STRUCTURED PEER FEEDBACK FOR DEVELOPING THE SOCIAL COMPETENCE OF FUTURE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE TEACHERS

M.M. Ergashov
Independent Researcher
Chirchik State Pedagogical University
Chirchik, Uzbekistan
E-mail: mamur-194@yandex.ru
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24186758

Abstract. *The paper proposes a structured peer feedback procedure for developing the social competence of future Russian language teachers. It connects shared criteria, evidence from microteaching, dialogue and a subsequent teaching attempt. Practical examples show how students can justify comments, seek clarification and use suggestions responsibly. Observable indicators are offered for reviewing the quality of participation and feedback uptake.*
Keywords: *peer feedback, social competence, Russian language teachers, microteaching, shared criteria, feedback uptake.*

Future Russian language teachers need opportunities to discuss teaching with colleagues before they assume responsibility for a school class. Knowing a grammatical rule does not automatically prepare a student to explain a concern tactfully, listen to an alternative interpretation or respond to criticism. Peer feedback can provide practice in these professional relationships. Its contribution depends, however, on how the exchange is organised. General praise may preserve a friendly atmosphere while offering little guidance; an unsupported judgement may discourage participation. A useful procedure therefore needs shared criteria, evidence and an opportunity to act on suggestions.

This paper proposes a structured peer feedback procedure for teacher education seminars. Its purpose is to connect the development of social competence with the everyday work of observing, discussing and revising a short Russian language lesson. The approach draws on a conceptual comparison of five publications and the design of illustrative microteaching tasks. It is a methodological proposal, not a report of an intervention. Social competence is understood here as the capacity to coordinate professional action with others through respectful communication, reasoned judgement and responsibility for shared work.

Korenev distinguishes feedback directed towards learning from comments about the educational process and describes several dimensions of feedback, including its source, timing and focus. His account also emphasises specificity, constructive guidance and dialogue [3, pp. 118–125]. For the present proposal, this means that students should discuss an observable teaching action in relation to a shared purpose. A comment such as “Your explanation was weak” does not identify what needs attention. A more useful contribution describes the explanation, identifies its effect on the task and offers a possible adjustment.

Carless and Boud conceptualise feedback literacy through four connected features: recognising the value of feedback, making judgements, managing emotional responses and taking action. They discuss peer feedback and the analysis of examples as ways to support these capacities [4]. This framework helps explain why receiving comments alone is insufficient. Students need to understand the grounds of a suggestion and decide how to use it. In teacher preparation, these decisions also involve a social responsibility: reviewers should support improvement without claiming unquestionable authority over a colleague’s work.

Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick connect formative assessment with learner self-regulation and argue for opportunities to interpret feedback through dialogue [5]. Their approach supports a procedure in which the recipient can ask questions rather than simply accept an assessment. The specific application proposed here places that dialogue between two teaching attempts. Feedback uptake becomes visible

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

when the student revises a classroom instruction, adapts a question or explains why a suggested change would not serve the lesson objective. Agreement with every comment is not treated as evidence of social competence.

The procedure begins with a brief discussion of shared criteria. Before microteaching, the group examines two sample comments and decides which provides stronger evidence. Three criteria are then agreed: clarity of the learning task, opportunities for pupil participation and the way understanding is checked. These criteria refer to teaching actions rather than personality. Students also practise distinguishing observation from interpretation. “Two pupils began a different task” records an event; “the teacher was careless” attributes a personal quality that the observation does not establish.

During microteaching, one student teaches a short segment while colleagues take the roles of pupils and observers. An observer records a small number of relevant details, including the wording of an instruction and the response it produced. The reviewer then develops one comment through three connected moves: identifying an observed action, explaining its relevance to a criterion and suggesting a feasible next step. This structure is offered as a practical scaffold. Students may vary its wording, provided their peer feedback remains understandable, grounded and open to discussion.

Consider a lesson segment on Russian verbs of motion. The student teacher asks the class to complete a dialogue but does not explain whether pupils should write individually or speak in pairs. Some begin writing while others wait. A reviewer might comment: “You asked us to complete the dialogue, but the working arrangement was unclear. Two of us started writing. Before distributing the task, you could specify pair work and demonstrate the first exchange.” The recipient can clarify the intended objective and decide whether that demonstration would help. The example concerns professional cooperation around lesson design rather than the correction of a colleague’s character.

The next step is a short response from the recipient. A useful response restates the suggestion, asks about unclear evidence and identifies one change to try. Sentence openings such as “Which part of the instruction caused uncertainty?” or “I will keep the task but clarify the working arrangement” can support this exchange. Gureeva and Khitrova identify analysing communicative behaviour, anticipating methodological consequences and reviewing results as relevant abilities in language teacher preparation [2]. These abilities help connect peer feedback with an informed teaching decision instead of automatic compliance.

A second microteaching attempt should follow while the comment is still relevant. The student changes one aspect of the lesson and observers record whether the intended difference is visible. A short written note links the initial observation, the chosen adjustment and the subsequent response. Averkieva and Shchekina argue that a teaching practice diary needs a purposeful structure and tasks to fulfil its reflective role [1, pp. 144–145]. Applied here, that principle supports a concise record of feedback uptake rather than a list of compliments or an unexamined account of the lesson.

The teacher educator has an active role throughout the process. Before independent exchanges, the educator models a comment and explains its relation to shared criteria. During discussion, the educator checks subject accuracy and challenges conclusions that exceed the evidence. Reviewer roles should rotate so that confident speakers do not monopolise judgement. Private written comments can precede discussion when students need time to formulate their views. These arrangements give future Russian language teachers practice in listening, explaining decisions and sharing responsibility for the quality of peer feedback.

The procedure can be reviewed through observable indicators: whether a comment uses evidence, relates to shared criteria, invites clarification and leads to an explained decision. The recipient’s willingness to accept criticism should not be inferred from silence or immediate agreement. Likewise, a revised lesson does not by itself demonstrate broad social competence. The relevant evidence concerns the interaction and the reasoned use of comments across repeated tasks. These indicators guide formative discussion; they are not presented as a validated measurement scale.

Structured peer feedback offers a practical setting in which future Russian language teachers can practise professional cooperation while improving lesson decisions. Its educational value rests on a

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

complete sequence: shared criteria, observation, discussion and a further teaching attempt. Social competence is exercised in how students justify judgements, consider another person's reasoning and take responsibility for feedback uptake. Embedding this sequence in microteaching provides a manageable link between university seminars and collaborative work during teaching practice.

REFERENCES

1. Аверкиева Г.В., Щекина С.С. Педагогическая практика как рефлексивная среда формирования профессионального опыта будущего учителя // Вестник Северного (Арктического) федерального университета. Серия «Гуманитарные и социальные науки». 2014. № 4. С. 141–149. URL: https://vestnikgum.ru/archive/?ELEMENT_ID=178743.
2. Гуреева А.В., Хитрова И.В. Методическая рефлексия в профессиональной подготовке будущих учителей иностранного языка // Преподаватель XXI век. 2024. № 3, ч. 1. С. 39–49. DOI: 10.31862/2073-9613-2024-3-39-49.
3. Коренев А.А. Обратная связь в обучении и педагогическом общении // Rhema. Рема. 2018. № 2. С. 112–127. URL: https://rhema-journal.com/Rema-2-2018.pdf.
4. Carless D., Boud D. The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback // Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. 2018. Vol. 43, No. 8. P. 1315–1325. DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354. URL: https://hub.hku.hk/handle/10722/261886.
5. Nicol D.J., Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice // Studies in Higher Education. 2006. Vol. 31, No. 2. P. 199–218. DOI: 10.1080/03075070600572090. URL: https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/3235/.

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.