

Facilitating Peer-feedback as Competence in Project-Oriented Online Teaching

Anja Marie Bornø Jensen & Mie Seest Dam

Department of Public Health
University of Copenhagen

Introduction

Background and Motivation

Peer-feedback is a popular activity in the competence-oriented university education, which has been significant in Denmark since around 2000 (Christiansen et al., 2015). Learning not only how to receive, but also how to provide peer-feedback facilitates so-called “deep learning”, in which the students reflect on their own learning process and develop their own self-evaluation competences (Nicol et al., 2014). As such, peer feedback feeds into concepts of student centered and dialogue based learning, which prescribe that students’ learning outcome increase, when they act as active participants and co-producers of the teaching and learning situation (Cook-Sather et al., 2014). Furthermore, in imitating the academic peer review process, peer-feedback has been highlighted as a way to construct research based learning that helps the students to develop a critical approach to academic knowledge production (Horst, 2018)

In the spring of 2020, we taught the course “Qualitative Methods and Analysis” at the Master of Public program where the students own qualitative projects play a fundamental role. Based on this course our pedagogical project focus on activities that aim to support the students in engaging in an ongoing *formative* peer-feedback process (Rienecker & Bruun, 2015) to motivate and support their own formulation and conduction of a qualitative study. Both of us have used peer-feedback in previous teaching, but

often just as a single activity in the end of the course, causing the peer-feedback exercise to have an almost result-oriented and summative form. The focus of this project is motivated by an interest in testing and developing the learning potential of using peer-feedback throughout the course. Our pedagogical aim is that through supportive peer-feedback activities, the students in our course will practice and gain confidence in the reflective and critical approach central to the qualitative methodology. In focusing on the formative and process-oriented peer-feedback, we aim to encourage our students to initiate their own reflective and creative thinking and writing process from the beginning of the course to develop “their own voice” (Entwistle, 2009). In order to value this active learning process, in which the students develop as qualitative researchers, reflections on their own process is a mandatory part of the final project rapport, and a part of the intended learning outcomes and competences of the course.

Problem statement – in extraordinary circumstances

In order to create a productive and safe learning environment in which formative peer-feedback plays an active role, teachers as well as students must shape their feedback as suggestions for improvements pointing to potentials for development rather than as evaluations and troubleshooting (Hvass and Heger 2018). Due to the covid-19 pandemic, we suddenly had to convert the course in to an online format. Thus, peer-feedback exercises were conducted in a context of online teaching and learning and we had to continuously reflect thoroughly on how to create and ensure a safe learning environment for peer-feedback among students who did not meet in person, and who we did not meet in person. On this background, our project aims to investigate how our students experienced peer-feedback during online teaching and how we as teachers can design feedback exercises to increase the students’ competences in their process of becoming capable of conducting their own independent qualitative research project. We therefore pursue the following problem statement.

How do MPH students experience the outcome of providing and receiving peer-feedback during online teaching in a project-oriented course? And how can teachers facilitate peer-feedback when a course is suddenly converted to online teaching?

The Course, the Students and Congruence in Project-Oriented Learning

The course is called Qualitative Methods and Analysis for Master of Public Health (MPH) Students. It is on the 2nd semester of a 4. Semester program giving in total 90 ECTS, and it is an elective course that gives 7,5 ECTS. Classes are relatively small – between 10-15 students, this year we had 11. On the 1st semester of the MPH there is a mandatory course in qualitative methods (10 ECTS) so the students attending are familiar with the basic elements of qualitative research and the course is meant to be an offer for students wanting to work in depth with these topics. The students are evaluated in a written exam, a 15-page assignment based on their own independent project. They have the freedom to choose the topic, but ethnographic fieldwork, participant observation (one day) and interviews (at least two) are mandatory methods. If they wish, they can do the project and the exam in collaboration with a fellow student. This year we had 7 individual projects and 2 projects done in pairs.

The students are health professionals such as medical doctors, nurses, dentists, physical therapists etc. All of them have made a deliberate choice to embark on the Master Program, and they invest a lot of time and energy in it, trying to balance it with their normal work obligations, so they are dedicated and motivated students. However, they also face some challenges, which we as teacher have to be aware of. Coming from a position in healthcare, starting to think like a student and/or a researcher is not only a difficult task, but also a shift in their own perception of their professional identity. Sometimes students might obstruct themselves by leaning on premises such as, “I am not theoretical”, or “This genre is new to me”. In addition, most have experience with only medical or quantitative research and do not understand the science of qualitative studies. A student this year, wrote an excellent paper, but ended it with stating how this task had made her “*aware how much of a newcomer I am in qualitative research*”. Therefore, during the course qualitative research has to somehow become a part of their professional identity.

Our course is very closely connected to the phases in a qualitative ethnographic project and designed to fit the students own process of making a problem statement, gaining access, collecting data, organizing and analyzing data and writing the assignment. Based on previous experiences (Anja has run the course in 2013, 2018, and 2019), we are very aware of the time pressure students might experience. Not only do they have to emerge into

the literature and learn a new topic every week, carrying out a field study is a pressure in itself. If they are not able to gain access or collect data, the course days will not make sense to them since their own material and their own projects are so deeply embedded in the whole course structure. Also the evaluations from this year speak to this, students feel the time pressure, and that they have to learn a lot over relatively short period. Therefore, as the evaluation shows, they also appreciate a strong congruence between the literature, the teaching and their own projects.

The work of Hounsell and Hounsell, 2007 teaches us the importance of congruence regarding teaching-learning activities, student background and aspiration and course organization and management. Here our job as teachers is to pay attention to the individual student and their particular circumstances when joining the course. Most of the students have full time or part time jobs in the health care sector while doing the MPH, so preparing them and supporting them in the time management of a qualitative field study is actually one of the biggest challenges as teachers. The fact that Covid-19 also contributed to an extra workload for the students in the healthcare sector was also taken into consideration. For instance, as we shall explain further, we recorded the lectures, so students could watch them when it suited them in a busy work schedule.

Our ideology for teaching and project oriented learning follow the idea of constructive alignment, meaning that students are engaged in learning activities closely connected to the intended learning outcomes (Biggs, 2011; Rienecker et al., 2015). If activities outside class do not take place at the right moment according to the course literature, students might still learn, but the optimal learning outcome is achieved when the processes of the topics in teaching and the experiences from field studies are temporally aligned. For instance, it would be hard to ask the students to do an exercise discussing and reflecting upon the challenges of doing participant observation and taking notes in the field, if students have not yet carried out participant observation in the field

As a main part of project oriented learning, we introduced peer-feedback from the beginning. Peer-feedback builds on the idea that listening to the comments and experiences from your peers, and reflecting on them critically, can be very rewarding. During class, we asked students to share their progress and discuss with fellow students how far along they have come and reflect on the challenges of sticking to the plan, many of which other students will recognize. As we will describe later, we intended to introduce peer-feedback in many phases of their project: when making a problem

statement and a synopsis (on Absalon), when analyzing the data material (in the Zoom classroom), and when presenting the results orally (at the finishing conference).

Methods and Empirical material

During our teaching in Qualitative Methods and Analysis at the Master of Public Health, we developed and conducted three peer feedback exercises, which constitute the empirical focal point in this project. In answering our problem statement, we draw on several forms of empirical material. First, we have documented our own observations and reflections of the three exercises in reflection papers, which we discussed with our pedagogical supervisors. Second, we asked the students for permission to use examples from Absalon from their written feedback exercise on the problem statement and synopsis as documentation. Finally, by the end of the course, we conducted an open-ended questionnaire study (see Appendix A) in which we asked the students to reflect on how they experienced the peer feedback exercises and how the exercises facilitated their own process of conducting a qualitative project. Seven out of eleven students replied. Their replies were anonymized and we have provided the students with pseudonyms, when we quote them in this project. Before we move on to discuss our intentions and the students' experiences with peer-feedback, we reflect on the conversion to online teaching.

Conversion to Online teaching – Intentions and Experiences

Usually, the course in Qualitative Methods and Analysis runs over 8 days over 11 weeks in the second term of the spring. We meet for 5 lessons from 10-3 pm. The days consist of a mixture of lectures, class teaching, guest lectures, exercises in groups, student presentations etc. Because of Covid 19 we decided to convert the 5 lessons into a series of online-lectures that were uploaded the day before the teaching and 2 hours of zoom classroom teaching. We used Screencast-O-Matic for recording videos. Typically, before every teaching day, we did 4-5 videos of 15-20 minutes, organized by topic. When converting to the new online format, we discussed how to create congruence between the different elements; literature, videos, classroom teaching and the students own project work. Somehow, the video is static like the texts, student cannot engage or respond when they see it, and that makes it more authoritative. We asked ourselves, what can the video

do that the literature cannot, why must the students watch the video lectures and how can we make them more interesting and relevant? The relatively short format of the videos forced us to focus on what is important. As such, the learning outcomes become clearer for us and for the students. We started every video by saying; the purpose of this lecture is to enable you to perform an interview for instance. We never say that in the classroom, so somehow the premise of online lectures clarify and specify the intended learning outcomes for both teachers and students. In the videos, we offered students a condensed presentation of the most important topics of the day, and we drew parallels to the assigned literature and to our own experiences as researchers. We used our own research to exemplify for instance how to conduct an interview, how to handle ethical challenges, or how to analyze empirical data material. The videos also introduced and explained the exercises we were going to do in the coming zoom classroom teaching, so the students could be prepared. For instance, we would say, "when we meet the next time, we are going to ask you to bring your problem statement, because we would like to do this exercise on breaking down a problem statement to research questions, and to a question guide."

The videos were challenging for us as teachers, because we were very aware that the students could rewind and watch it again if there was something they did not understand. Therefore, we made a great effort, to be specific and clear and not contradict ourselves. In the evaluations, it became evident that students loved the videos and the fact that they were able to watch them several times. This video format also forced us to collaborate closely as teachers. We decided to cover two topics each in our lectures and we made agreements on who would cover what and how we related to each other. During the course, we received feedback from our supervisors on being clear in the video lectures on what competencies the students were supposed to gain from the lectures. For instance we as teachers should not "present" the narrative approach or the phenomenological method, to students. Rather the students should become capable at "identifying" narrative features in a text, or "using" phenomenological method in an interview. Competence focused teaching can be hard in an online video, but awareness of the verbs we use in our intended learning outcomes is a good idea in order to make the teaching more relevant for students. Based on the new format, we also decided to make the slides available to students before class.

We decided to do class room teaching online at 2 hours in Zoom meetings where we met online and discussed the lectures, the literature, their

projects, and we had guest lectures and student presentations of the texts. In these team meetings, we very rarely did lectures as such, we focused on dialogue-based teaching and did all we could to engage the students and encourage them to speak about the literature and their own projects. Here, peer feedback turned out to be a central tool, which worked to create a “multi-voiced classroom” (Dysthe, 1996), in which dialogue between students and between teachers and students was a natural significant learning activity. We decided to record the zoom teaching to accommodate students that were not able to attend class, but found out that many decided to watch the online teaching session again in order to get a better learning outcome from the discussion.

Before each online session, we discussed the structure of the lessons so we would not waste any time. We had guest lectures that also did videos visiting us online; we had student presentations, and exercises. Therefore, we did everything in our power to change the activities so students would stay motivated. It was our impression that the online teaching went well under the circumstances. The evaluations from the students confirmed this. They were very happy about the pre-recorded lectures but they missed the face-to-face discussions with their peers. However, time is an important issue. It was evident that not all students could keep up the energy. The online format affected the opportunity to engage with fellow students. Mette a MPH student said:

The videos were great. They made sense in relation to the literature because the teachers explained the concepts and brought in their own examples. Zoom was okay as an emergency solution, but it was really exhausting to sit there and concentrate for two hours. I became “screen tired”. Regarding fellow students, I missed sitting next to each other and work together. It means a lot to be able to make small assignments and sit together and reflect. I missed that. (Mette, MPH Student)

It was our impression that, given the circumstances, it worked out fine, but it was not the optimal learning environment. A course like this is built around project related group work is very challenged by the limitation of not being able to meet face to face and discuss with fellow students, and have the insights validated by the teacher in the classroom afterwards. We realize we could have broken into groups as it is a technological option on Zoom, and it would perhaps have provided some of the peer interaction Mette was missing. But given the limited time on zoom, 2 hours, we did not do that. However, we encouraged students to talk with their study-buddy outside teaching, and some of them did so.

Peer-feedback in teaching: Intentions and Experiences

In the course we teach, peer-feedback is part of the course description, but it has not been given much attention previously. As pointed out in a paper published in Danish Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher education, it takes more than a single exercise to create a good peer-feedback culture (Müllen 2019). To facilitate such a culture, we aimed at using peer-feedback continuously during the course by conducting three organized exercises in which peer-feedback was a core activity.

Absalon: Facilitating written Peer-feedback on problem statement

In the beginning of the course, we encouraged students to start writing their problem statement in order to get an idea of what their project and their fieldwork should focus on. We had an exercise in the Zoom classroom, where Anja guided the students to write for 7 minutes about what was interesting about their project, to write their conclusion in one minute, and immediately after, write the question, which their conclusion was the answer to. This question was their problem statement and we made it possible in the Discussion section on Absalon for students to comment on each other's problem statements. Although Absalon has a peer-feedback feature, we chose the Discussion format because we wanted to make peer-feedback voluntary, informal and not anonymous. Before the first day of teaching students were assigned a study-buddy to who was responsible for commenting on the problem statement, but other students were also allowed to do so. On Absalon, we tried to guide the students in this first peer-feedback exercise. We wrote the following:

Hereby a thread where you can write your problem statement and comment on each other's. Remember the good advice on problem statements from the teaching: It has to be feasible (meaning it must be able to be answered a place or among some people where it is possible for you to gain access). It has to be clear and understandable and represent a curiosity towards your field. It also has to be very evident where you want to explore it, and it has to be articulated in a way that can provide some detailed discussing answers. Find more advice in our literature, in the slides on problem statement and in our discussion in class (which is available as video in media gallery).

Before this peer-feedback exercise, we were doubtful whether students had the competencies to provide comments to a qualitative problem statement when many had little previous experience. In addition, we were very

excited to see if students were brave enough to do so, given that they had not met in person. We agreed that we as teachers would validate this exercise and provide our advice to the problem statements, but we would not do so, before the peers had had the chance to comment in order not to make it difficult to argue against the teachers. However, the tread turned out to be a big success with lots of active participation. Students commented on their study-buddy's problem statement, but also on others' and they did so in a respectful tone, acknowledging and appreciating the feedback. Here is an example of such a process.

Albert and Carl: How does newly diagnosed patients with schizophrenia and professionals make decisions on depot treatment in psychiatry? Which perceptions of autonomy and authority come to the surface in these negotiations?

Catja: Hi Albert and Carl: You could also write this: How is the decision made about treatment with depot medicine for newly diagnosed patients with schizophrenia?

Albert and Carl: Hi Catja, Thanks for feedback. Yes, this seems as a more straightforward way to understand it, the way you articulate our problem statement.

Heidi: Hi Albert. I noticed, you already assume that autonomy and authority is at stake. Could you instead write: Does autonomy and authority come to the surface in these negotiations?

Anja: Good point, Heidi. But be careful about yes/no questions. Possibly, there is good reason to assume autonomy and authority. And it is not wrong to ask into specific concepts. But be careful that the concepts are not closing in and preventing new insights. Alternatively, you could "save" autonomy and authority for the analysis and ask: How do staff and patients experience their mutual relation and power balance in these negotiations?

This dialogue shows that when students engage in peer feedback, the learning outcome is big. It is great that Heidi notices the point about autonomy and authority, and how they assume it is at stake. Instead she suggests a yes/no question, giving Anja the opportunity to validate on not only the danger of being too closed in the conceptual framing but also on making sure to avoid yes/no questions in a qualitative problem statement. This point was explicitly mentioned in both the lectures and the slides and the class teaching. Simultaneously, it was important to recognize that Heidi made a good point pointing to the danger of the firm concepts. With this exercise students got to know a little about the projects of their peers, and they got a hands on feeling of the need to constantly adjust the problem statements.

As teachers, we also used the exercise to get a feeling of the level of the students and of the issues that need to be repeated and repeated again regarding the art of creating a qualitative problem statement. As such, peer feedback written on Absalon is also a visual tool for getting to know about the students and how they acquire and apply new knowledge. In the final written papers, we asked the students to reflect explicitly on how their problem statement changed along the way, and here it was very clear to see how the Absalon exercise contributed to the development, as many mentioned this exercise and how it affected their process. Cathrine, one student, had the development of her problem statement explicitly in an appendix in her assignment where it was evident to see how it had been affected by the peer-feedback. (see appendix B).

The Zoom classroom: Facilitating Peer-feedback on analysis exercise

The second planned peer-feedback exercise took place when the students had all collected and transcribed their interviews and some conducted their days of fieldwork. At this point of time in the project, the students are about to develop their analytical competences as well as their ability to communicate their analytical results. We know from experience that most students find this difficult and need guidance. Thus, we designed an oral exercise in which the students were guided through the process of analyzing qualitative data. Before the classroom session on Zoom, each student sent an interview excerpt or a field note to Anja, who arranged the quotes in a power point show, which we could share when we met up at zoom. Here, we instructed the students in “presenting” and “explaining” their empirical material to their fellow students and finally they were encouraged to start “analyzing” their empirical material by referring to articles from the curriculum or by contextualizing their material (see Appendix C). Each individual session was followed by “help” from the group, which we instructed to point out what they found interesting in the empirical material and to share ideas of how any of the analytical concepts introduced during the course could help their fellow student unfold the analytical potential in their material. Finally, the students were encouraged to point out if there was any part of the empirical material they did not understand. We are aware that it can be overwhelming for students to perform an analysis “live”. Thus, in framing the peer-feedback part of this exercise as “help” we hoped to enforce a constructive and collegial atmosphere in which the students would encourage and support each other. Furthermore, we wished to avoid that the fellow

students focused too much on their own performance as feedback providers (Hvass & Heger, 2018).

During the sessions, we as teachers validated the feedback process by underlining particularly important points. Anja noted these points as comments below each slide in order for the students to have a collection of examples and take home points to revisit when analyzing their full empirical material for the final assignment.

Reflecting on the exercise after class, we agreed that this exercise seemed to work as a revelation in relation to how much context you actually need to provide to make an interview excerpt meaningful and likewise, that your analytical thoughts needs to be very explicit in order for other people to be able to follow the argument. In the questionnaire, we asked the students how they experienced this exercise and the outcome of providing and receiving peer-feedback. Here Mette reflects:

This was the part that opened my eyes. Here the pieces fell into place in relation to how I could approach my assignment and how to write the analysis. It was a practical and relevant exercise. In my preparation for the exercise, I could see what theoretical perspective I could use, and performing the exercise, the structure became evident. To listen to the comments from my peers and to reflect upon their examples was really good and instructive. After class, I provided peer-feedback to my study-buddy. That worked very well. (Mette, MPH Student)

All responding students likewise expressed that they found this exercise helpful. However, the implied student in this kind of exercise likes to discuss and reflect in plenum. We noticed that a couple of the students were less engaged in the discussion, and they could probably have benefitted from preparation or reflection time in smaller groups or pairs.

The step from collecting empirical material to initiate a written analysis can be a hurdle in project-oriented learning. We know from the pedagogical literature that writing exercises can help students reflect upon theoretical input and translate them into analytical arguments (Bak et al., 2015; Krogh, 2010). Mette's statement shows us how we can likewise stimulate this process in an oral exercise in which the students express orally what they will later write in their assignment. Furthermore, the statement from Mette made us realize the learning potential of exercises that entail some kind of well-instructed preparation before class. All students had similar experiences and used words such as "funny," "instructive" and "directive" to describe the exercise. To us, the oral presentation has the advantage of being dynamic and open to instant dialogue and feedback. In explaining their

empirical material and formulating an analytical context, we experienced that our students internalized the theories and concepts presented to them during the course (Kringstad & Kvithyld, 2014). Here the peer-feedback served to facilitate that the students practiced the process of relating empirical material and analytical concepts again and again as they did not only do it in their own session, but also as active participants in the sessions of their fellow students.

The Garden: Facilitating Peer-feedback on oral conference presentation

In the end of the course, we arranged a mini-conference in Anja's garden where students had an option to present ongoing challenges, methodological reflections and preliminary analysis of data. This conference was deliberately situated at the end of the course when the students have finished fieldwork and have begun writing the exam assignment. Even if students have freedom to choose their own project topics, many issues go across themes, and it is likely that students benefit from the feedback provided to those who present and from providing feedback to each other. In order to facilitate peer-feedback, every presenter/group was assigned with a feedback group among their peers, which was given the task of being the first to comment after the presentation or pose a question to the presenter. At this point in the course, the students have practiced peer-feedback throughout the course and most students feel confident in the role as feedback provider. Before the conference, we had uploaded a document on Absalon stating the plan of the conference, and explaining how to present. However, for the opponents giving feedback we had only provided the following sentence: "You should ask a question or give a comment that can bring your fellow student further along towards the final paper". (See Appendix D plan for the conference).



However, we as teachers are still responsible for facilitating the feedback process. Dysthe, 1996 has developed a framework that elaborates on how teachers can make students reflect and construct meaning in teaching situations. Authentic questions that is open-ended and with no pre-specified answers, is a key element in her strategy, in which student answers are used as a thinking device to facilitate deep learning or what Dysthe refers to as “uptake”. In order to facilitate this process, we encouraged the students to present “the disturbing elements” in their project; the interview data that does not fit the research question, the access negotiations gone wrong, or the ethical dilemma they suddenly found themselves in. Through these open and authentic questions, we aimed at facilitating formative (peer)-feedback helping the students to improve their project before the final evaluation. Overall, the students reported that they experienced the conference as highly rewarding. Mette explains:

I learned a lot from listening to the presentations and from providing and receiving feedback. In my experience, much of what we read along the way fell into place. It was put into a context, which we produced ourselves. This was incredibly instructive to listen to the others and to be forced to reflect myself. (Mette, MPH Student)

The quote from Mette clearly indicate that peer-feedback in the conference format can facilitate the students’ meaning making process. Especially, we notice that Mette emphasized the value of “a context, which we

produced ourselves". We take from this quote that the conference exercise supported the students in transforming an abstract curriculum of academic papers into an active catalogue, which they can draw upon in their own work. Yet, the students' reply to the questionnaire also pointed to how we could improve this part of our teaching.

Karen recounts that "*the conference was very instructive and a nice way to pick-up on the entire curriculum of the course*". However, she emphasized that the conference was arranged too late in the project process for her to incorporate the feedback in her assignment:

It would have been nice, though, if the conference had been arranged a week earlier. I was quite far in my assignment at the time of the conference. However, some of the others were not that far, and I think that the conference helped them to get on track. (Karen, MPH Student).

Catja who was not as far as Karen in her process, likewise requested the conference earlier on – this to be able to get the help from her fellow students and the teachers at an earlier stage. According to Hvass and Heger, 2018 timing the feedback is an important aspect of a successful learning outcome. In order to be able to benefit from feedback, it has to be provided when students have the *opportunity* and the *means* to incorporate the feedback in their work. At the time of the conference, the students had a week left before they were to hand in their assignment, and as many of them are working full time, they did not have much time to revise their project according to the conference feedback. This is something that we need to consider, if we want the conference feedback to be formative in its character. However, we do not think the conference would work at a much earlier stage, as the students would not neither have the empirical material nor the analytical merits for the conference to be such a joyful event in which the students can see for themselves that they have gained new competences.

It was however evident from the exam assignment that some groups did not incorporate the conference feedback. For some students this may be due to the time pressure. However, students not trusting the feedback from peers can also be an explanation. In the following quote, Albert expressed how he perceived the value of the conference feedback.

It forced me to focus on the projects of other students. That was ok, but actually, I did not feel that it was necessary. I do not think everyone in the group was capable of providing useful feedback. (Albert, MPH student)

Albert did not feel that the feedback from his peers was very helpful. While we do of course take this serious, and consider if we could guide and qualify the peer-feedback even more – for instance by introducing rubrics

for the conference feedback as recommended by von Müllen, 2019 – we contend that the greatest learning outcome is not a product of receiving, but producing feedback (Nicol et al., 2014). This may well be contra intuitive to students, who want feedback to provide them with corrections and new possibilities of actions. Yet, providing feedback tremendously develop the students' competences in terms of critical reflection and self-evaluation (ibid). These are important academic skills particularly in a qualitative method course in which the ability to reflect upon, analyze and relate to the qualitative work of others are core competences crucial for students to become competent users of qualitative methods.

Conclusion: Our reflections for future teaching

Based on this assignment we have realized how big an effort it takes to initiate and succeed with peer feedback. As teachers it takes an extraordinary amount of work to organize and facilitate peer-feedback. We realized that students have to be instructed very carefully in how to conduct peer-feedback. Not only the style and tone of providing feedback, which is often mirrored by how we as teachers provide feedback, but also which criteria we want them to comment on. There is no doubt that the exercise that worked best, was the “tell, explain analyze exercise”, where the students had three clear “phases” to engage with. Furthermore, these were explained in detail in a book chapter on interviews that were on the curriculum. At the conference, we had just organized WHO was giving feedback, but somehow we had not stated clearly enough, HOW feedback should be given. This is perhaps the main pedagogical learning outcome for us in this process. If we work with peer-feedback we need to be very specific with providing a solid framework for explaining students the criteria and the kind of feedback we are looking for.

We also became very aware of the timing of feedback. It has to happen on a specific point of time in order to be successful. For instance in the “tell, explain analyze” exercise students who are not ready with a quote cannot participate. Likewise, at the garden conference, students who are more or less finished with their exam paper have are less likely to incorporate the feedback from peers. However, even if not all points were evident in the papers, we are quite certain that the students obtained the competence of giving and providing feedback, and that they will be able to use it in their further endeavors.

To sum up, next year when we run the course, we will continue with peer-feedback, because we believe that we as teachers get a good impression of the skills of the students when hearing them give and receive feedback. In addition, it is an important competence that should not be overlooked in the course plan, as it can travel way beyond the framework of the course. We will revise the teaching plan to ensure that the conference is placed earlier. We will work even harder to produce a “how to give feedback”- document, where we explicitly state for every exercise what the criteria are. Furthermore, we will work on the validation of these exercises so that both students who give and receive feedback are guided towards fulfillment of the learning outcomes of the course.

References

- Bak, M. B., Brok, L. S., & Korsgaard, K. (2015). *Skrivedidaktik: En vej til læring*. Klim.
- Biggs, J. B. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does*. McGraw-hill education (UK).
- Christiansen, F. V., Harboe, T., Horst, S., Kjær-Rasmussen, L. K., & Sarauw, L. L. (2015). Trends in the development of danish universities. In *University teaching and learning* (pp. 17–40). Samfundslitteratur.
- Cook-Sather, A., Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2014). *Engaging students as partners in learning and teaching: A guide for faculty*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Dysthe, O. (1996). The multivoiced classroom: Interactions of writing and classroom discourse. *Written communication*, 13(3), 385–425.
- Entwistle, N. (2009). *Teaching for understanding at university: Deep approaches and distinctive ways of thinking*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Horst, S. (2018). Tidsskrift for studerendes forskningspublikationer. In *Videnskabelse på universitetet*. Samfundslitteratur.
- Hounsell, D., & Hounsell, J. (2007). 7 teachinglearning environments in contemporary mass higher education. In *Bjep monograph series ii, number 4-student learning and university teaching* (pp. 91–111). British Psychological Society.
- Hvass, H., & Heger, S. (2018). Brugbar peer feedback: Instruktion og træning, før de studerende selv skal give og modtage. *Dansk Universitetspædagogisk Tidsskrift*, 13(25), 59–70.

- Kringstad, T., & Kvithyld, T. (2014). Fem prinsipper for god skriveopplæring. *Viden om læsning*, 15, 60–69.
- Krogh, E. (2010). Videnskabsretorik og skivedidaktik. *Rapport om et forsknings-og udviklingsprojekt med deltagelse af Avedøre Gymnasium, Kongsholm Gymnasium & HF samt Syddansk Universitet. I: Gymnasiepædagogik*, (77).
- Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2014). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: A peer review perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(1), 102–122.
- Rienecker, L., & Bruun, J. (2015). Feedback. In L. Rienecker, P. S. Jørgensen, J. Dolin, & G. H. Ingerslev (Eds.), *University teaching and learning* (1st ed., pp. 259–280). Samfundslitteratur.
- Rienecker, L., Jørgensen, P. S., Dolin, J., & Ingerslev, G. H. (Eds.). (2015). *University Teaching and Learning* (1st ed.). Samfundslitteratur.
- von Müllen, R. (2019). Dut guide: Peer-feedback. *Dansk Universitetspædagogisk Tidsskrift*, 15(27), 188–196.

A Our Open-ended Questionnaire

Kære MPH'ere

Endnu en gang tusind tak for et spændende og lærerigt forløb sammen med jer. Som I ved, er vi i gang med at tage pædagogikum. Vi skal i den forbindelse skrive en lille opgave om studentercentreret og dialogbaseret undervisning med fokus på **peer feedback (når studerende giver feedback til hinanden)**.

Vi har derfor lavet 7 spørgsmål til jer, som vi håber at I vil tage jer tid til at reflektere over. Jeres besvarelse vil indgå som empiri i vores opgave. Skriv gerne jeres svar under hvert spørgsmål. Hvis I ønsker at være anonyme, kan I sende jeres svar til Gitte Hansen på MPH; ellers bare send dem til anja.jensen@sund.ku.dk

Hvordan oplevede du **dialogen med underviserne og med andre studerende i undervisningen** ?

Hvordan oplevede du udbyttet af at give og modtage peer feedback på hinandens **synops**er?

Hvordan oplevede du udbyttet med at give og modtage peer feedback på hinandens **minianalyser** under "fortæl, forklar, analyser" øvelsen?

Hvordan oplevede du udbyttet af at give og modtage peer feedback under **konference-præsentationerne**?

Hvordan oplevede du at **underviserne muliggjorde** at I studerende kunne give feedback til hinanden?

Hvilke **kompetencer** har du opnået ved at give og modtage feedback fra medstuderende, og hvordan har det påvirket dit eget projektarbejde?

Coronasituationen betød, at vi måtte omlægge hele kurset til et nyt og uprøvet online format. Vi vil gerne spørge dig:

Hvad synes du **om online formatet**? Og hvordan **påvirkede det muligheden** for at bruge dine medstuderende aktivt under kurset ?

På forhånd mange tak og god velfortjent sommerferie.

Mvh Mie og Anja

B Student Log over the process of her problem statement

Bilag 1: Logbog over problemformuleringens udvikling

- Hvordan opleves søvn af patienter med reumatologisk arthritis, som er tilknyttet søvnklinikken i Glostrup?
 - Anbefalet at løsrive mig fra mit speciale og være mere etnografisk nysgerrig. At være ydmyg over for, hvad der byder sig i felten.
- Hvordan opleves patientperspektivet på livet med leddegigt og søvnproblemer?
 - Midlertidig ny arbejdstitel.
- Hvordan oplever personer med leddegigt deres søvnvaner og dennes betydning for hverdagen?
 - Arbejdsproblem under udarbejdelse af spørgeguiden.
- Hvordan beskriver to kvinder med leddegigt deres søvn, og hvilken betydning får søvnen på hverdagen?
 - efter kollektiv feedback i diskussionsfeltet i klassen blev oplevet skiftet ud med beskriver for at opnå en dybere fænomenologisk tilgang. Antallet og køn på informanterne blev skrevet ind i problemformuleringen.
- Hvordan beskriver to kvinder med leddegigt indgangen til søvn, og hvilken indflydelse har søvnkvaliteten på hverdagen?
 - Problemformulering, som blev dannet efter analysen.
- Hvordan beskriver to kvinder med leddegigt deres livsverden, som er rettet mod søvnen, og hvilken indflydelse har søvnkvaliteten på hverdagen?
 - Endelig problemformulering, som blev dannet efter konferencen i Anjas have.

C Explanation of the Exercise in the Lecture

Model at tænke med i analyse og skrivning

Fortæl

Forklar

Analyser

Fortæl: Præsenter citat eller observation: INDSIGT I MATERIALE

Forklar: Tydeliggør for læser hvad der sker, hvilken central pointe ønsker du som forfatter at få frem gennem det empiriske eksempel HJÆLP LÆSER PÅ VEJ

Analyser: Relater det til noget bredere, brug begreber, teorier, andre forfattere, andre lande = SKAB MENING MED EGEN STEMME



D Plan for the conference

KONFERENCE 23.juni kl 10-15.

MPH Kvalitative Analysestrategier

MØD GERNE OP 950..... ☺

Tidspunkt	Præsentation	Opponent
10.05-10.30	Carina	Ulla
10.30-10.55	Jeanette	Christine
10.55-11.20	Maria	Camilla
PAUSE		
11.35-12.00	Anders Christian	Carina
12.00-12.25	Belinda	Maria
12.25-12.50	Camilla	Helle Stine
FROKOSTPAUSE		
13.20-13.45	Christine	Anders Christian
13.45-14.10	Helle Stine	Belinda
14.10-14.35	Ulla	Jeanette
EVALUERING		
14.35-15		

Alle projekter har 25 min. Præsentationen må være 10-15 min – derefter kommentarer 10 min

OVERHOLD TIDEN.

Præsenter gerne en analysebid. Dvs. et uddrag af empiri, som du viser os hvordan du fortolker = et resultat. Præsenter også gerne et etisk dilemma, eller metodisk udfordring eller noget andet der har drillet undervejs. BRUG DAGEN TIL AT FÅ KOLLEGIAL HJÆLP TIL OPGAVESKRIVNING

Hvis I bruger Power Point (frivilligt), send præsentationen til Anja senest kl 9 tirsdag morgen (anja.jensen@sund.ku.dk), så lægger jeg den ind, så vi undgår teknisk spildtid.

OBS Vi prøver at sidde udendørs – så brug gerne hand-outs eller plancher etc (eller ikke noget) da power point kan være svær at se.

Opponenten skal stille et spørgsmål eller give et godt råd, der bringer opgaven videre. Mie og Anja vil gøre det samme.

Sted. Thimandsvænget 28 2791 Dragør (Anjas hus)

Offentlig transport: Metro til lufthavn, bus 35. Eller bus 250S hele vejen.

Mødepligt hele tidsrum fra 10-15, da alle har glæde af hinandens projekter og de diskussioner der opstår.