed back), Where to next (Feed Forward)'* (p. 86).

Teaching effectively is a process of not merely conveying knowledge and information to learners, but it is also a practice of offering feedback with a wider focus on ongoing learning rather than assessment and marking. To initiate a feedback process, three essential questions that both teachers and learners have to answer incorporate *'Where am I going? How am I going? and Where to next?'*(Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p. 90). Based on three questions, these authors categorised feedback according to four different levels including *'Feedback about the Task, Feedback about the Processing of the Task, Feedback about Self-Regulation, Feedback about the Self as a Person'*. (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p. 90).

In support with the perspectives of Hattie and Timperley, feedback in this study was intepreted and examined in regard to its focuses and possibility of generating reflective thinking of PreTs during post-lesson analyses. In order to yield effective feedback, the definition of reflection and its relationship with feedback should be taken into account by both feedback offers and receivers.

2.3 Reflection

Improving teaching practice is an ultimate goal of all of the dedicated and responsible teachers. To achieve that goal, teachers are in an urgent need of becoming reflective practitioners (Cowan, 2006; Ross et al., 1993; Schön, 1983).

Reflection has been extensively applicable in a number of professions, and thereby attracted substantial attention of scholars to capture a comprehensible and precise perception of its nature. As

defined by Dewey (1933), reflection incorporates *'active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends'* (p. 9).

In the educational setting, one of the most concise definitions of reflection was advocated by Marland (2007), *Reflection is the process of deliberately, systematically and rigorously examining one's teaching plans and actions to arrive at new ways of understanding oneself, students and classroom events and of building more effective models of practice for enhancing student learning* (p. 109).

On the basis of the focus of reflection, Van Manen (1977, cited in Marland, 2007) divided reflection into three particular levels including *technical reflection, practical reflection and critical reflection*. At the technical level, reflection *'focuses on the means that teachers use to achieve certain ends or goals and is concerned with the efficiency and effectiveness of those means'* (p. 111). Practical reflection emphases *'the goal (or ends) of the activity, the assumptions underlying the practices (or means) and the actual outcomes of the activity'* (p. 111). The final level is critical reflection with its focus on *'ethical and moral issues to do with (fairness, equity, attention to individual needs and respects for students)'* (p. 112).

Based on time when it occurs, Schon (1983, cited in Marland, 2007) differentiated and classified reflection into two types: reflection-in action and reflection-on action. *'Reflection-in-action is reflection that teachers engage in when actually involved in the action, for example, while they are teaching or planning'* (p. 114). On the other hand, *'reflection-on-action can occur at two times relative to action. The first is prior to a teacher's engaging in an activity... Reflection-on-action also refers to the thinking about the lesson that teachers engage in after the lesson'* (p. 113).

In this study, the levels of reflection of PreTs was narrowly examined in the post-lesson discussions on micro-teaching through their self-assessment and responses to the feedback of their teachers and peers. To assess and classify the level of reflection in each case, two aspects were focused. First is what PreTs often focus on looking back and thinking about their own teaching practice (the focus of reflection). Second is the explicitly stated ideas and descriptions of what theories and conclusions they can construct on the basis of consequences of their own practice and how they will make it improved

in the future (the depth of reflection). More particularly, we will apply the 'What' Model developed by Rolfe et al. (2001) into assessing the depth of reflective thinking of PreTs. The 'What' Model includes three different levels of reflection: descriptive level of reflection, theory and knowledge building and action orientated level of reflection. The first level of descriptive reflection indicates the individuals' descriptions of what happened during their practice. The second level is related to their ability of constructing theories and lessons from what they have experienced and implemented. When the practitioners propose actions for better results in the future practice, they can achieve the final level of action orientated reflection.

Being reflective is a highly essential capacity of teachers while as beginners of teaching practice, during micro-teaching, PreTs are often confronted with many of difficulties. A question posed here is whether feedback is needed to assist PreTs' in becoming reflective practitioners.

2.4 The relationship between feedback and reflection

There are several reasons why PreTs expect to be provided feedback for reflective practice. Firstly, as addressed above, feedback plays a significant role in professional development of teachers. '*Effective feedback can accelerate and facilitate learning*', and '*without feedback, learners may make inaccurate assumptions*'(Westberg & Jason, 2001). Secondly, as learners at the stage of preparation for their future teaching practice, PreTs encounter a wide range of challenges such as the lack of both professional knowledge and skills, appropriate self-esteem performance. Among these shortages and difficulties, the limited ability of feedback is also an obstacle to PreTs as they are not '*equipped to give themselves feedback*' (Westberg & Jason, 2001). It is, therefore, impossible for them to generate reflective considerations about their own practice without external supports, mostly from their teachers. Thirdly and more crucially, feedback was claimed to '*offer students an experiential base for reflection*', and proved as '*a vehicle for reflection*' by Quinton and Smallbone (2010). In short, both reflection and feedback are means of professional development, but it is in more favour of the inevitable reliance of PreTs on external sources of feedback in order to optimise their reflective teaching practice.

The table below presents levels of feedback classified by its focus. The third column predicts possi-

ble corresponding level(s) of reflection as a result of focused feedback shown in the second column. However, specification of the level of reflection

will be contextually analyzed and indicated in this research. Table 1 below will indicate the possible relationship between feedback and reflection.

Table 1: Levels of feedback and estimated corresponding level(s) of reflection

Levels of feedback	Focus of feedback	Possible level(s) of reflection
Level 1 *Feedback about the Task*	– 'a task or product, directions'. – 'to acquire more, different, or correct information'**(Surface learning)**	Technical level
Level 2 *Feedback about the Processing of the Task*	– 'the process used to create a product or complete a task'. – 'the processing of information, or learning processes requiring understanding or completing the task'**(Deep learning)**	Technical level Practical level Probably critical level
Level 3 *Feedback about Self-Regulation*	– 'skill in self-evaluation or confidence to engage further on a task'. – 'self-efficacy, self-regulatory proficiencies, and self-beliefs about students as learners…' that guide them to 'how to better and more effortlessly continue on the task'.	Technical level Practical level Probably critical level
Level 4 *Feedback about the Self as a Person*	'be unrelated to performance on the task'.	No reflection

Adapted from Hattie and Timperley (2007, p. 91 - 92), *The power of feedback* and Marland (2007), *Learning to Teach: a primer for pre-service teachers.*

Among these levels of reflection, practical and critical reflection are more likely challenging for PreTs in Vietnam to achieve. This is due to the fact that Asian learners, including Vietnamese student teachers come from the so-called culture of *'spoon-feeding or teacher centred style'* (Wong, 2004, p. 165) that often leads the learners to accept and practice under the teachers' provided knowledge, while both practical and critical reflection require a sense of deep learning and critical thinking of the practitioners. It is possible to predict that even though feedback can be most effective in use during the post-lesson discussions, Asian learning culture will continuously affect the focus and the depth of reflective thinking of PreTs.

3 THIS STUDY

3.1 Research questions

There are two questions as the focus of this research including

– What are levels of feedback generated by TEds and PreTs during micro-teaching?

– What does feedback facilitate PreTs' reflection during their micro-teaching?

3.2 Participants

Five TEds participating in this research were in service of training teacher. They come from five different departments (Chemistry, Physics, Primary, Vietnamese Literature and Linguistics and Biology Education) of a university of teacher education in the Mekong Delta. For the reasons of respects to the participants' privacy and professional accountabilities, they are coded as TEd A, B, C, D and E respectively. Two of them (TEd A & E) were senior lecturers with more than two decades of teaching experience, and the three others have gained three-year experience in minimum. All of these TEds obtained academic qualifications for teaching subject-specific knowledge, with Ph.D degree for TEd A & C and Master degree for the three others.

3.3 Results

3.3.1 The levels of feedback TEds and PreTs use during micro-teaching practices

At a univerity of teacher education located in the Mekong Delta, feedback is a central part of micro-teaching sessions of five subject-specific TEds from the department of Chemistry, Physics, Primary, Vietnamese Literature and Linguistics and Bi-

ology Education. In this research, data was collected by class observation and interviews. In general, four out of the five observed TEds followed a parallel three-step feedback procedure as listed below

Step 1: Self-feedback of the observed PreT.

Step 2: Peer feedback from other PreTs.

Step 3: Feedback from TEds.

In terms of the structure of micro-teaching classes, it is obvious that most of the TEds were aware of the necessity of exercising the impacts of both internal feedback (step 1) and external feedback (step 2 and step 3) on their guided PreTs. However, feedback might be different from each other on the basis of its focus at which feedback offers target, and from which feedback receivers can benefit. A record of feedback categorised according to its focus is reported in the following table.

Table 2: Summary of levels of feedback records

Focus of feedback	Author of feedback	Records of feedback	Level of feedback
Assessing the level of achievement.	TEd A	*'Some things I consider that you have done quite well include: lesson plan, the introduction of your lesson, asking questions, demonstrating the experiment in class'*	L1
	TEd B	*'Fail to identify lesson objectives'*	
	TEd C	*'You performed well for what I had taught you.*	
	TEd D	*'A well-prepared lesson plan, self-esteem performance, oral fluency, good classroom management skill', 'You also replace an example in the textbook with another good one'*	
	TEd E	*Your newly created introduction about the lesson was unfortunately less attracting than the introduction in the textbook', 'You misunderstood the function of one device and made your students misguided'*	
	Other PreTs (in TEd B's class)	*'Your teaching pace is unreasonably slower than expected', 'Time allocated to important parts of the lesson is inappropriate'.*	
	Other PreTs (in TEd C's class)	*'A fluent speaking and good blackboard handwriting skill'. 'Use various teaching methods'*	
	Other PreT (in TEd D's class)	*'The atmosphere of your class was quite boring with repeated classroom activities'*	
Suggestions related to teaching process and skills	TEd A	*'There are some things you should change such as designing more learning situations, more attention to questions for clarification, more practice of blackboard handwriting skill'.*	L2
	TEd B	*'Be more aware of the structure of the lesson', 'Include more questions relating to the central focus of the lesson', 'Diversify the way of starting your lesson'.*	
	TEd C	*'Remember to ask questions for the whole class, renumber the page of your lesson plan, rename the title of some sections'.*	
	TEd D	*'However, you should notice to ask students for reasons why they came to their answers'.*	
	TEd E	*'You should list all of the devices as well as their functions before starting the experiment'.*	
	Other PreT (in TEd B)	*'You as a teacher should pay more attention to the interconnection between different sections of the lesson',*	
	Other PreTs (in TEd D)	*'If I were you, I would not choose to merely transmit knowledge to my students'.*	

Focus of feedback	Author of feedback	Records of feedback	Level of feedback
		' *If I were you, I would request all groups to write their discussion results on the blackboard simultaneously so that it could be much more time-saving*'	
	Other PreT (in TEd E)	'*You should give more time for discussion to students*'	
Self-assessment of weaknesses	PreT guided by TEd B	'*My teaching practice, especially the way of asking questions was confusing. Also, I provided insufficient information about the lesson topic*'	L3
	PreT guided by TEd C	'*I added one more example in hope of reminding the students of not doing calculate in such a wrong way. Yet, it was really problematic for me not to clarify why they should not do that*'	
	PreT guided by TEd D	'*I think there were some weaknesses because my lesson is not interesting enough*'	
Personal emotions/ feelings.	PreT guided by TEd D	'*My strength was self-confidence*'	L4
	PreT guided by TEd E	'*I was embarrassed, and I feel that my students appeared indifferent to my lesson*'.	

The table indicated that feedback during discussion about micro-teaching arrived at different levels of focus. Among four levels of feedback, L2 feedback generated by peers of PreTs and TEds with focus on solutions to weaknesses in their teaching performance was the most popular, accounting for more than half of the total feedback recorded across five micro-teaching sessions. Both L1 feedback *(about the task)* and L3 feedback *(about self-regulation)* were likely equal in popularity. However, it is also noticeable that only when TEds offered an opportunity for PreTs to evaluate their own teaching practice, could L3 feedback arise. It is, therefore, understandable why there was no L3 feedback recorded in micro-teaching session of TEd A. Finally, the least common form was L4 feedback *(about the self as a person)* with merely two times on record. In conclusion, when participating in discussions shortly after micro-teaching, TEds, PreTs and their peers were generally highly conscious of focusing on teaching related issues rather than on personal concerns or unrelated teaching practice issues.

3.3.2 Feedback facilitating PreTs' reflection during their micro-teaching practices

In-depth analyses of feedback in the previous section concluded that feedback at various levels of focus was generated during the micro-teaching sessions guided by all five TEds. Feedback in relation to activating reflective thinking of PreTs in post-lesson analyses will be investigated in this section.

On the one hand, offering PreTs an opportunity for self-feedback positively stimulated them to reflect on what they had already put in practice. According to the data in Table 2, when assessing their own teaching performance, PreTs deliberately shared their concerns about weaknesses or something unsatisfactory with TEds and peers. They normally started to judge the effectiveness of questions, examples, a number and scale of appropriateness of tasks given to students. To some extent, under the light of reflection, they performed ability of self-detecting and pointing out failures in adopting teaching techniques and methods to achieve lesson aims prior to evaluations of others. All of the reflective thoughts were, however, restricted within the technical level. It is also noticeable that reflective statements of PreTs were merely descriptors of observable phenomena or surface problems facing them during teaching practice with almost no subsequent deeper inquires and supportive explanations. In particular, whenever they stood up to talk about their lessons, they were resemble together in the way of using several common models of descriptive adjective words or phrases such as '*confusing*', '*insufficient information*', '*unspecified information*', '*problematic*', '*not interesting enough*' (Records of Classroom Observation).

In addition, during discussions about micro-teaching, TEds were also noted to deliberately engage PreTs into reflective conversations by posing additional questions to encourage them to pursue critical thinking and deeper learning. The following

analyses will present two common approaches applied by TEds to organise reflective conversations.

Firstly, it was based on the initial reflective thoughts of PreTs in their oral self-feedback. In this situation, TEds demonstrated ability of capturing the central focus of PreTs' reflective thinking and then engaging them to get insights into their self – feedback. As a result, they further developed with deeper analytical considerations. An extracted conversation below is a good illustration for the first type of reflection-orientated questions.

PreT: '*My teaching practice, especially the way of asking questions was confusing. Also, I provided insufficient information about the lesson topic*'.

TEd: '*When your classmates acted as teachers, you were in charge of student. That position was interchangeable as soon as you played role of teacher. Now, let me know if you were student, is it easy to understand the lesson? Why?*'

PreT: '*Only section 1 and 2 seemed easy to acquire while section 3 was impossibly comprehensible*'.

TEd: '*Why? For example, how do you think of visual aids?*'

PreT: '*I had designed and collected many pictures, but failed to use them effectively. More importantly, I realised that it is inappropriate to teach that knowledge unit with only pictures. So, it is useful for me to keep in mind that pictures need to be used in combination with questions*'.

TEd: '*And now, I think that you know how to make it improved. I expect to see your revised lesson plan*'.

(*Observation minute of micro-teaching guided by TEd B*)

The final feedback of TEd B in the conversation above is serving as 'an open-ended question' to the feedback receiver for rethinking, adjusting and re-planning. However, TEd B was also a sole teacher among five ones to apply such a feedback-for- reflection strategy in this research.

Secondly, in response to PreTs' self-feedback containing very limited and poorly valuable reflection information, TEds diverged him to focus on other issues much more directly related to his teaching effectiveness through reflective questions. In this case, TEds took a key role in facilitating pre-service teacher to arrive at effective reflection, otherwise discussion about micro-teaching would be-come nonsense and time-wasting. As a good example for that, the following conversation reveals how it occurred in reality.

PreT: '*...I designed many topics for students to discuss on, but I did not provide them with discussion boards to write on*'.

TEd: '*Really? Have you ever thought that you had offered abundant assignments to them?*'

PreT: '*Well, I understood. It would have been much better if I had organised fewer discussions by selecting topics more carefully*'.

(*Observation minute of micro-teaching guided by TEd D*)

Data analyses indicated that reflective conversations based on inquiry and cognitive questions of TEds occurred in extremely low frequency throughout five observed micro-teaching sessions. There were merely four reflective conversations equally distributed to micro-teaching sessions of TEd B, C, D and E. Overall, the focus of these reflective conversations were merely on improving effectiveness of teaching technique and methods, thereby limited at technical level. This finding also strongly supports with the focused objectives of micro-teaching addressed in the interview of five TEds. All of them particularly emphasised the primary purpose of fostering teaching skills for PreTs including '*designing a lesson plan, modelling an experiment and using teaching aids (projector, pictures and diagrams)*' (Minute of interview of five TEds). Such a teaching position of TEds predominated over the whole process of micro-teaching in general and feedback giving as well as reflection guidance in particular.

4 DISCUSSION

This study established a significant correlation between feedback and reflection. Feedback was proven to be consciously utilised as a means of supporting reflective practice. That is in the same line with the previous study by Quinton and Smallbone (2010) stating that feedback works as '*a vehicle for reflection*' (p. 125). Likely, many other authors (Benammar, 2004; Dewey, 1933; Leijen *et al*., 2014; Leijen *et al*., 2012; Procee, 2006) also advocated that interaction is an ideal condition for reflection. Moreover, in this research, the focus of reflection was wholly consistent with that of feedback recorded during post-lesson discussions. Corresponding with a vast majority of feedback records aimed at effectiveness of teaching methods

and teaching aids, a large proportion of reflective thinking also focused on technical level. Unsurprisingly, such an overall pattern of feedback and reflection universally represented a top priority of both PreTs and TEds during post-lesson discussions. As claimed by Marland (2007),

.. in your early teaching experiences, your main concern might be the development of your teaching skills such as questioning, motivating, explaining or reacting to student answers. At this time, the effectiveness and efficiency of your use of these skills may be the focus of your concerns, so technical reflection would be more urgent concern than other levels of reflection (p. 113).

According to the classification of Marland (2007) based on a combination of both level of reflection and time when it arises, all of the reflective thinking generated by PreTs in this study was equivalent to ROA-T (reflection-on-action at the technical level).

The findings also indicated that even when PreTs reached the technical level of reflection, the depth of their reflective focuses were generally restricted within descriptive level of reflection. Most of the articulating reflection records of the observed PreTs were frequently a recall of problems facing them, teaching methods and consequences of these methods. Such a reflection trend was equivalent to the descriptive level in the 'What' Model of reflection formulated by Rolfe et al. (2001). The 'What' Model classifies reflection into three levels from descriptive to theory and knowledge building and finally action orientated level of reflection. At the first level of description, 'What' questions are comprised of *'...the problem/ reason for being stuck etc.?...my role in the situation...action did I take? ...were the consequences for me? For the students?'* (p. 10). Additionally, despite feedback-based reflection PreTs received from their TEds during post-lesson analyses, they were almost unable to enter the next two levels of reflection: theory and knowledge building as well as action orientated level. A major reason for that phenomenon is both of TEds and PreTs had dealt with tremendous time-related pressure. As noted by *'For pre-service teachers, teaching practice sessions are stressful and busy periods. Finding time to reflect on a regular and systematic basis, in what is a very busy schedule, is not easy'* (p. 115). Consequently, TEds in general were more likely to favourably use a direct approach when giving feedback with focus on correction and suggestions for improvements.

The research also contains several limitations due to both external and internal factors. At the present time, most of the TEds were relied on oral feedback as a means of activating reflective thinking of their student teachers. Inevitably, the evidence for PreTs' reflective thinking presented and analysed in this study was heavily based on tracing observable and audible sources of oral language used during post-lesson discussions. What happened inside PreTs after receiving direct feedback even when they made no response to their teachers' evaluation is still a black hole of knowledge for further exploration.

5 CONCLUSION

Findings from this research could contribute to reinforcing our hypothesis about the correlation between feedback and reflection. To succeed in teaching practice requires teachers to be a life-long learner, and learning to be a reflective practitioner is an indispensable experience to achieve that target (Marland, 2007). In terms of micro-teaching, feedback, mostly from TEds plays a crucial role in achieving the ultimate goal of supporting PreTs in becoming reflective-minded teachers in the future. The focus of feedback should be taken more into consideration since it strongly correlates with the level or quality of reflection. Both feedback and reflection should be collaboratively used as an effective teaching strategy to drive PreTs on the course of deep learning rather than surface learning. Obviously, in the setting of the SOE, CTU in particular and Vietnam in general, it requires TEds to apply more diversified strategies of developing feedback and reflection capacity for PreTs. The research findings suggest that the effects of developing feedback skills on reflective capacity and teaching effectiveness of both PreTs and TEds during micro-teaching should be further explored in other Vietnamese contexts.

REFERENCES

Belt, W., 1967. Micro-teaching - Observed and critiqued by a goup of trainees. American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York.

Benammar, K., 2004. Conscious action through conscious thinking - Reflection tools in experiential learning. Public seminar. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Brown, S., 2007. Feedback & feed-forward. Bulletin 02.

Cowan, J., 2006. On becoming an innovative university teacher: Reflection in action. McGraw-Hill Education. UK, 173 pages.

Curtin University, 2012. Assessment and student progression manual: Principles & requirements.

Dewey, J., 1933. How we think: A restatement of the relation of thinking to the educative process. D C Heath & Co, 301 pages.

Gibbs, G., Claire, S., 2004/5. Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. Learning and Teaching in Higher Education 1 (1): 3-31.

Hattie, J., Helen, T., 2007. The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research 77 (1): 81-112.

Leijen, Ä., Allas, R., Toom, A., Husu, J., Marcos, J. M., Meijer, P., Knezic, D., Pedaste, M., Krull, E., 2014. Guided reflection for supporting the development of student teachers' practical knowledge. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences 112:314-322.

Leijen, Ä., Valtna, K., Leijen, D.A., Pedaste, M., 2012. How to determine the quality of students' reflections?. Studies in Higher Education 37 (2): 203-217.

Marland, P., 2007. Learning to Teach: a primer for pre-service teachers. Frenchs Forest, N.S.W. : Pearson Education. Australia, 344 pages.

Nicol, D. (2007). Principles of good assessment and feedback: Theory and practice. From the REAP International Online Conference on Assessment Design for Learner Responsibility, 29th-31st May, 2007. Recuperado el, 15.

Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., O'Donovan, B., 2010. Feedback: all that effort, but what is the effect?. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 35 (3): 277-289.

Procee, H., 2006. Reflection in education: A Kantian epistemology. Educational Theory 56 (3): 237-253.

Quinton, S., Smallbone, T., 2010. Feeding forward: using feedback to promote student reflection and learning – a teaching model. Innovations in Education and Teaching International 47 (1): 125-135.

Rolfe, G., Freshwater, D., Jasper, M., 2001. Critical reflection for nursing and the helping professions: A user's guide. Palgrave Basingstoke, 194 pages.

Ross, D. D., Bondy, E., Kyle, D. W., 1993. Reflective teaching for student empowerment: Elementary curriculum and methods. Macmillan, 376 pages.

Schön, D. A., 1983. The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Vol. 5126. Basic books, 374 pages.

Westberg, J., Jason, H., 2001. Fostering Reflection and Providing Feedback. Springer Publishing Company, 110 pages.

Wong, J. K., 2004. Are the learning styles of Asian international students culturally or contextually based?. International Education Journal 4 (4): 154-166.