
A Systematic Literature Review of Online Peer Feedback: Uncovering the Current Situation in EFL Setting

Sibakhul Milad Malik Hidayatulloh ¹

¹ Corresponding author, State University of Malang, Indonesia; milad.malik.fs@um.ac.id

Received: 1 September 2024

Accepted: 24 December 2024

Published: 18 January 2025

Abstract

This paper digs into the landscape of online peer feedback in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context which aims to provide a comprehensive overview of its practices and implementation strategies. Having literature review as the source of finding the current practices, 59 articles were chosen as the basis of the current study justification in mapping the current practices in online peer feedback. The findings reveal that over the past decade, the practices of online peer feedback in EFL have become increasingly diverse, extending beyond specific educational levels. As time progresses, advancements in response strategies, ICT-supported tools, and practical methodologies have enriched these practices. By presenting a detailed account of the current state of online peer feedback in EFL settings, this paper seeks to support teachers and practitioners in navigating and implementing effective strategies. It aims to serve as a guide for understanding and selecting appropriate methods to integrate online peer feedback into classroom settings, ultimately enhancing learning outcomes.

Keywords: Online peer feedback, peer feedback, current practices

To cite this article: Hidayatulloh, S. M. M. (2025). A systematic literature review of online peer feedback: Uncovering the current situation in EFL setting. *SALEE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education*, 6(1), 39-54. <https://doi.org/10.35961/salee.v6i1.1614>

DOI: 10.35961/salee.v6i1.1614

1. Introduction

Peer feedback can be conceptualized as a communicative process wherein learners engage in the exchange of ideas pertaining to performance and standards (Liu & Carless, 2006). While often used interchangeably, peer feedback and peer assessment are distinct terms. As noted



by Liu and Carless (2006), peer feedback primarily focuses on the interactive aspects of the process, while peer assessment typically involves assigning a grade or evaluation. In alignment with this distinction, Yu and Lee (2016) characterize peer feedback as encompassing peer collaboration, peer comment, and peer interaction. Consequently, peer feedback can be described as a student-centered activity that fosters interaction through the provision of comments, feedback, and suggestions among peers.

Peer feedback offers a myriad of benefits for students. Notably, it can foster the development of critical thinking and higher-order thinking skills (Elizondo-Garcia & Gallardo, 2020). By exposing students to diverse perspectives and approaches, peer feedback can broaden their understanding and problem-solving abilities (Kulkarni et al., 2013). Additionally, peer feedback can encourage students to reflect on their learning and apply their knowledge in meaningful ways (Najafi et al., 2015). To maximize the benefits of peer feedback, classroom activities should cultivate an environment where students are active and collaborative learners. This entails providing opportunities for students to engage in meaningful interactions, exchange ideas, and provide constructive feedback to their peers.

Despite its potential benefits, peer feedback, especially in English as Foreign Language (EFL) context has encountered several challenges in classroom implementation. Previous studies indicate that peer feedback activities often deviate from the desired student-centred approach. Teacher-centric practices, such as controlling the feedback process and correcting student errors, continue to dominate (Irfani & O'Boyle, 2024; Jayusna et al., 2022). Additionally, student readiness for providing effective feedback is frequently overlooked (Buod & Molloy, 2013) which reflects in superficial and uncritical comments. Additionally, the transition to online learning has further exacerbated these issues. Many teachers express reluctance to implement peer feedback online due to unfamiliarity with the necessary ICT tools and strategies (Butarbutar et al., 2023). It was found in Chen (2014) who conducted a literature search on technology-used in peer feedback from 1990 to 2010, analyzing 95 journal articles. The results indicated that technology has significantly influenced the way peer feedback is conducted, with 54 out of 95 articles demonstrating this impact. It is believed that the shift from offline to online classrooms during the pandemic era has accelerated the adoption of online peer feedback. The necessity of conducting educational processes online has emphasized the use of online peer feedback in classroom contexts.

Furthermore, a common trend observed in online peer feedback is the prevalence of superficial responses such as "yes, good" or "yes, I agree." Previous research has also identified student trust, confidence, and feedback quality as key challenges (Kangni, 2015; Yu & Lee, 2016). The widespread adoption of online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic has compounded these difficulties, particularly for teachers who lack proficiency in using ICT in EFL classrooms. Given these challenges, this paper aims to explore and address the current practices online peer feedback in EFL classrooms. By doing so, it

uncovers the current situation of the use of online peer feedback in the realm of EFL teaching setting, particularly in teaching and learning for writing skill.

2. Method

This paper employed a literature review methodology, adhering to the four-step approach outlined by Snyder (2019): designing the review, conducting the review, analyzing the data, and writing up the review. The primary objective was to reframe the practices and boundaries of peer feedback, necessitating a comprehensive synthesis of existing published literature. To gather the necessary data, it utilized secondary sources, including scholarly articles, books, and research papers retrieved from reputable databases. These sources were carefully selected based on their relevance to our research questions and their contribution to the broader understanding of peer feedback.

To identify the current trend in online peer feedback, a systematic literature review was conducted to examine online peer feedback studies published between 2014 and 2024 since Elboshi (2021) initiated to review the trend spanning from 2000 – 2019. Yet, even though there are some of journal articles and books which are more than 10 years old, but the contained knowledge in them have been broadly used by some scholars in their citations. Furthermore, in finding the data, the researcher used some key words such as [Feedback], [Online Peer Feedback], [Activity in Online Peer Feedback], [Online Peer Feedback in ELT] and combinations of those keywords. Similarly, the use of books in this research also were set as recent as possible. Finally, 59 selected articles journal were included as the basis of having the discussion in this current study.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Defining peer feedback

It is generally accepted that feedback has been involved in educational processes for a long time. Moreover, peer feedback, as a component of feedback, has been introduced as a student activity where dialogue contributes to knowledge and interpretation with the objective of enhancing current learning (Zhu & Carless, 2018). In addition, peer feedback plays a significant role in promoting student-centered learning processes. The purpose is not only for learning but also for the development of critical thinking skills (Han & Zu, 2019). Students are invited to provide comments and suggestions on their peers' work without teacher intervention. This fosters interaction and collaborative learning among students in the classroom context (Boud & Molloy, 2013). Lately, Zhu and Carless (2018) mentioned that peer feedback is promoted in higher education to assist students' writing skills. It invites students to be both providers and receivers of feedback. Since student-centered learning is widely promoted, peer feedback has successfully gained teacher support in classrooms. Furthermore, peer feedback can be considered a catalyst for promoting active learning and deep learning for students, as the activity immerses them in the assessment process (Gaynor,

2019). Therefore, peer feedback can be described as a student activity that requires active participation and critical thinking to evaluate and provide feedback on other students' work.

Peer feedback is designed to enhance student participation and engagement in the classroom. Consequently, teachers should prioritize its effective implementation. The primary goal of peer feedback extends beyond merely achieving a final outcome. As noted by Naylor et al. (2014), peer feedback activities should be closely aligned with students' developmental learning objectives. Students must adopt a critical mindset to effectively evaluate their peers' work using critical review techniques. This process enables them to identify both strengths and weaknesses in the content (Naylor et al., 2014). Peer feedback has been widely adopted by practitioners and teachers as a valuable tool for developing writing skills (Huisman et al., 2019). Given its interactive nature, writing is a particularly suitable context for implementing peer feedback. In contrast to teacher-centered learning, peer feedback emphasizes a student-centered approach, where students take control of their own learning activities (Huisman et al., 2018). Furthermore, peer feedback aligns with constructivist theory, which posits that students learn through a systematic process of building knowledge (Kangni, 2015). Beyond constructivism, peer feedback also promotes collaborative learning, as students work together to improve their work. Jacobs and Huat (2021) highlight the importance of peer collaborative learning as a foundation for effective collaborative learning.

3.2. Types of peer feedback

To differentiate between types of peer feedback, this paper offers a distinction based on both the practical process and the functional purpose. While the practical process focuses on the mechanics of conducting feedback, the functional purpose emphasizes the intended outcomes of the peer feedback activity in the classroom. Consequently, it presents two primary types of peer feedback: the practical and the functional.

From a practical perspective, peer feedback can be categorized into two primary processes: online and offline. Offline peer feedback occurs in a face-to-face setting within the classroom context, with limited reliance on technology. In contrast, online peer feedback emerged as a response to the time-consuming nature of offline feedback (Choi, 2014). Online peer feedback leverages information and communication technology (ICT), reflecting the demands of modern teaching practices. Moreover, online peer feedback offers greater flexibility in terms of setting and time, enabling it to be conducted through various platforms such as blogging, web-based 2.0 tools, and social media. As a result, online peer feedback has become increasingly prevalent in contemporary classrooms due to its practical advantages (Choi, 2014).

From a functional perspective, peer feedback can be categorized into formative and summative types. Formative peer feedback serves as an integral component of the teacher's

summative assessment process (Gaynor, 2019). Beyond its role in student improvement, formative peer feedback also fosters student engagement and motivation (Gaynor, 2019). As noted by Bader et al. (2019), formative peer feedback acts as a bridge between students' current learning performance and the desired outcomes of the learning process. Typically, formative peer feedback occurs at the beginning of learning to assess students' understanding. In contrast, summative peer feedback involves students assessing their peers as part of the conclusion of a learning unit (Sambell, 2013). To ensure the quality of summative peer feedback, teachers should familiarize students with similar activities prior to its implementation.

3.3. ICT selection in online peer feedback

Technology significantly impacts teaching methods, including the execution of peer feedback. This paper addresses the necessity of integrating technology into educational practices, recognizing that both teachers and students rely on technological tools to facilitate effective peer feedback. For example, the growing use of smartphones for educational purposes, as noted by Darko-Adjie (2019), enhances access to the internet and online learning platforms. Consequently, while practical issues related to technology and connectivity can pose challenges, the continual development and accessibility of technological resources are likely to minimize these barriers. As a result, these advancements should not significantly hinder the effectiveness or implementation of peer feedback processes.

However, another problem seems raising since the use of technology requires teachers to be more engaged with the technology. Since the presence of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) from Schmidt et al. (2009) teachers are required to have additional knowledge and skill among Pedagogical, Content, and Technological Knowledge. TPACK requires teachers not only knowing about technology, but also knows how to serve a content, run a class which is linked with the technology. In relation with the peer feedback, TPACK plays a significant role for navigating students to be able conduct online peer feedback.

An essential component of TPACK (Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge) for educators is the ability to select appropriate platforms for classroom activities. However, there is a prevailing perspective that pedagogy should take precedence over technology (Brennan, 2015; Papert, 1987). This perspective aims to counteract 'technocentrism,' which refers to the inclination to prioritize technology itself over pedagogical considerations (Brennan, 2015). Technocentrism can lead to a focus on technological practices at the expense of effective pedagogical methods. Nevertheless, Brennan (2015) acknowledges that technology can, in some contexts, appropriately take precedence if the learning objectives specifically promote technological engagement. Thus, when implementing online peer feedback, it is crucial to first establish the pedagogical approach and instructional plan before selecting the technological tools or platforms. By prioritizing the design and methodology of

the class, educators ensure that the chosen technology serves to enhance and support pedagogical goals rather than driving the instructional process. Once the pedagogical framework is in place, teachers can then proceed to select the most suitable platform or application to facilitate the peer feedback process.

Then, when it comes to deciding the tools, it should be fully considered. The different tools will give different result. For instance, van der Pol et al. (2008) found different result of students' response in using different tools, the used of blackboard-based platform proved that students' response to be more evaluative comments, while the Annotation system proved that students tend to be give suggestion for revision. On the other hand, a literature study revealed that in the las five years starting from 2016, the use of technology for giving feedback are categorized into several models which are peer interaction can be recognized as the synchronous or asynchronous; oral or written and the scheme can be noticed as web-based, learning management system, social media, and mobile mobile application (Priyantini, 2020).

Different stages of online peer feedback may require the use of various media, each suited to specific educational contexts. For instance, Learning Management Systems (LMS) are particularly well-suited for university-level interactions (Priyantini, 2020). However, other platforms and applications are also capable of supporting online peer feedback effectively. Over the past five years, social media platforms and collaborative tools such as Blackboard, alongside LMS and mobile applications, have been increasingly utilized for this purpose (Priyantini, 2020). It is important to note that the selection of a platform should prioritize the functionality of the application to ensure it meets the specific needs of the feedback process. According to van der Pol et al. (2008), providing interactive and functional tools can enhance the effectiveness of online peer feedback. Tools such as Padlet, Google Docs, Facebook, Twitter, and blogs have been shown to facilitate engaging and practical peer feedback (Luo, 2016; Sari, 2019; Xie et al., 2008; Yeh et al., 2019). Additionally, teachers must consider students' familiarity with the chosen applications. It is crucial to ensure that students are adequately introduced to and comfortable with the platform. Saeed (2018) recommends that teachers model the intended activity in front of students to familiarize them with the application and its functionalities. This approach helps mitigate any potential difficulties students might encounter and ensures a smoother implementation of the online peer feedback process.

3.4. Current response for the practice of peer feedback

Proponents of peer feedback highlight its potential to foster student interaction, collaboration, and engagement (Huisman et al., 2018; Smith, 2017). By providing feedback, students become more actively involved in their peers' work, examining content, context, methodologies, and analysis (Smith, 2017). When effectively implemented, peer feedback can enhance competence, collaboration, and interaction skills (Lerchenfeldt et al., 2019).

Research by Sivaci (2020) demonstrates the positive impact of peer feedback on reducing student anxiety related to writing. Additionally, students' writing performance improves as they gain exposure to diverse perspectives. Moreover, peer feedback can increase student participation as they actively engage in providing feedback. In conclusion, peer feedback offers several benefits, including activating student participation, enhancing competence, collaboration, and interaction skills, reducing writing anxiety, and improving writing performance.

Despite its numerous benefits, peer feedback is not without its challenges. Scholars have identified both practical and cultural drawbacks associated with peer feedback implementation. Rollinson (2005) highlights the time-consuming nature of peer feedback, which involves students actively preparing, providing, and responding to feedback. Additionally, pre-conditions for effective peer feedback can also be time-intensive. Furthermore, the quality of feedback and students' confidence have been identified as potential issues (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). From a cultural perspective, Kunwongse (2013) emphasizes the importance of self-respect in Asian contexts. This cultural value may influence students' reluctance to provide direct and critical feedback, potentially hindering their ability to offer constructive suggestions. As a result, the feedback provided may not have a significant impact on students' work at the conclusion of the session.

3.5. Current ICT-supported used in online peer feedback

The practice of online peer feedback has been noticed by some scholars having some responses and effects. The activity also had the side effect for students since the student had an easy access to access the knowledge, so the teacher did not pay attention on the students' burden when giving the students' work to be reviewed. Consequently, students argued that the feedback was not as they expected before. In other word, the quality of the feedback from each paper was different. As mentioned earlier, that collaborative activity becomes a key instrument in conducting peer feedback. Therefore, the choosing of ICT platform should be relied on it. In other words, the platforms are able provide students learning together at the same time.

Furthermore, some scholars have already noticed the positive impact of ICT towards peer feedback. For instance, Sari (2019) revealed the impact of Padlet as one of ICT tools to conduct peer feedback. Prior to that, Padlet is a free online application that is best illustrated as an online whiteboard. Padlet can be used by students and teachers to post notes on the same page. The result showed that students tended to put their preferences in using Padlet to give comment and suggestion for their peers. The next research is about the use of Google Docs as a part of Web2.0 for promoting the collaborative learning and peer feedback. Moreover, they added that the special features in Google Docs in which allow the participant to communicate in the chat room makes the collaboration alive.

Another ICT platform that can be used to promote peer feedback is blog. The opportunity and the wide access of a blog ease the students putting their comment and suggestion in the comment section in a blog to improve peers' writing quality. Xie et al. (2008) mentioned that the use of blog can improve students' reflective thinking. However, the need of clear instruction and teacher's guidance are a must to meet the goals. Surprisingly, writing is not one of skills to be improved using the combination of ICT and blog. In a sense, Yeh et al. (2019) found that blog can assist students to improve the speaking quality particularly in delivering materials. Moreover, the improvements could be noticed in their grammar and vocabulary used. Above all, all ICT platforms can be used to promote peer feedback activities. The possibilities appear when the students have a chance to collaborate with the others both directly and not directly at the same time.

However, the presence of ICT is not merely bringing a perfect learning situation. In some previous research mentioned that the use of ICT made the students' confused since the message and the comment can be rapidly appeared in their task (Braine, 2001). Additionally, another practical issue notices from the time consuming of doing peer feedback since there is no limitation in giving comment, post edit session can be more time consuming (Liu & Sadler, 2003). On the other hand, the affective issue also appears in integrating peer feedback and ICT in which heavy workload feeling from the students. Since the teachers have access to control the students' comment and work, the students have moral workload to present good feedback to their peers (Sengupta, 2001). The last is the technical issue in which related with the internet connection and the device where the online peer feedback relies on connection and device to access web 2.0 (Chen, 2014)

Noticing the previous research, to effectively implement online peer feedback, careful planning and preparation are essential. Teachers must establish clear guidelines and expectations for student participation during online feedback activities. Additionally, strategic distribution of student work is crucial to ensure equitable and high-quality feedback among peers. By considering these factors, teachers can create a conducive environment for meaningful online peer feedback interactions. This paper seeks to delve into the current state of peer feedback in EFL classrooms, identifying its challenges and proposing strategies for improvement. By examining the factors that hinder effective implementation, this study aims to provide practical guidance for teachers and researchers to overcome these obstacles and cultivate a more student-centered and collaborative learning environment.

3.6. Current practice of online peer feedback

This study explores the current practice of online peer feedback by examining previous related research in greater depth. It considers current conditions, such as the existing feedback models and students in learning environments.

3.6.1. Current practices: Method in the class

First, it is important to recognize that teachers play a dual role in the learning process—not just as facilitators but also as role models. This is especially relevant in the context of online peer feedback, where teachers are expected to provide examples of effective feedback. These examples serve as models for students, who may imitate and replicate them in their own feedback practices. Yang (2015) found that observing how more skilled writers work through giving and receiving peer feedback is an effective strategy for improving the quality of writing. The concept of peer guidance can be introduced alongside its practical implementation. In this context, teachers are expected to model effective feedback for students, as Yang (2015) highlighted that correcting grammar (local changes) and enhancing content, organization, and style (global changes) are some of the benefits of providing high-quality feedback through online peer feedback. Additionally, the study also identified two additional factors that may contribute to this process: first, providing scaffolding to support students' learning, and second, revisiting errors and mistakes after receiving feedback.

Still the current practice found in the teaching setting, another practice was found in which the teachers manipulate the condition of given feedback. In this sense, three types of feedback are possibly given for instance the unscripted, scripted and guided feedback. Unscripted feedback is spontaneous, informal, and not pre-planned. It is delivered in the moment, based on the observer's immediate reactions or observations. Example: A teacher gives immediate feedback to a student during class when they notice a mistake or success. Scripted feedback follows a predetermined script or framework. It is structured and often planned beforehand, typically to ensure clarity, uniformity, or adherence to specific criteria. Example: An evaluator uses a rubric with predefined comments to assess student work or performance. Guided feedback strikes a balance between unscripted and scripted feedback. It provides a structure or framework but allows for flexibility and adaptation to individual needs or contexts. Example: A teacher asks a student reflective questions like, "What do you think worked well in your essay?" before giving specific suggestions for improvement. Latifi et al. (2019) found that in a scripted condition, the students were able to reproduce and give better quality of the feedback to their peers. Thus, the practice of scripted feedback may be presented in online peer feedback.

The earlier discussion about scripted feedback aligns with the findings of Valero Haro et al. (2023), who explored the effects of direct and indirect feedback on students' writing. In their study, both types of feedback were shown to improve the quality of students' writing. Direct feedback involves providing specific corrections or explicit guidance, while indirect feedback encourages students to identify and correct their own mistakes based on hints or general comments. Interestingly, the study revealed that both approaches had a similarly positive impact on students' writing skills. This was further supported by the mean scores of the students, which showed no significant difference between the two methods. In other words, direct and indirect feedback were equally effective in enhancing students' writing

abilities. This suggests that either approach can be a valuable method in teaching writing which also depends on the context and the specific goals of the learning process.

Further, although online peer feedback has already connected with technology as the medium of provision, the advancement of technology has made it combined with the Artificial Intelligence. For instance, Sanosi (2022) included Grammarly AI-Powered Writing assistant in the process of students' writing. Such program is designed to assist learner, particularly on their writing error and grammatical error. Previously, a study by Shang (2019) compared and contrasted the online peer feedback (OPF) and Automated Corrective Feedback (ACF) to their impact in EFL learners writing particularly on their grammatical accuracy, sentence complexity, and vocabulary variation. The result revealed that ACF outperformed in enriching students' vocabulary, as for OPF, it assisted students to increase their writing quality, and trigger fewer grammatical error. Thus, the collaboration of AI-Powered writing program becomes the common practice found in ELT settings.

Online peer feedback extends beyond individual practices, with group-based approaches showing considerable potential for fostering collaboration. Su et al. (2022) examined the role of Group Awareness (GA) tools in enhancing student engagement during online collaborative language learning. Their study revealed that GA tools significantly increased student participation in the peer feedback process, encouraging them to be more actively involved. These tools also guided students to focus on providing detailed feedback, particularly on aspects such as grammar and meaning, ensuring a more comprehensive review. However, the use of GA tools had limited influence on how students utilized peer feedback to make revisions, especially in later stages of their work. Additionally, while students with access to GA tools reported feeling more motivated and engaged, the difference in motivation compared to students without these tools was not significant. This suggests that while GA tools enhance certain aspects of the peer feedback process, their overall impact on revision and motivation may vary. Briefly, grouping method also becomes the common and promising practice in online peer feedback.

3.6.2. Current practices: Students' variations

The current practices of online peer feedback are not limited to the method in the classroom. In some literatures, they noted that the students also can be modeled to gain and expand the benefits of online peer feedback in the classroom, especially in EFL settings. For instance, Kerman et al. (2022) examined the practice of online peer feedback among three categories of students: unsuccessful, less successful, and successful learners. The findings revealed distinct patterns in the type of feedback these groups received. Unsuccessful and less successful students were provided with more supportive (affective) and general (descriptive) feedback, which likely aimed to encourage and motivate them. In contrast, successful students received more specific, problem-focused feedback that targeted areas for improvement in their writing. These results highlight the significant role students play in

shaping the feedback process, as the type of feedback given appears to be influenced by the perceived ability of the recipient. This implies that peer feedback practices can be tailored to address the specific needs of different student groups. Also, teachers are expected to pay attention on the students' academic achievements.

Going further into the variations among students, Noorizi et al. (2024) investigated the relationship between students' perceived learning and actual learning during peer feedback on argumentative writing. Their study considered factors such as success level, education level, gender, and academic major to understand their influence. While this classification allowed for a nuanced analysis, the results ultimately showed that gender and academic major had no significant impact on students' perceived learning in the context of online peer feedback. This indicates that, despite demographic differences, the perceived benefits of peer feedback are shaped more by the feedback process itself than by these individual characteristics. It suggests that peer feedback can be equally effective across diverse groups.

In online peer feedback, the quality of feedback can be influenced by the relationships between students, as close connections within the class may lead to less honest critiques to preserve peer harmony. Recognizing this, Sha et al. (2022) explored whether anonymity impacts the feedback students provide. Their study revealed that anonymous peer feedback allows students to dig deeper into their evaluations by offering more detailed reviews and suggestions. Furthermore, the analysis demonstrated that feedback given anonymously tended to be more thoughtful (cognitive) and reflective (metacognitive), ultimately leading to higher-quality feedback. This suggests that anonymity can encourage students to provide more constructive and honest feedback, free from concerns about interpersonal dynamics.

4. Conclusion

The practice of online peer feedback has increasingly been shaped by technological advancements which made it a preferred method in EFL/ESL classrooms. Despite this, many implementations still reflect a teacher-centered approach, which may hinder the effectiveness of peer feedback. The transition from traditional classroom settings to online peer feedback introduces several challenges, including the roles of teachers, practical issues related to technology, and student concerns. This paper shows the current condition of the practice of online peer feedback in the realm of EFL setting. It was noted that during ten years-time spanning, the practices of online peer feedback have been multifarious and not only segmented on certain educational level. Also, as the time goes by, the response, ICT supported tools, the practices become fruitful with main variation in its practices. It is finally expected that this paper is able to assist teacher, practitioner in EFL setting to understand the current practice of online peer feedback. It also functions as the navigation to map their

selection and implementation to their provision of online peer feedback within classroom settings.

References

- Bader, M., Burner, T., Iversen, S. H., & Varga, Z. (2019). Student perspectives on formative feedback as part of writing portfolios. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1564811>
- Boud, D., and E. Molloy. (2013.) "Rethinking Models of Feedback for Learning: The Challenge of Design." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 38: 698–712. doi:10.1080/02602938.2012.691462
- Braine, G. (2001). A study of English as a foreign language (EFL) writer on a local-area network (LAN) and in traditional classes. *Computers and Composition*, 18, 275_292.
- Brennan, K. (2015). Beyond technocentrism: Supporting constructionism in the classroom. *Constructivist Foundations* 10 (3): 289–296.
- Butarbutar, R., Ruing, F. H., Basri, N., Tuharea, V. U., & Leba, S. M. R. (2023). Unpacking Online Collaborative Learning in Teaching EFL Speaking: Insights from Three Rural Area Case Studies. *The Qualitative Report*, 28(12), 3379-3401.
- Chen, T. (2014): Technology-supported peer feedback in ESL/ EFL writing classes: a research synthesis, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, DOI: 10.1080/09588221.2014.960942
- Choi, J. (2014). Online Peer Discourse in a Writing Classroom. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 26(2), 217-231.
- Darko-Adjei, N. (2019). The use and effect of smartphones in students' learning activities: Evidence from the University of Ghana, Legon.
- Elboshi, A. (2021). Web-Enhanced Peer Feedback in ESL Writing Classrooms a Literature Review. *English Language Teaching*, 14(4), 66-76.
- Gaynor, J. W. (2020). Peer review in the classroom: student perceptions, peer feedback quality and the role of assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(5), 758-775. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1697424>
- Elizondo-Garcia, J., & Gallardo, K. (2020). Peer Feedback in Learner-Learner Interaction Practices. Mixed Methods Study on an xMOOC. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 18(2), pp122-135.
- Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2020). The development of student feedback literacy: the influences of teacher feedback on peer feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(5), 680-696. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1689545>
- Harmer, J. (2001). The practice of English language teaching (4th ed). *Pearson*
- Huisman, B., Saab, N., van den Broek, P., & van Driel, J. (2019). The impact of formative

- peer feedback on higher education students' academic writing: a Meta-Analysis. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(6), 863-880.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1545896>
- Huisman, B., Saab, N., Van Driel, J., & Van Den Broek, P. (2018). Peer feedback on academic writing: undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(6), 955-968. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1424318>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39, 77-95. doi:10.1017/S0261444806003399
- Irfani, B., & O'Boyle, A. (2024). Teacher practices and student preferences of oral corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A Vygotskian perspective. *Training, Language and Culture*, 8(1), 101-114.
- Jacobs, G., & Chau, M. H. (2021). Two Approaches for Promoting Student Centered Language Learning: Cooperative Learning and Positive Psychology. *Beyond Words*, 9(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.33508/bw.v9i1.3042>
- Jayusna, S. R., Asih, Y. U., & Suhatmady, B. (2022). Depiction of Role and Power in EFL Teachers' Lesson Plans. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 2(3), 242-247.
- Kerman, N. T., Noroozi, O., Banihashem, S. K., Karami, M., & Biemans, H. J. (2024). Online peer feedback patterns of success and failure in argumentative essay writing. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 32(2), 614-626.
- Kulkarni, C., Wei, K. P., Le, H., Chia, D., Papadopoulos, K., Cheng, J., Koller, D. and Klemmer, S. R., (2013.) Peer and self-assessment in massive online classes. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)*, 20(6), pp.1-31.
- Kunwongse, S. (2013). Peer feedback, benefits and drawbacks. *Thammasat Review*, 16(3), 277-288.
- Latifi, S., Noroozi, O., Hatami, J., & Biemans, H. J. (2021). How does online peer feedback improve argumentative essay writing and learning?. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 58(2), 195-206.
- Le, H., Janssen, J., & Wubbels, T. (2018). Collaborative learning practices: teacher and student perceived obstacles to effective student collaboration. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 48(1), 103-122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2016.1259389>
- Lerchenfeldt, S., Mi, M., & Eng, M. (2019). The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. *BMC medical education*, 19(1), 1-10. doi:10.1186/s12909-019-1755-z
- Liu, N. F., & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: the learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher education*, 11(3), 279-290.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582>
- Liu, J., & R. Sadler (2003). The effect and affect of peer review in electronic versus

- traditional modes on L2 writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2, 193–227.
- Luo, T. (2016). Enabling microblogging-based peer feedback in face-to-face classrooms. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 53(2), 156–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2014.995202>
- Min, H. T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System* 33.2, 293–308
- Najafi, H., Rolheiser, C., Harrison, L. and Haklev, S., (2015). University of Toronto instructors' experiences with developing MOOCs. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 16(3).
- Naylor, R., Baik, C., Asmar, C., & Watty, K. (2014). Good Feedback Practices: Prompts and Guidelines for Reviewing and Enhancing Feedback for Students. *Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education*.
- Noroozi, O., Alqassab, M., Taghizadeh Kerman, N., Banihashem, S. K., & Panadero, E. (2024). Does perception mean learning? Insights from an online peer feedback setting. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1-15.
- Papert, S. (1987). "Information Technology and Education: Computer Criticism vs. Technocentric Thinking." *Educational Researcher*. 16 (1): 22–30.
- Priyantini, T. (2021). Technology-supported peer feedback: a literature review. *JETLi | Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics Studies*, 3(1), 1-14.
- Rizqiyyah, R., & Prianty, T. (2020). An analysis of focused metalinguistic written feedback: How would learners react?. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 8(1), 44-57. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v8i1.5972>
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class. *ELT Journal* 59 (1), 23-30. DOI: 10.1093/elt/cci003
- Saeed, M. A., Ghazali, K., Sahuri, S. S., & Abdulrab, M. (2018). Engaging EFL learners in online peer feedback on writing: What does it tell us? *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 17, 039–061. <https://doi.org/10.28945/3980>
- Sambell, K., L. McDowell, and C. Montgomery. (2013). *Assessment for learning in higher education*. Routledge
- Sanosi, A. B. (2022). The impact of automated written corrective feedback on efl learners' academic writing accuracy. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 301-317.
- Sari, A. B. P. (2019). EFL peer feedback through the chatroom in Padlet. *LLT Journal*, 22(1), 46-57. DOI: doi.org/10.24071/llt.2019.220105
- Schmidt, D. A., Baran, E., Thompson, A. D., Mishra, P., Koehler, M. J., & Shin, T. S. (2009). Technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) the development and validation of an assessment instrument for preservice teachers. *Journal of research on Technology in Education*, 42(2), 123-149.

-
- Sengupta, S. (2001). Exchanging ideas with peers in network-based classrooms: An aid or a pain? *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(1), 103_134. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/vol5num1/sengupta/default.html>
- Sha, L., Wang, X., Ma, S., & Mortimer, T. A. (2022). Investigating the effectiveness of anonymous online peer feedback in translation technology teaching. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 16(3), 325-347.
- Shang, H. F. (2022). Exploring online peer feedback and automated corrective feedback on EFL writing performance. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 30(1), 4-16.
- Sivaci, S. (2020). The Effects of Peer Feedback on Writing Anxiety Levels of Pre-Service English Teachers. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 20(2), 131-139.
- Smith, D. A. (2017). Collaborative Peer Feedback. *International Association for Development of the Information Society*.
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of business research*, 104, 333-339.
- Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 1.3, 217– 233.
- Su, Y., Ren, J., & Song, X. (2024). The effects of group awareness tools on student engagement with peer feedback in online collaborative writing environments. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 32(5), 1907-1923.
- Valero Haro, A., Noroozi, O., Biemans, H. J., Mulder, M., & Banihashem, S. K. (2024). How does the type of online peer feedback influence feedback quality, argumentative essay writing quality, and domain-specific learning?. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 32(9), 5459-5478.
- van der Pol, J., van den Berg, B. A. M., Admiraal, W. F., & Simons, P. R. J. (2008). The nature, reception, and use of online peer feedback in higher education. *Computers and Education*, 51(4), 1804–1817. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2008.06.001>
- Walker, R., & Rocha da Silva, P. (2015). Emerging trends in peer review—a survey. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 9, 169.
- Xie, Y., Ke, F., & Sharma, P. (2008). The effect of peer feedback for blogging on college students' reflective learning processes. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 11(1), 18–25. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2007.11.001
- Yang, Y. F. (2016). Transforming and constructing academic knowledge through online peer feedback in summary writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(4), 683-702.
- Yeh, H. C., Tseng, S. S., & Chen, Y. S. (2019). Using online peer feedback through Blogs to promote speaking performance. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 22(1), 1-14.
- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Peer feedback in second language writing (2005–2014). *Language*

Teaching, 49(4), 461-493.doi:10.1017/S026144481600016

Yufrizal, H., & Sinaga, T. (2021). A quasi experimental Study on google classroom mediated peer assessment of English subject at high school in Indonesia. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*

Zhu, Q., & Carless, D. (2018). Dialogue within peer feedback processes: Clarification and negotiation of meaning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 37(4), 883-897. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2018.1446417>

Zhu, W. (1995). Effects of training for peer response on students' comments and interaction. *Written Communication* 12.4, 492–528.