

## Peer and Instructor Feedback from the View of Korean Adults

Merrilee Brinegar

---

1. Graduate School of TESOL, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, South Korea.

\* Corresponding Author's Email: merrileeann@gmail.com

---

**Abstract** – The present study investigates the perspectives on giving and receiving peer feedback among adult Korean students enrolled in a 16-week TESOL certificate program conducted in English. Among the six required courses, four were administered online. Multimedia and Materials was the course of focus for the study, and it was one of the courses conducted online. In this course, students were required to engage in peer feedback three times during the course on their major assessments prior to submitting final drafts for scoring and feedback from the instructor. An online survey was administered after completion of the course including both closed and open-ended questions to gather students' views on the use of peer feedback in the course. The overall results revealed that students came to realize the value of peer feedback and that they implemented changes to their assignments based on both peer and instructor feedback.

**Keywords:** Korean learners, online education, peer feedback

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Assessments fall into two categories: summative or formative. Summative assessment occurs at the end of a program and typically only gives students a score. In contrast, formative assessment happens during a course, and the purpose is to provide feedback to both the learners and the instructors regarding learners' progress. Learners, in turn, can then use the formative feedback to know what specific areas they need to work on. This kind of assessment helps students become more autonomous and increases agency, helping them make plans for how to improve, become cognizant of their strengths and weaknesses, focus on areas for remediation, and develop transferable skills such as metacognitive strategies (Brown & Knight, 1994).

Feedback is needed for students to improve, and teacher feedback is not the only way for students to get a critique on their work. Peer feedback is quite common at the university level (Haswell, 2005), and it can be given orally or in written form and either augment or replace instructor feedback. Regardless of the process, it can be very useful not only to help students focus more on their areas for improvement but also to save teachers time. Also, peer feedback is often considered to be more useful in that feedback from peers may be less threatening and friendlier than when it comes from an authoritarian figure such as a teacher. Moreover, it provides opportunities for English as a foreign language (EFL) students to negotiate meaning and practice a variety of language skills (Lockhart & Ng, 1995).

Additionally, Chandler (2003) and Tsui and Ng (2000) note that when EFL students engage in peer feedback, they learn how to support each other and benefit from shared motivation to improve their work. However, Cho and MacArthur (2010) point out that

because they may not have sufficient subject matter expertise, their ability to provide useful peer feedback may be limited. At the same time, feedback received from peers may be more accessible, in that it is often delivered in a style that may be more understandable to the students.

Peer feedback can be advantageous, particularly in a Korean context, because Kim (2001) points out that Korean college students spend very little time on the revision process and are thus generally inflexible about changing their original ideas. Rollinson (2005) suggests that although students may at first be resistant to the idea of peer feedback, after the process starts, students are likely to change their view if the feedback received is useful; similarly, students may find that commenting on others' work helps them better focus on areas of improvement in their own. Additionally, students may feel more in control of the revision process when receiving comments from peers because they have more ownership of their work and feel they are able to reject comments they judge as irrelevant or incorrect, whereas instructor feedback is usually considered more non-negotiable.

Rollinson (2005) notes, however, that students from some cultures may find it difficult to accept comments from peers as being valid, rather preferring simply to get feedback from the teacher. Korea is a country with a strong hierarchical society, and Korean culture epitomizes high power distance, meaning that not all members in society are considered equal (Hofstede, 1984). Because of these cultural dimensions, students in Korea highly revere their teachers and often look to them as the all-knowing sole distributors of knowledge. Consequently, Korean students typically put a much stronger emphasis on the importance of instructor feedback and tend to devalue that of their peers; however, in TESOL courses, it is common to instruct students on the importance of incorporating peer assessment in their teaching. Thus, to help students realize the usefulness of peer feedback, it is necessary to have them experience it firsthand.

While peer feedback may take place in a classroom setting, Warschauer (1997) notes that online communication provides new ways to connect learners in that it increases the number of learners who can provide peer feedback without the time limitations of a classroom and it can take place at any time. Furthermore, in a Korean EFL context, learners require a lot of time and effort to give peer feedback related to content (Moon, 2000).

Much research has been done on peer feedback in EFL contexts, mostly focusing on writing, but there is not ample research on peer feedback in EFL content courses, particularly pertaining to teacher-training programs. This paper attempts to uncover adult Korean students' views on giving and receiving peer feedback in an online class as part of a teacher training program. First, a review of the literature will be presented, primarily highlighting studies based on EFL university writing contexts, as that is where most of the current research is concentrated. Second, methodology of the study and findings will be overviewed. Finally, this will be followed by a discussion of the results including implications and limitations of the study.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Much research has been done on peer feedback, with the majority focused on writing contexts. One main concern is whether or not students view the peer feedback they receive as

credible and whether it is actually useful. Rollinson (1998) found that college students regarded 80% of the comments received from peers as valid. Caulk (1994) also found that 89% of advanced foreign language students considered comments from peers as useful and that 60% actually commented on aspects the instructor had not commented on, clearly demonstrating the usefulness of peer feedback, which is not necessarily meant to replace instructor feedback but rather to augment the feedback from instructors.

Similarly, Topping (1998) examined 31 studies on peer assessment at the university level and found that in 18 of the studies peer assessment was found to be valid and reliable and that peer assessment was generally more reliable than self-assessment. Jacobs and Zhang (1989) examined the difference in outcomes on essay writing from self, peer and teacher feedback among second language learners at the college level and found that neither teacher nor peer feedback was more advantageous for informational or rhetorical accuracy, and both were effective for grammatical accuracy.

Additionally, Mendonca and Johnson (1994) reported that ESL students did, in fact, make modifications to their work based on peer feedback; 53% of their total revisions were based on peers' comments. Furthermore, Watson (1989) researched the impact of peer assessment at the university level and found that after students engaged in peer feedback, their grades increased. Ney (1989) had similar results and additionally noted that peer feedback had a positive impact on class attendance.

Chaudron (1983) found that peer feedback also had a positive effect on ESL college students' attitudes. Furthermore, he found that students made improvements on their writing based on peer feedback and that the instructor feedback was not superior to that of peer feedback in terms of pushing students to revise their compositions. Moreover, Cho, Chung, King, and Schunn (2008) found that feedback given by novice technology users was more accepted and more revisions made thereon than on feedback provided by technology experts. Similarly, Richer (1992) compared the impact of peer feedback versus teacher discussion on students' essays of first year college students and found that the peer feedback group experienced greater improvements in their writing proficiency than the group who received teacher feedback orally.

Despite the positive findings regarding peer feedback, Zhang (1995) found that there can be issues with peer feedback interactions because sometimes the students do not trust the accuracy and sincerity of the feedback, or the comments given are not clear enough. After having students engage in teacher, peer and self-directed feedback in an ESL writing class, students were administered a questionnaire to collect their preferences, and the results showed that by and large, ESL students highly valued teacher feedback over peer feedback. Additionally, Leki (1991) found that ESL students in a college writing class deemed the feedback from peers as even less helpful than a friend who was a native speaker, the reason being that non-native students prioritize accuracy, for which they deem peers unsuitable to give feedback.

Jiang and Yu (2014) did a study on Chinese university freshmen in an English writing course and trained learners first on how to engage in online peer feedback sessions for error correction. They found that while it was quite effective overall at improving students' writing, the majority of the benefits were for the less-proficient students. In fact, over 90% of the students in the more-proficient group did not trust the feedback from their peers, which resulted

in their error correction rates not increasing.

Devenney (1989) conducted a study with ESL students in Southeast Asia and noted that peers and teachers play different roles in giving feedback. Correspondingly, Carson and Nelson (1996) studied peer feedback perspectives in China, a high power distance country like Korea. They found that the main motivating factor for Chinese students giving peer feedback was social, and thus they had a tendency to avoid giving critical comments in order to maintain group harmony. Additionally, some were reluctant to give criticisms because they did not feel comfortable taking on a role of authority.

Liu and Sadler (2003) studied the differences in peer review using offline versus electronic modes, including both asynchronous and synchronous. They found that the asynchronous mode resulted in greater effectiveness compared to the synchronous mode. Similarly, Cha (2007) found that Korean university students provided almost three times as much peer feedback using an online asynchronous discussion board as compared to a synchronous chat. Additionally, Lee (2002) compared Korean EFL students' peer review in offline and discussion board modes and found that students participated more in the asynchronous mode online. Jun (2005) also found that asynchronous computer mediated peer feedback was effective for encouraging for Korean learners to improve their writing.

### **3. RESEARCH DESIGN**

#### **3.1. Research Questions**

The aim of this study is to find out how Korean adult learners in an online TESOL certificate course view giving and receiving peer feedback after completion of a course, Multimedia and Materials, in which they were required to engage in asynchronous peer feedback on the class discussion board three times during the semester.

Hypothesis 1: Students will be uncomfortable giving peer feedback at the beginning of the semester but will, over the 16 weeks of the semester, come to realize the benefit of it; by the end of the course, students will highly value the peer feedback process.

Hypothesis 2: Students will use both peer and instructor feedback to make changes on their future assignments.

#### **3.2. Participants and Setting**

The participants were 11 Korean adult students enrolled in a TESOL certificate course at a university in Seoul, South Korea. All had already received a bachelor's degree. In the TESOL program, they were enrolled in six credit courses, four of which were run online. The course utilized for this research was Multimedia and Materials, which aimed to provide learners with the pedagogical knowledge to utilize multimedia tools in productive ways for teaching second language learners.

The course, Multimedia and Materials, was conducted fully online. Each week of the course, the students were to watch a 90-minute video lecture and engage in asynchronous online discussions on the course learning management system (LMS) with prompts provided weekly by the instructor related to the week's content. The course consisted of three major

assessments: 1) Creating a presentation slideshow using PowerPoint or Prezi; 2) Creating a board game; and 3) Student's choice.

Prior to submitting each of the three assignments to the instructor for grading and feedback, the students were required to post their assignments on the class discussion board on the course LMS in order to get feedback from their peers. They were instructed to use the criteria from the scoring rubrics for each assignment provided to help find areas for improvement on their peers' work. After receiving feedback, the students were instructed to make changes accordingly and then send an improved version to the instructor.

For the first two assignments, the criteria were kept simple in order to make the process of giving and receiving peer feedback less overwhelming for students and to encourage students not to feel restricted in doing so. Additionally, the criteria were directly related to the course material that was covered and repeatedly reinforced through video lectures and examples given of proper use of multimedia for creating materials for English teaching.

For the first assignment, the students had an option to make either a PowerPoint presentation or a Prezi demonstrating their learning in the course, and the scoring criteria included the following:

<b>Criteria</b>
Correct English
Visually interesting but not overwhelming
Relevant for your students
Level appropriate and requires students to use English
Technical skills + Functioning (Does it work?)

Figure 1. Criteria for Assignment 1

The second assignment required students to make a board game demonstrating their learning in the course. The students had the option of creating a new board game or finding a template online and adapting it for their specific contexts. The scoring criteria included the following:

<b>Criteria</b>
Correct English
Visually interesting
Meaningful and appropriate for your students
Requires students to practice English while playing
Complete and professional

Figure 2. Criteria for Assignment 2

The third assessment allowed students to demonstrate their learning of the course material in the way that would best fit their teaching context. Some suggestions for the third project were provided in the syllabus as presented below:

- PPT or Prezi presentation + flashcards (enough sets for your class)
- PPT or Prezi presentation + game boards (different game than Project II)
- PPT or Prezi presentation with sound and/or video clips embedded
- Create a lesson plan that incorporates comics in a way that complements your course contents
- Create a lesson focusing on video, comics, or music that emphasizes cultural understanding
- Have your students use a comic builder and evaluate its usefulness
- Find and edit a video clip; create a lesson in which you integrate the video clip
- Make a lesson using music; then create a Doodle Video and post it on your classroom blog
- Find some useful podcasts and incorporate them into your lessons or create homework assignments for your students using podcasts
- Create a video assignment for your students; after students have completed the project, upload their work to your class website and allow students to comment
- Create your own podcast for your students and/or parents of your students
- Create a class blog; post regularly and have your students post as well
- Start your own video library by collecting at least 5 video clips and briefly explain how you would use each
- Make a vlog of your students doing activities using a variety of the suggestions in this class

Figure 3. Suggestions for Assignment 3

For this third assignment, although the students had a choice, they were instructed that their assignment should illustrate their knowledge and understanding of the course content, display higher level thinking and analysis, and demonstrate application of knowledge to their individual context. As this was the third assignment and was meant to be comprehensive, the criteria were more complex than the first two assignments, as demonstrated below in figure 4.

<b>Criteria</b>
Uses a combination of multimedia, technology and/or materials to illustrate what you have learned in this class
Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of course content
Demonstrates application of knowledge to your individual context
Encourages students to communicate in English in meaningful ways
Correct use of English
High quality of materials; everything functioning
Easy to understand and use

Figure 4. Criteria for Assignment 4

### 3.3 Data Collection Procedures

The present study sought to find Korean adult students’ perspectives on the process and value of peer feedback in a TESOL certificate program through a survey, and this study was qualitative in nature. After the 16-week course was finished, the survey was administered to the 11 students enrolled in the course to find out their views on the peer feedback they had engaged in three times during the semester. The survey consisted of both open-ended and closed-ended questions. Six questions in total were on the survey, but one question involved a matrix style with 22 statements to which students had to respond using a 5-point Likert scale. This question, item 3, was the main focus of analysis.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1. Results

As previously stated, the main area of focus on the survey was a matrix item with 22 separate statements, which was question 3. Students had to respond to each statement with *Strongly Disagree*, *Disagree*, *Unsure*, *Agree*, or *Strongly Agree*. Using a 5-point Likert scale, each response was given a numerical value, with 1 assigned to *Strongly Disagree* and 5 for *Strongly Agree*. Each statement required a response from participants. Table 1 shows the 22 statements along with the mean and standard deviation for each statement.

Table 1: *The mean and standard deviation of participants' responses to question 3*

<b>Item Description</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
I enjoyed showing my classmates my work.	4	1.04
Writing comments on my classmates' work was not difficult for me.	2.91	1.16
I felt uncomfortable giving comments on my classmates' work.	2.27	1.14
It was useful getting to see my classmates' work.	4	1.13
My English level was good enough to improve my classmates' work.	2.55	0.99
My classmates' English level was good enough to improve my work.	3.55	1.08
Negative feedback helped me improve my work.	3.73	0.96
Positive feedback helped me improve my work.	3.55	1.08
I worried about hurting my classmates' feelings.	3.09	0.9
I think my comments helped improve my classmates' work.	3.45	0.99
The feedback I received from my classmates was useful.	3.55	1.08
The feedback I got from my classmates was similar to the professor's feedback.	2.36	0.77
I improved in giving feedback during the semester.	3.73	1.05
I made changes to my projects after getting peer feedback.	3.55	1.23
I checked the scoring criteria for each assignment before giving feedback.	3.45	1.08
I checked the scoring criteria for each assignment before submitting my assignment to the professor.	3.64	0.98
I checked the professor's feedback on A1 to improve my A2.	4.09	1.08
I checked the professor's feedback on A1 and A2 to improve my A3.	4	1.13
I did not read all of the professor's feedback on my assignments.	1.09	0.29
I used the professor's feedback on my own assignments when I gave feedback to my peers on A2 and A3.	3.55	1.08
After I received feedback (and the grade) from the professor, I made changes to my materials before using them with my students.	3.91	1.08
In the future, I am likely to ask my peers or coworkers for feedback on materials I create.	3.82	1.03



In addition to the main item, question 3, that contained 22 statements in a matrix format, three questions were open-ended in order to get more specific explanations from participants regarding their perspectives on giving and receiving peer feedback, as seen in figure 5 below.

\* 4. How did you feel about giving feedback to your peers?

\* 5. Did your attitude toward giving and receiving peer feedback change over the semester? If so, explain.

6. Is there anything else you would like to mention about peer feedback in this class, such as how to improve the process (or anything else)?

Figure 5. Open-ended questions

Questions on the survey started with finding out students' past experience with peer review; 45.45% (n=5) answered that they had done peer review prior to this course in a Korean class. In contrast, only 36.6% (n=4) had previously done peer review in a course taught in English.

In regards to students' views about engaging in peer feedback online, 10 out of 11 students (90.9%) chose *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* to the statement *I enjoyed showing my classmates my work*. However, to the statement *Writing comments on my classmates' work was not difficult for me*, no student strongly agreed, and only 45.45% (n=5) agreed. In contrast, to the statement *I felt uncomfortable giving comments on my classmates' work*, 27.7% (n=3) answered *Strongly Disagree*, 45.45% (n=5) answered *Disagree*, and 27.27% (n=3) answered *Agree*. Thus, although students found it difficult to provide peer feedback overall, for the most part they were not uncomfortable doing so.

As for the value of peer feedback, 36.36% (n=4) answered *Strongly Agree* and 45.45% (n=5) answered *Agree* to the statement *It was useful getting to see my classmates' work*. Furthermore, 63.64% (n=7) answered *Agree* and 9.09% (1 student) answered *Strongly Agree* to the statement *The feedback I received from my classmates was useful*. Furthermore, 81.81% (n=9) agreed or strongly agreed that receiving negative peer feedback helped them improve their work, whereas 72.72% (n=8) agreed or strongly agreed that positive peer feedback was useful. As to whether the student used the feedback from their peers, 72.72% (n=8) answered *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* to *I made changes to my projects after getting peer feedback*. Similarly, 81.81% (n=9) indicated that in the future they would be likely to ask their peers or coworkers for feedback on materials they create. In an open-ended question about how they felt about giving peer feedback, several students were positive.

I think it is very useful and meaningful. (Student 2)

It could be a help for me too [sic] to give feedback to my peers. (Student 6)

It was very useful. Way more than I expected. As I didn't want to get hurt from someone else's feedback, I added compliments first. And it was a good experience. (Student 11)

Mostly, peers' feedback were [sic] helpful... (Student 5)

After submitting each assignment for grading, the professor gave detailed comments using the scoring criteria for each assignment. Ten out of 11 (90.91%) students indicated that they read all of the professor's feedback on their assignments. Ten out of 11 students also agreed or strongly agreed that they checked feedback from the first assignment to improve on their second assignment, whereas nine students (81.81%) agreed or strongly agreed that they checked the feedback on the second assignment in order to improve on the third assignment. Most of the students enrolled in the course were currently teaching while studying, and 27.7% (n=3) answered Strongly Agree and 54.55% (n=6) answered Agree to the statement *After I received feedback from the professor, I made changes to my materials before using them with my students.*

Interestingly, no student chose *Strongly Agree* to the statement *My English level was good enough to improve my classmates' work*, whereas 54.54% (n=6) agreed or strongly agreed that the English level of their peers was enough to improve their work. On an open-ended question about how they felt giving feedback to peers, one student echoed the sentiment that it was difficult.

My English wasn't good enough to give then (sic) feedback. So it was difficult for me. (Student 3)

Additionally, in another question where students were asked to give any additional comments to improve the peer feedback process, two students suggested they needed more guidance.

Mostly, peers' feedback were helpful but if Ss know exactly what they didn't know exactly when they gave feedback, Ss could be a big help each other. (Student 9)

Giving rubric to Ss before Ss are giving peer feedback. (Student 10)

In terms of affective factors, 36.36% (n=4) indicated they were worried about hurting their classmates' feelings when giving feedback. A few students mentioned this again on the open-ended question about how they felt giving feedback to peers.

I was uncomfortable to give negative feedback to my peers since everyone could see it. (Student 4)

I should consider the feeling of peers always and felt a bit uncomfortable when I should tell something on other's work in the beginning. But later I got used [to it]. (Student 5)

Although students were given the scoring rubric in the syllabus that the instructor used to grade the three assignments, 63.63% disagreed or strongly disagreed to *The feedback I got from classmates was similar to the professor's feedback*. Not surprisingly, only one student strongly agreed to the statement *I checked the scoring criteria for each assignment before giving feedback*, and only six students (54.55%) agreed. A similar trend was found regarding whether students checked the scoring criteria before submitting their assignments to the professor, in that only one student strongly agreed and only seven (63.64%) agreed.

Students were also asked an open-ended question about whether or not their attitude toward giving and receiving peer feedback changed over the semester. Two replied that their attitude toward it did not change, and one changed for the negative. However, 6 of the 11 students (54.54%) answered positively.

During this semester, I could think that feedback is a good way to improve skills based on the topic and share a variety of thoughts and opinion with other people. It is very useful [sic] to learn something. (Student 7)

I didn't think giving and receiving peer feedback that important before but now I think it can be very helpful for improving [sic] materials. (Student 8)

Yes, I thought it was subjective without a theoretical [sic] reason. But, most of feedback from peers was really reasonable and acceptable. (Student 10)

Yes. Nobody wants to hear negative things. So I might avoid asking for peer feedback in a real life but through this course, attitudes towards giving and receiving have changed in a positive way. (Student 11)

At first, I didn't think deeply about the contents of my feedback, but as time went by, I could refer the professor's feedback and adjust my feedback. (Student 4)

Yes, I was hesitating in the beginning but gradually I start to accept them. (Student 5)

Additionally, 18.18% (n=2) chose *Strongly Agree* and 54.55% (n=6) chose *Agree* to the statement *I improved in giving feedback during the semester*, whereas only one student (9.09%) strongly disagreed.

#### 4.4. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to find out how adult Korean students in an online TESOL certificate course run in English viewed the giving and receiving of peer feedback. Below the two original hypotheses are presented along with a discussion of the findings.

**4.4.1. Hypothesis 1:** Students will be uncomfortable giving peer feedback at the beginning of the semester but will, over the 16 weeks of the semester, come to realize the benefit of it; by the end of the course, students will highly value the peer feedback process.

Only 27.27% of students agreed that they did feel uncomfortable providing peer feedback, which was less than expected. Furthermore, 81.81% said they found it useful getting to see their peers' work (Agree or Strongly Agree), and 72.72% agreed or strongly agreed that the feedback they got from peers was useful. Additionally, one student commented that the feedback was quite useful, "Way more than I expected." Another also mentioned it was helpful for her to give feedback to her peers.

Moreover, 54.54% responded positively in an open-ended question regarding how their attitude changed about peer review over the semester. One mentioned that she felt she improved her skills by sharing thoughts and opinions; another indicated that while she previously did not place much value on peer review, she now thinks it can be helpful. One student seemed surprised as well to find that the feedback was “reasonable and acceptable.” Another student admitted that she was hesitant to consider the feedback she got from peers at the beginning but that she gradually came to accept it.

Although only a little more than half of students indicated a positive attitude change as a result of giving and receiving peer feedback, the majority suggested that they improved on giving feedback during the semester. Also, as the majority agreed that the feedback they received from peers was useful and that they used it, the first hypothesis seems to be confirmed.

**4.4.2. Hypothesis 2:** Students will use both peer and instructor feedback to make changes on their future assignments.

The majority of students did use the professor’s feedback to improve on their future assignments, and 27.7% indicated they even made changes before using the materials for their teaching. Additionally, 72.72% of students agreed or strongly agreed that the feedback they got from peers was useful and that they used that feedback to change their projects accordingly prior to submitting them for scoring and feedback from the professor. Thus, the second hypothesis is also corroborated by the survey results.

Interestingly, although students were told to use the same criteria for providing peer feedback as the professor used, 63.63% indicated that the feedback from peers was dissimilar to the professor’s feedback. This coincides with what Devenney (1989) mentioned about peers and instructors playing different roles in giving feedback.

## **5. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS**

In general, students indicated that although they did not mind sharing their work online, they found it difficult to give peer feedback. Additionally, they were worried about hurting each other’s feelings. To combat this challenge, one student mentioned that she first gave compliments before commenting on areas for improvement. Also, despite that the scoring criteria was provided to all students in the syllabus, one student still commented that she wanted a rubric before giving peer feedback. Thus, it seems students do not view the assignment scoring criteria that the professor will use for feedback as suitable for giving peer feedback. In fact, many students answered that they did not even look at the scoring criteria for each assignment before providing peer feedback.

Thus, in order to facilitate more successful peer feedback online, it would be helpful to give students a specific format or a set of phrases to use for giving peer feedback. Not only would this help with linguistic scaffolding, but the standardization would likely make students feel more comfortable with giving critical feedback, knowing that each student would be doing the same. For example, students could be told to use the following sentence starters for providing peer feedback:

- One thing I really liked about your work/idea/presentation was...
- Here are some suggestions for improving...

In addition, some less-proficient students might need further support, as students in this study answered that they felt their English level was not good enough for providing peer feedback. Thus, if a class has lower proficiency students or students lacking confidence in their linguistic abilities, sentence starters as mentioned above may not be adequate. Instead, they may benefit from a specific checklist of criteria to rate, check off, or comment on. However, the disadvantage of such a checklist is that students may have a tendency to simply check all the criteria off, regardless of the quality of the work they are reviewing.

Even with a clear format, though, students might still be wary about posting critical comments, as one student mentioned that she was uncomfortable doing so where all of the other students could see it. Thus, it might be worth considering to create private discussion boards where smaller groups or even pairs could privately provide feedback to each other without the watchful eye of all of the other students; however, there are some downsides to this. First, many Korean students are afraid to be the first to post comments and may benefit from seeing the kinds of feedback other students give first, as scaffolding to guide them when they give feedback. Secondly, it is clear that students benefit from seeing each other's assignments, and if the posting and peer review is done privately, this advantage disappears.

This study used a survey to discover the views of Korean adult learners toward giving and receiving peer assessment in an online course, Multimedia and Materials, that was part of a TESOL certificate program conducted in English. As only 11 students were enrolled in the course, the sample size was very small. Thus, it is difficult to generalize the results of this study. In the future, a larger-scale study should be performed to compare with the results of this study and to be able to get statistically significant results. Furthermore, it would be interesting to repeat the study but with a specific format given to students for the peer review process and to compare the findings to the current results to see how much of a difference it makes to give students more specific guidelines.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2018.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, S., & Knight, P. (2012). *Assessing learners in higher education*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of second language writing*, 5(1), 1-19.
- Caulk, N. (1994). Comparing teacher and student responses to written work. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 181-188.
- Cha, Y. (2007). A study of peer feedback patterns in CMC modes on Korean EFL students. *Multimedia Assisted Language Learning*, 10(1), 9-35.

- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of second language writing, 12*(3), 267-296.
- Chaudron, C. (1983). Evaluating writing: Effects of feedback on revision. *RELC Journal, 15*, 1-14.
- Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2010). Student revision with peer and expert reviewing. *Learning and Instruction, 20*(4), 328-338.
- Cho, K., Chung, T. R., King, W. R., & Schunn, C. (2008). Peer-based computer-supported knowledge refinement: an empirical investigation. *Communications of the ACM, 51*(3), 83-88.
- Devenney, R. (1989). How ESL teachers and peers evaluate and respond to student writing. *RELC Journal, 20*(1), 77-90.
- Haswell, R. H. (2005). NCTE/CCCC's recent war on scholarship. *Written Communication, 22*(2), 198-223.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5). London: Sage Publications.
- Jacobs, G., & Zhang, S. (1989). Peer feedback in second language writing instruction: Boon or bane? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.
- Jiang, J., & Yu, Y. (2014). The effectiveness of internet-based peer feedback training on Chinese EFL college students' writing proficiency. *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education (IJICTE), 10*(3), 34-46.
- Jun, J. Y. (2005). The effects of web-based feedback types on college students' English writing abilities and attitudes. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 11*.
- Kim, S. (2001). A Description of College Students' Writing Process. *English Teaching, 56*(4), 55-73.
- Lee, E. (2002). Using web-based bulletin board for peer correction in EFL basic writing classes. *Foreign Languages Education, 9*(4), 147-164.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign language annals, 24*(3), 203-218.
- Liu, J., & Sadler, R. W. (2003). The effect and affect of peer review in electronic versus traditional modes on L2 writing. *Journal of English for academic Purposes, 2*(3), 193-227.
- Lockhart, C., & Ng, P. (1995). Analyzing talk in ESL peer response groups: Stances, functions, and content. *Language learning, 45*(4), 605-651.
- Mendonca, C. O., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(4), 745-769.

- Moon, Y. I. (2000). The nature of peer revisions in an EFL writing class of a Korean university. *English Teaching*, 55(1), 119-140.
- Ney, J. W. (1989). Teacher-student cooperative learning in the freshman writing course. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 312659).
- Richer, D. L. (1993). The effects of two feedback systems on first year college students' writing proficiency. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53, 2722.
- Rollinson, P. (1998). Peer Response and Revision in an ESL Writing Group: A case study. Unpublished PhD thesis. Universidad Autonoma de Madrid.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30.
- Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276.
- Tsui, A. B., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147-170.
- Warschauer, M. (1995). Comparing face-to-face and electronic discussion in the second language classroom. *CALICO journal*, 7-26.
- Watson, H. M. (1989). Report on the first year of research into developing an evaluative technique for assessing seminar work. *Collected Original Resources in Education (CORE)*, 13(2).
- Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 209-222.