

교수·학습 지도안 구안 활동 중 수행한 동료 피드백에 대한 예비음악교사들의 인식

Pre-service Music Teachers' Perceptions of Peer Feedback Practices in Designing a Lesson Plan

배 수 영*
Su-Young Bae

초록 본 연구는 음악과 교수·학습 지도안 구안 활동 중 수행한 동료 피드백에 대한 예비 음악교사들의 인식을 살펴보는 것이다. 이를 위해 23명의 음악교육전공 교육대학원생을 대상으로 동료 피드백 활동을 진행한 후 이에 대해 설문조사를 하였다. 연구결과 학생들은 동료 피드백 활동에 매우 긍정적인 반응을 보였으며, 동료 피드백 활동이 학습목표 설정, 학습 내용 선정, 활동시간 배분, 교수·학습 방법 선정에 도움이 되었다고 보고하였다. 하지만, 학생들은 자신들의 피드백에 대한 확신이 부족했으며, 동료의 오류를 지적하거나 다소 많은 의견을 제시했을 때 그들의 교우 관계가 불편해질 것에 대해 걱정하였다.

주제어: 음악교육, 동료 피드백, 교수·학습 지도안, 예비교사교육, 교사교육

Abstract The purpose of this study was to examine pre-service music teachers' perceptions of peer feedback practices conducted in designing a lesson plan. A total of 23 students who enrolled in the 'Teaching Materials and Strategies in Music Education' course participated in the study. Through questionnaires, pre-service music teachers' perceptions of peer feedback practices were analyzed. The results of the study were as follows: the students were strongly positive about peer feedback practices and reported peer feedback practices were particularly helpful in identifying educational experiences and determining objectives. However, the students were not much confident in giving feedback and worried that peer feedback practices might threaten their relationships with peers when pointing out the errors or making too many comments.

Key words: music education, peer feedback, lesson plan, pre-service teacher education, teacher education

* Corresponding author, E-mail: sb2388@dau.ac.kr
© 2019 Korean Music Education Society.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.30775/KMES.49.1.125>

I . Introduction

The importance of designing a lesson plan for quality teaching cannot be overemphasized. Given that much research has been done on developing a lesson plan, the ability to design a lesson plan is essential for the improvement of instruction, which may be the reason why this ability is tested in the teacher certification examination.

Effective teaching requires four components of knowing, planning, doing, and reflecting(Johnson, 2000). Knowledge is necessary so that teachers can make thoughtful decisions about learning experiences; planning allows teachers to link knowing and doing; doing has to do with the pedagogical skills and strategies teachers use to implement the lesson plan; reflection allows teachers to make changes in all the other parts, thus enhancing teacher effectiveness(Watts & Johnson, 1995). Although all four components are significant in creating effective teaching, lesson planning is considered an essential, high-priority skill for first-year music teachers, in the opinion of experienced teachers, first-year teachers, and university professors(Soderblom, 1982). 98% of the professors instructing music education methods course identified “developing lesson-planning skills” as a primary purpose for their course, and 94% always or almost always covered “developing lesson plans” in their methods courses(Gauthier & McCrary, 1999). However, pre-service teachers in methods classes tend to discount lesson planning as a chore, necessary for the method class and maybe for student teachers, but not part of the practice of real world teachers(Harwood & Wiggins, 2001, p. 35).

Formative evaluation applying to the assessment of student work that is still under development has been discussed as a strategy with great chance to enhance student learning and increase learner motivation(Black & William, 1998; Fallows & Chandramohan, 2001; Sadler, 1989; Wolf, Bixby, Glenn, & Gardner, 1991). Formative evaluation applied in the process of developing a lesson plan is also found to be effective for pre-service teachers to design a lesson plan(Ozogul, Olina, & Howard Sullivan, 2008). And, peer feedback practice has gained much attention in recent years and viewed as having significant pedagogical value as a tool for

formative evaluation(Li, Liu, & Steckelberg, 2010).

Peer feedback practice is a process in which students evaluate the outcomes or achievement of peers(Topping, Smith, Swanson & Elliot, 2000). This approach aims to authorize students and foster active learning. In most peer feedback practices, “students act as both assessors and assessees(Li, Liu, & Steckelberg, 2010).” As assessors, they check peers' work and provide valuable feedback. As assessees, students get feedback and may get improved accordingly. Participating in peer feedback practice creates opportunities for students' interaction while clarifying objectivity in the process. If students are placed in a situation where they should assess outcomes, then they can define their understanding of what is required of them(Patri, 2002).

Although various aspects of peer feedback practices and the effects of peer feedback have been studied, there is still a lack of research on peer feedback practices in designing a lesson plan and on the perceptions of pre-service music teachers about peer feedback practices. Therefore, this study aims to find out how pre-service music teachers enrolled in the ‘Teaching Materials and Strategies in Music Education’ course perceive the practice of giving and receiving peer feedback in designing a lesson plan.

II. Literature Review

The term peer feedback is used in similar terms as peer response, peer assessment, peer editing, peer critique, peer review, and so on. Many studies prove the benefits of peer feedback on student learning. For instance, Pope(2001) conducted a study to find out peer assessment as a tool to facilitate learning with forty master's students at a university located in Australia. The results showed peer assessment had an effect on the improvement of writing and reporting skills, especially in the area of “spelling and grammar, referencing and logic(p. 242).” Venables and Summit's(2003) study with computer science students also showed the positive with initial reservations of peer review and students valued the process with improved knowledge of subject matter. In the study of Stefani(1994), students

pointed out that peer assessment had them think more. A majority of students (85%) were positive about peer assessment regarding learning, compared this approach to the traditional assessments. After analyzing 109 papers made on peer assessment, Topping(1998) concluded that peer assessment has cognitive benefits for assessors as well as assessees in many ways: attention on important elements of quality work, increased time on task, constructive reflection, and better sense of responsibility and accountability, and so on.

These findings were also supported by other studies. Brindley and Scoffield(1998) reported that undergraduate business students who used peer assessment on instructional modules noted that it increased their motivation and their understanding of the instructional content. Li and Steckelberg(2005) examined the impact of an anonymous technology-based peer assessment on the quality of students' projects. 47 teacher education students learned and developed WebQuest projects. After, they were assigned randomly into two groups(a control group and an experimental group). Students in the experimental group evaluated each other's works in a web-based peer assessment system and revised their own works based on peer feedback. On the other hand, the control group conducted WebQuest-related activities, for example, reviewing the rubric that they had studied and discussed or reading WebQuest examples or articles related to this topic. Both groups spent the same amount of time on the task. Works from these two groups were gathered and blindly assessed by an independent grader. Data analysis showed that the experimental group outperformed the control group.

Although general learning improvements have been frequently reported, less has been made on the role of being assessors or assessed. Some research on the perspectives of giving feedback such as Davies(2000) suggested that students receive significant benefits from giving peer feedback as most students reported that they had a deeper level of understanding about the learning content. In the study of Li and Steckelberg(2006), students reported that it was helpful to "look at what others are doing" and some students felt that "they were inspired by their peers' work(p. 268)." Furthermore, Smith, Cooper, and Lancaster(2002) reported that peer assessment increased university undergraduate students' awareness of the assessment process and students used the scoring criteria more for their own work.

When student attitudes toward teacher, self, and peer evaluation are compared, students tend to prefer teacher evaluation over the other two. Zhang(1995) conducted a study with college students to find out their preferences among teacher, self, and peer evaluations. He found out most students preferred teacher evaluation over the other two, and when comparing the other two, peer-evaluation over self-evaluation. Similar results were reported in the study of Olina and Sullivan(2004). The main difference between teacher and peer feedback in a formative-evaluation process is that peers are not experts in the field, as opposed to teachers. Consequently, the peer assessors are generally not considered as a 'knowledge authority' by students, leading to more hesitation in accepting a peer's judgment or advice(Hanrahan & Isaacs, 2001; Strijbos, Narciss, & Du`nnebie, 2010). Ozogul, Olina, and Sullivan(2008) examined the effects of teacher, self, and peer evaluation on pre-service teachers' performance, knowledge, and attitudes related to writing lesson plans that incorporate technology. All three treatment groups significantly improved their lesson plans from initial version to final version, though the teacher-evaluation group improved significantly greater and wrote significantly better final lesson plans than the other two groups.

However, the opposite results were reported in the study by Yang, Badger, and Yu(2006). They found revision commenced by peer feedback was more successful than revision commenced by teacher feedback, which might be due that peer feedback induced uncertainty. Students tend to believe that in the teacher feedback, the teacher had addressed all errors, and no further corrections were needed, which may cause lowering students' self-corrections. In contrast, students' doubts about peer feedback led them to seek confirmation by asking the teacher, checking instruction manuals, and performing more self-corrections, which comes students acquired a deeper understanding of the subject.

In addition, peer feedback may also increase the frequency, extent, and speed of feedback for students while keeping workload for teachers under control, since involving students in the assessment process increases the number of assessors and feedback opportunities. Although the accuracy might be lower compared to teacher feedback, this can be considered an appropriate compromise to improve students' progress(Gibbs & Simpson, 2004).

III. Method

1. Participants

The participants were 23 graduate music education majors enrolled in the ‘Teaching Materials and Strategies in Music Education’ course at a university located in Busan, Korea. This course is taken during the second semester of study and required for all students. Their average age was 27. About 87% of the participants were female and 13% were male, and they represented various educational backgrounds.

2. Procedures

This study examined students' perceptions of peer feedback practices in designing a lesson plan in the ‘Teaching Materials and Strategies in Music Education’ course. The research questions guided this study were how participant students would perceive peer feedback practices and what are the positive and negative outcomes. ‘Teaching Materials and Strategies in Music Education’ course includes four activities: analyzing middle and high school music textbooks, developing an annual music curriculum for middle school students, studying teaching and learning strategies, and lesson planning and lesson demonstration. During the first half of the semester, students completed the first three activities. After, students conducted two successive experiences of designing lesson plans and performing lesson demonstrations, of which the second included peer feedback practices.

In the process of developing the first lesson plan, students were provided with the information and practice on the parts of a lesson plan, and several examples of lesson plans were viewed. Then, students formed small groups of three or four, and together they worked on one lesson plan weekly by adding parts of the lesson plan covered in the class for three weeks. While the students worked in small group settings, the instructor interacted with the students and gave some feedback. After completing the lesson plan, one student from each group conducted the lesson

demonstration.

As with the first experience, in the second experience, students developed lesson plans in small groups; however, at this time, each of group members developed his or her own lesson plan for two weeks. On the third week of the second experience, lesson plans were exchanged between groups, and peer feedbacks on lesson plans were made in small groups. Before the peer feedback practices, the purpose of and structure for the peer feedback process were explained, and guidelines for feedback were provided as well. After completion of peer feedback practices, a survey was distributed in order to find out participant students' perceptions and attitudes about peer feedback practices. All the participating students completed the survey, which took about one hour.

3. Research Data

The questionnaire used in the survey was revised and reorganized based on the questionnaire used in Kim, Lee, and Jang(2019) to meet the goals of this study. The contents of the questionnaire are as in <Table 1>.

<Table 1> Student survey

Type	Item	Survey content
Closed	1	Preference for receiving peer feedback
	2	Preference for giving peer feedback
	3	Whether giving feedback practice improves developing lesson plan skills
	3-1	Elements of lesson plan that felt improved
	4	Whether receiving feedback practice improves developing lesson plan skills
	4-1	Elements of lesson plan that felt improved
	5	The most difficult thing in developing a lesson plan
Open	6	Whether peer feedback practice improves the difficulty
	7	Important elements in developing a lesson plan considered when giving feedback to peers
	8	What was good about giving peer feedback
	9	What was difficult about giving peer feedback

Type	Item	Survey content
	10	What was good about receiving peer feedback
	11	What was difficult about receiving peer feedback
Closed	12	Whether reflect the feedback received on developing a lesson plan
	13	Perception about giving feedback before the course
	14	Perception about giving feedback during the course
	15	Perception about giving feedback after the course
	16	Perception about receiving feedback before the course
	17	Perception about receiving feedback during the course
	18	Perception about receiving feedback after the course
	19	Preference of peer feedback to instructor feedback
	20	Whether peer feedback practice improves developing lesson plan skills
	21	Whether confidence increased in giving peer feedback and developing a lesson plan
	22	Whether confidence increased in receiving peer feedback and developing a lesson plan
	23	Whether peer interaction increased confidence
	24	Whether peer interaction increased the motivation of developing a lesson plan
	25	Whether peer interaction improved new ideas in developing a lesson plan
	26	Willingness to participate in future peer feedback
	27	Willingness to participate in future peer feedback practice
	28	Contents of feedback received from peers
Open	29	Advantages and disadvantages of peer feedback compared to instructor feedback
	30	Suggestions for peer feedback practice

A total of 30 questions were made comprised of open and closed questions. Most of the closed questions used a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'not at all' to 'to a high extent'. Some closed questions, on the other hand, were designed to identify the most helpful part of a given view and to rank them in order of importance(eg, 1st, 2nd, 3rd). As shown in <Table 1>, the questionnaire was to ask whether giving and receiving peer feedback was a positive experience, how helpful it was and how

difficult it was, and comments on how to improve peer feedback practice.

4. Data Analysis

The results of the survey were analyzed as follows. First, data from the questions using the Likert scale and the rank scale was analyzed by descriptive statistics, examining students' perceptions of peer feedback practices. Next, the selective questions using the nominal scale were analyzed by frequency statistics. Lastly, open questions were qualitatively analyzed by positive and negative responses.

IV. Results

1. Students' Perceptions of Peer Feedback Practices

After completing peer feedback practices, students' perceptions of peer feedback practices were examined. First, as shown in <Table 2>, the average value of the subjects' preferences for receiving peer feedback was 4.43 and giving peer feedback was 4.04, which indicates that the students were highly positive about peer feedback practices conducted during this study.

<Table 2> Preference of peer feedback

Question		Mean	SD
Q. 1	Did you like receiving feedback from your peers?	4.43	.59
Q. 2	Did you like giving feedback to your peers?	4.04	.98

Next, the questionnaire examined the effect of peer feedback practices on the improvement of their ability to design a lesson plan. As shown in <Table 3>, the average value of the effect of giving peer feedback on improving their ability to design a lesson plan was 4.36 and the average value of the effect of receiving peer feedback on improving their ability to design a lesson plan was 4.22. The students

recognized that peer feedback practices both in giving and receiving had a positive effect on their ability to design a lesson plan.

<Table 3> Influence of peer feedback practices on designing a lesson plan(multiple responses)

	Question	Mean	SD
Q. 3	Did giving feedback to your peers help to improve your designing a lesson plan?	4.36	.66
Q. 4	Did receiving feedback from your peers help to improve your designing a lesson plan?	4.22	.85

Analyzing the answers to the open questions related to question 3 and question 4, shows that the students were able to identify shortcomings in their own lesson plan by evaluating their peers', clearly see the elements needed in designing a lesson plan in order to provide detailed feedback, and enrich their knowledge of designing a lesson plan by looking at others. In addition, in the process of analyzing their peers' lesson plans, there were some cases in which they were unsure about what kind of feedback they should give, especially when insufficiently written. However, this was the moment when students studied for themselves by searching and confirming the relevant contents.

<Table 4> shows the results of students' responses to improved elements of their lesson plan through peer feedback practices. Identifying educational experiences was the highest in both giving(n=19, 44.2%) and receiving(n=19, 46.3%), and determining objectives was the next in both giving(n=10, 23.3%) and receiving(n=9, 22.0%). Teaching strategies and time allocation were also considered as improved elements of their lesson plan. On the other hand, teaching materials, evaluation, organizing experiences were the lowest both in giving and receiving. Taken together, though there is a slight difference, the students perceived that peer feedback practices were particularly helpful in identifying educational experiences and determining objectives but not much helpful in developing teaching materials, planning evaluations, and organizing experiences.

<Table 4> Improved elements of teaching plan through peer feedback practices (multiple responses)

Elements	Motivational activity	Determining objectives	Educational experiences	Organizing experiences
Question	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)
Q. 3-1 Giving feedback	2(4.7)	10(23.3)	19(44.2)	1(2.3)
Q. 4-1 Receiving feedback	3(7.3)	9(22.0)	19(46.3)	2(4.9)
Elements	Teaching strategies	Teaching materials	Evaluation planning	Time allocation
Question	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)
Q. 3-1 Giving feedback	5(11.6)	0(0.0)	1(2.3)	5(11.6)
Q. 4-1 Receiving feedback	3(7.3)	1(2.4)	1(2.4)	3(7.3)

The main contents of the feedback received from peers were as shown in <Table 5>. Most students received peer feedback on designing educational experiences related to teaching objectives(18 out of 23 students) and determining objectives(17 out of 23 students). Time allocation and teaching strategies were also the main contents of the feedback received from peers.

<Table 5> Main contents of the feedback received from peers(multiple responses)

Elements	Educational experiences	Determining objectives	Time allocation	Teaching strategies
Question	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)
Q. 28	18(35.3)	17(33.3)	10(19.6)	6(11.8)

<Table 6> shows the results of students' ranks for the important elements considered when giving feedback to peers. Educational experiences ranked the first with the average rank value of 1.62. Determining objectives ranked the second with the average rank value of 2.86. Teaching strategies ranked the third with the average rank value of 3.04. And, Time allocation ranked the fourth with the

average rank value of 3.52. These results are consistent with the results in the <Table 4>.

<Table 6> Important elements considered when giving feedback to peers

Q. 7	Educational experiences	Determining objectives	Teaching strategies	Time allocation
Mean rank	1.62	2.86	3.04	3.52
SD	1.06	1.63	1.74	1.85

The result of students' ratings of the effect of peer feedback practices on the improvement of their skills in designing a lesson plan was as seen in <Table 7>. The average value of the effect of peer feedback practices on the improvement of their skills was 4.14, which indicates that the students strongly felt their ability to designing a lesson plan improved through peer feedback practices.

<Table 7> Effect of peer feedback practices on designing teaching plan

	Question	Mean	SD
Q. 20	Did peer feedback practices improve your skills in designing a lesson plan?	4.14	.71

<Table 8> shows the result of students' rating of the improvements of difficult parts in designing a lesson plan through peer feedback practices. The average value of the improvements of difficult parts was 4.22, which indicates that the students strongly felt that the difficult parts in designing a lesson plan improved through peer feedback practices.

<Table 8> Improvement of difficult parts of designing a lesson plan

	Question	Mean	SD
Q. 6	Have difficult parts of designing a lesson plan been improved through peer feedback practices?	4.22	.60

The result of the students' preference for peer feedback to instructor feedback was as shown in <Table 9>. Most students answered 'neutral'(n=10, 43.5%) on the

preference for peer feedback to instructor feedback, but 26.1% of the students answered they prefer peer feedback over instructor feedback, which denotes there are positive aspects in peer feedback practices in developing a lesson plan.

<Table 9> Preference for peer feedback to instructor feedback

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)
Q. 29	1(4.3)	6(26.1)	10(43.5)	6(26.1)	0(0.0)

The results so far indicate that participant students were positive in giving and receiving peer feedback, and also recognized the peer feedback practices helped them to improve their abilities to design a lesson plan. Especially, students perceived that there was an improvement in identifying educational experiences and determining objectives as well as developing teaching strategies and time allocation. These findings are consistent with the findings of Li, Liu, and Steckelberg(2009) in that peer feedback practices may facilitate student learning.

2. Answers to Open Questions

Through analyzing the answers to open questions, the positive and negative aspects of peer feedback practices that students perceived were identified. Here are the findings: First, in receiving peer feedback, finding out what they had not thought of or missed in their designing a lesson plan was the most positive aspect that students felt, which in consequence increased the completeness of their lesson plan. Getting a new idea was another positive aspect that students mentioned in receiving peer feedback. Also, receiving good comments from peers increased their competence in designing a lesson plan. On the other hand, the negative aspects of receiving peer feedback were that it was rather difficult to trust peer feedback since they were not experts in the field and to accept peer feedback made from a completely different perspective due to a misunderstanding of their intentions. Some students felt limits in peer feedback and would like to have more specific comments

and alternatives as to be professional help. Another negative aspect of receiving peer feedback was that it was not helpful to receive feedback from peers who had less proficiency. Furthermore, it was heartbreaking and shameful to receive bad comments from the peers.

Second, in giving peer feedback, identifying lacks in their own lesson plan by evaluating someone else's was the most positive aspect that students found. Seeing the elements of lesson plan more clearly in order to give detailed feedback was another positive aspect of giving peer feedback. Also, some students mentioned that looking at many others' lesson plans enriched their knowledge of designing a lesson plan and giving peer feedback in small groups helped each student reduce the difficulty of giving feedback and gave a chance to learn from each other. Furthermore, in the process of analyzing other's lesson plan, there were some cases in which they were unsure about what kind of feedback they should give, especially when insufficiently written, and this was the moment when students studied for themselves by searching and confirming the relevant contents. On the other hand, the most negative aspect of giving peer feedback was that providing feedback in detail was a lot of work and time-consuming, and difficult to be done within one class time. Another negative aspect of giving peer feedback was that pointing errors and making suggestions for revision were not only burdensome but also made them feel sorry for their peers. Some students felt their knowledge was lacking in giving feedback and worried about whether their feedback was wrong. In addition, several students pointed out that it was difficult to give feedback when peer's lesson plan was not clear and difficult to understand.

Third, compared to the instructor feedback, peer feedback was more comfortable and gave more diverse opinions. However, lack of expertise, ideas, detailed advice, and accuracy were mentioned as disadvantages in peer feedback compared to the instructor feedback. And emotional reaction was another disadvantage of peer feedback mentioned.

Finally, what students have suggested for more successful peer feedback practices were as follows: first, since 'Teaching Materials and Strategies in Music Education' course in which these peer feedback practices were made includes three other activities, it was a heavy burden to do all in one semester; therefore, it is suggested

to reduce one or two activities, or combine relative activities and extend the time for peer feedback practices. Second, in order to prevent emotional response and make more sincere feedback, anonymous peer feedback was suggested.

V. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine pre-service music teachers' perceptions of peer feedback practices made in designing a lesson plan. A total of 23 students who enrolled in the 'Teaching Materials and Strategies in Music Education' course participated in the study. Through questionnaires, pre-service music teachers' perceptions of peer feedback practices were analyzed. The results of the study were as follows.

First, the students who participated in this study were strongly positive about peer feedback practices, and reported improvement in their designing a lesson plan through both giving and receiving peer feedback. These results are consistent with the findings of Brindley and Scofield(1998), Venables and Summit(2003), Li and Steckelberg(2005, 2006) that peer assessment is an effective tool to facilitate students' learning.

Second, peer feedback practices provide students an opportunity to critically examine important elements of lesson plan, resulting in a deeper level of understanding of designing a lesson plan. Most students answered peer feedback practices were especially helpful in identifying educational experiences, determining objectives, developing teaching strategies, and allocating time. These results support Davies'(2000) and Smith, Cooper, and Lancaster's(2002) studies that peer feedback practices helped learners to realize what to be done more clearly.

Third, the students found that all students, including themselves, made similar errors, and felt relieved that their ability to design a lesson plan did not lag far behind other students'. And, some students reported receiving good comments from peers increased their confidence in designing a lesson plan. This is consistent with the findings of Li and Steckelberg(2005, 2006) that students learn the advantages and disadvantages of their works as well as they can get confidence or reduce

anxiety in the process of giving and receiving feedback.

Fourth, several negative aspects of peer feedback practices were also reported. Despite the fact that most students were strongly positive about peer feedback practices, most students did not trust peer feedback and were not confident in giving feedback. In particular, many students mentioned that the feedback they received from their peers who had less proficiency was less helpful. This is consistent with the findings of Davies(2000) that a student's perception of peer ability significantly influences his or her attitude toward the peer's feedback and how much they accept, and with the findings of Venables and Summit(2003) that the student himself is distrusted. In addition, because it is feedback between friends, the students were afraid of having trouble with their peers if they pointed out problems or shortcomings in detail.

Fifth, the students felt peer feedback was more comfortable and gave more diverse opinions, compared to the instructor feedback, which is opposite of the findings of Zhang(1995) and Olina and Sullivan(2004). However, lack of expertise, ideas, detailed advice, and accuracy were mentioned as disadvantages in peer feedback.

Finally, the students needed more time to successfully conduct peer feedback practices, and anonymous peer feedback was suggested in order to prevent emotional response and make more sincere feedback.

Based on the research findings discussed above, I would like to make the following suggestions. First, students who do not have much experience in designing a lesson plan should actively participate in peer feedback practices so that they can have more access to various lesson plans and get better ideas.

Second, the importance of peer feedback practices should not be overlooked in order for peer feedback practices to be carried out efficiently. For students who still lack confidence and experience in designing a lesson plan, it is a burdensome task to evaluate the lesson plan and give feedback on it. It is important for the instructor to spend enough time for training on feedback practices prior to actual peer feedback practices, because without it, it may lead to meaningless feedback exchange and psychological contraction or dissatisfaction during the process of peer feedback practices.

Third, a class environment for peer feedback should be created safe to share opinions with diverse perspectives. To this end, it should be made clear to students that the purpose of peer feedback practices is to facilitate their own learning. To perform peer feedback practices anonymously is also suggested.

Finally, in order to maximize the effect of peer feedback practices, combining peer feedback and instructor feedback is suggested. Students can improve their skills by identifying problems, critically examining important elements, and getting diverse opinions from both peer feedback and instructor feedback.

References

- Black, P., & William, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 5(1), 7-74.
- Brindley, C., & Scofield, S. (1998). Peer assessment in undergraduate programs. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 3(1), 79-80.
- Davies, P. (2000). Computerized peer assessment. *Innovations in Education and Training International*, 37(4), 346-354.
- Fallows, S., & Chandramohan, B. (2001). Multiple approaches to assessment: Reflections on use of tutor, peer and self-assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(2), 229-245.
- Gauthier, D., & McCrary, J. (1999). Music courses of elementary education majors: An investigation of course content and purpose. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 47(2), 124-134.
- Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2004). Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning? *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, 1, 3-31.
- Hanrahan, S. J., & Isaacs, G. (2001). Assessing self and peer-assessment: The students' views. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(1), 53-70.
- Harwood, E., & Wiggins, J. (2001). Composing a lesson: Examining our metaphors. *The Mountain Lake Reader*, 1(2), 32-41.
- Johnson, A. P. (2000). It's time for Madeline Hunter to go: A new look at lesson plan design. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22(1), 72-78.

- Kim, H. J., Lee, J. Y., & Jang, S. Y. (2019). Pre-service teachers' perception on peer feedback in English writing. *International Journal of Contents*, 19(1), 513-523.
- Li, L., & Steckelberg, A. L. (2005). Impact of technology-mediated peer assessment on student project quality. In M. Simonson & M. Crawford (Eds.), *Proceedings of Association for Educational Communications and Technology International Conference 2005* (pp. 307-313). Bloomington, IN: AECT.
- _____ (2006). Perceptions of web-mediated peer assessment. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 10(2), 265-269.
- Li, L., Liu, X., & Steckelberg, A. L. (2010). Assessor or assessee: How student learning improves by giving and receiving peer feedback. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(3), 525-536.
- Olina, Z., & Sullivan, H. (2004). Student self-evaluation, teacher evaluation and learner performance. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 52(3), 5-22.
- Ozogul, G., Olina, Z., & Sullivan, H. (2008). Teacher, self and peer evaluation of lesson plans written by preservice teachers. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 56(2), 181-201.
- Patri, M. (2002). The influence of peer feedback on self- and peer-assessment of oral skills. *Language Testing*, 19(2), 109-131.
- Pope, N. (2001). An examination of the use of peer rating for formative assessment in the context of the theory of consumption values. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 26(3), 235-246.
- Smith, H., Cooper, A., & Lancaster, L. (2002). Improving the quality of undergraduate peer assessment: A case for student and staff development. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 39(1), 71-81.
- Stefani, L. A. J. (1994). Peer, self and tutor assessment: Relative reliabilities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 19(1), 69-75.
- Strijbos, J. W., Narciss, S., & Dünnebier, K. (2010). Peer feedback content and sender's competence level in academic writing revision tasks: Are they critical for feedback perceptions and efficiency? *Learning and Instruction*, 20(4), 291-303.

- Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276.
- Topping, K. J., Smith, E. F., Swanson, I., & Elliot, A. (2000). Formative peer assessment of academic writing between postgraduate students. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 25(2), 149-169.
- Venables, A., & Summit, R. (2003). Enhancing scientific essay writing using peer assessment. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, 40(3), 281-290.
- Watts, S., & Johnson, A. (1995). Toward reflection in teacher education: The role of dialogue journals. *Journal of Reading Education*, 21, 27-38.
- Wolf, D., Bixby, J., Glenn, J. III., & Gardner, H. (1991). To use their minds well: Investigating new forms of student assessment. *Review of Research in Education*, 17(1), 31-74.
- Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(3), 179-200.
- Zhang, S. (1995). Re-examining the affective advantages of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 209-222.

Received: 30 November 2019, Reviewed (Revised): 13 January (30 January) 2020

Accepted: 30 January 2020, Published: 29 February 2020

Su-Young Bae: E-mail: sb2388@dau.ac.kr

Adjunct Professor, Dong-A University, Nakdong-daero 550th Street, 37, Busan, Korea