Analyzing Peer Feedback: Insights from Microteaching Practicums

Nicole A. Michol
Graduate Student
Washington State University
P.O. Box 646420
387 Clark Hall
Pullman, WA 99164-6402
509-335-1172
nicole.michol@wsu.edu

Dr. Anna J. Warner
Associate Professor of Agricultural Education
Washington State University
P.O. Box 646420
387 Clark Hall
Pullman, WA 99164-6402
509-335-1172
anna.warner@wsu.edu

Introduction & Need for Research

Teaching is an ongoing process where teachers strive to develop skills to apply to a variety of unique situations and students. Traditionally, skills are first developed through teacher education programs where microteaching allows pre-service teachers to practice methods and theories in a supportive environment (Lozgka, 2024; Remesh, 2013) improving teacher candidates' content knowledge and technical skills (Albritton et al., 2023). Pre-service teachers receive feedback from instructors and peers encouraging them to reflect on their lesson design and delivery (Remesh, 2013; Lozgka, 2024). Microteaching is a vital part of the teacher preparation program helping to ensure pre-service teachers are better prepared to enter student teaching with greater confidence, perspective, skillsets, and knowledge of school-based agricultural education. While pre-service teachers benefit from feedback, agricultural teacher education programs can also gain valuable insights from this data. By recognizing themes in microteaching feedback provided by pre-service teachers, programs will have a greater understanding of areas of success and shortcomings in instruction and subject mastery.

Conceptual Framework

First introduced in 1963, microteaching is now an integral part of teacher education programs (Sa'ad et al., 2015). Microteaching aims to prepare pre-service teachers for their careers by simulating realistic classroom conditions in a laboratory environment (Lozgka, 2024; Remesh, 2013) and identify areas of growth through the "plan, teach, observe, re-plan, re-teach, and re-observe" model (Remesh, 2013). After instruction in teaching methods, teacher candidates prepare a lesson plan and deliver a portion of the lesson, usually focusing on one skill or activity before introducing more, to a small group of mock students (Lozgka, 2024). Teacher candidates receive immediate feedback and watch a recording to reflect, discuss, and critique their own performance (Remesh, 2013; Lozgka, 2024). Microteaching emphasizes the importance of planning and decision-making increasing confidence, refining teaching methods, and developing classroom management skills (Remesh, 2013; Sa'ad et al., 2015).

Rosenshine and Furst (1971) sought to determine teacher behaviors that facilitate higher achievement among students and identified five behaviors: clarity, variability, enthusiasm, task-oriented and opportunities to learn (Barrick & Thoron, 2019). Clarity refers to easily understood main points, well organized lessons, and intelligently answered questions. A classroom's variability includes various materials, teaching techniques, assessments, and accommodations. Effective teachers express enthusiasm in their personality, movements, and voice. Task-oriented teachers are concerned about student learning through structured lessons to maximize class time. Finally, effective teachers provide students with opportunities to learn, receive feedback, and apply their knowledge (Barrick & Thoron, 2019; Rosenshine & Furst, 1971).

Methodology

Qualitative data was collected over two years via a Google Form used in a teaching methods course at Washington State University to provide teacher candidates with peer feedback on their microteaching practicums. When completing the Google Form, students answered the following three questions: "What did your classmate do well?", "How can your classmate improve this lesson?", and "How did the teacher's response to your student role make you feel?" Content analysis was used to analyze written data and identify characteristics and trends about the material (Ary et al., 2019). This study examined qualitative positive and constructive feedback

through categorization into six codes: clarity, variability, enthusiasm, task-oriented, opportunity to learn, and the learning environment. These categories were selected due to their alignment with Rosenshine and Furst's (1971) list of effective teacher behaviors and alignment with the rubrics used to evaluate microteaching. Due to the use of the predetermined list of effective teacher behaviors, deductive coding strategies were used (Bringham, 2023). There were 1,548 responses with many including more than one answer to the question. Due to lack of specific or relevant information, 263 of the responses were discarded. Some responses were coded into multiple categories for a total of 1,321 categorizable answers.

Results

Table 1 provides a summary of the microteaching peer feedback data categorized into six codes.

Table 1
Summary of Coded Microteaching Peer Feedback

	Clarity	**Variability**	**Enthusiasm**	**Task-Oriented**	**Opportunity to Learn**	**Learning Environment**
Strengths	129	93	136	132	108	308
Improvements	105	73	30	72	68	67

More positive feedback (906) than constructive, improvement-focused feedback (415) was provided. Of the positive feedback, most comments were associated with creating a positive learning environment such as "great rapport with students, he found the line between authority figure and friend very well", "the classroom felt creative and upbeat", and "I felt understood and not pressured". Comments reflected a need for improvement in clarity as represented by "have some examples/ videos that show good methods", "break it down more slowly, at times felt overwhelmed", and "explain why this is important to students".

Conclusions/Implications/Recommendations/Impact on Profession

The data indicate teacher candidates view creating positive learning environments as a major contributor to effective teaching reflecting lessons from university instruction and personal experiences. The greatest area of improvement was related to clarity. While clarity of instruction improves with planning and experience (Asad Juma, 2024), researchers recommend greater emphasis on strategies promoting clarity such as practicing lessons prior to presenting and giving clear directions sets. Microteaching is a vital component of a teacher education program providing timely and relevant feedback and opportunities for improvement prior to entering the classroom (Lozgka, 2024; Odo, 2023; Remesh, 2013). Peer feedback aids in discerning strengths and weaknesses allowing them to see themselves from the perspective of students (Odo, 2023). The lack of constructive comments suggests teacher education programs should examine the need for instruction in providing constructive peer feedback. Teacher preparation programs should continue using microteaching and peer feedback to prepare teacher candidates and analyze feedback to improve and individualize instruction.

References

Albritton, M., Roberts, T. G., DiBenedetto, C., & Bunch, J. C. (2023). Exploring how an integrated skills acquisition activity impacts the teaching ability and perceived self-efficacy to teach agricultural technical skills of preservice teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 64*(1), 156-170. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.v64i1.35.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Irvine, C. K. S., & Walker, D. A. (2019). *Introduction to Research in Education (10th ed.)*. Cengage.

Asad Juma, A. (2024). The power of planning: How lesson plans enhance teacher clarity and classroom management. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, 9*(3): 1666-1670. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/IJISRT24MAR1464.

Barrick, R. K., & Thoron, A. C. (2019). *Teaching behavior and student achievement*. University of Florida IFAS Extension.

Bingham, A. J. (2023). From Data Management to Actionable Findings: A Five-Phase Process of Qualitative Data Analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 22*. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231183620.

Harding, J. (2013). *Qualitative Data Analysis from Start to Finish*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Lozgka, E. (2024). The application of microteaching in teachers' education and training. *Journal of Advances in Education and Philosophy, 8*(5), 345-350. https://doi.org/10.36348/jaep.2024.v08i05.002.

Mergler, A. G., & Tangen, D. (2010). Using microteaching to enhance teacher efficacy in pre-service teachers. *Teaching Education*, *21*(2), 199–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210902998466

Odo, D. M. (2023). Perceptions of preservice English teachers regarding peer reaction video feedback on their microteaching. *SAGE Open, 13*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231210652.

Rosenshine, B., & Furst, N. (1971). Research on teacher performance criteria. In B.O. Smith (Ed.) Research in teacher education, (p. 37–72). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Remesh, A. (2013). Microteaching, an efficient technique for learning effective teaching. *Journal of Research in Medical Sciences, 18*(2), 158-163.

Sa'ad, T. U., Sabo, S., & Abdullahi, A. D. (2015). The impact of micro-teaching on the teaching practice of undergraduate agricultural education students in College of Education, Azare. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(26), 109-115.