Linnæus University
Sweden

Independent project in Educational linguistics

Peer Feedback in the EFL Classroom
A Systematic Literature Review of Practices, Effects and Perceptions

Author: Johanna Carling
Supervisor: Charlotte Hommerberg
Examiner: Marie Källkvist
Term: VT21
Subject: English
Level: Advanced
Course code: 4ENÄ2E

Abstract

This systematic literature review investigates peer feedback in EFL education. Findings on practices, effects and teacher- and student perceptions of peer feedback are drawn together and thereby a multifaceted understanding of the phenomenon in EFL-related research is offered. The purpose of the study is to review and systematize previous research in order to enhance the understanding of peer feedback practices, effects and perceptions. Ten articles of practices, effects and perceptions were selected for this systematic literature review. The findings indicate that peer feedback is effective as it contributes to students' written and oral L2 development. Organized feedback from teachers is more effectful as it gives learners clear instructions of what to focus on. Therefore, the teacher has an important role in peer feedback practices in order to make it as efficient as possible. Teacher- and student perceptions were both positive and negative. Teachers reported learners' ability to identify errors in peer's performance as a benefit. Yet, lack of knowledge, incompatibility with the educational system and learners' low proficiency level were reported motives for not using peer feedback in their EFL classroom. Students perceived peer feedback as useful as it improved their L2 learning. Organized peer feedback was particularly highlighted. Lack of confidence due to limited proficiency level, interpersonal relationships, motivation and time were reported as difficulties in peer feedback practices. Further research in the field of the teacher role in peer feedback is requested.

Key words

Peer feedback, English as a foreign language (EFL), teachers' perceptions, students' perceptions

Acknowledgments

Thank you to my supervisor Charlotte Hommerberg for the commitment and guidance through this project.

Linnæus University
Sweden

Table of contents

Appendices

1 Introduction

One approach to activate students' involvement in evaluation and assessment practices is peer feedback. Peer feedback is one common form of assessment that requires learners to give and receive feedback such as comments, suggestions and corrections to their peer's performance (The Swedish National Agency for Education, 2021). The objectives of peer feedback are to activate students as resources to one another in order to promote opportunities for improvement in their own performance. Therefore, the purpose of implementing feedback is not only to evaluate and promote the recipient's learning but also to evaluate and promote one's own learning (Berggren, 2019).

To employ peer feedback activities in teaching is promoted in the steering documents for Swedish upper secondary school, which explain that the insight and process of a peer's work should increase students' understanding of a specific task in relation to the intended learning objectives (The Swedish National Agency for Education, 2021). Furthermore, peer feedback aims to profit students' learning outcomes by accessing a peer's work. This is claimed by The Swedish National Agency for Education (2021) which explains peer feedback to enable learners to retrieve inspiration of, for example, how a specific task can be solved. Black & Wiliam (2009) also argue for peer feedback to enable learners to "[g]ive and receive feedback of different character than the one given by the teacher.". In addition, Berggren (2019) highlights the effectiveness of peer feedback in the classroom as there are more students than teachers in the classroom.

To provide and receive critical feedback constructively can be a challenge in the peer feedback approach (Lauvås & Jönsson, 2019). Furthermore, as peer feedback can be a sensitive matter, it is important to maintain a harmonious and unprejudiced classroom environment (McMillan, 2018). The teacher thus has a complex role in order for peer feedback to function optimally. It is essential that teachers create an appropriate classroom atmosphere, identify tasks and activities that are suitable for peer feedback in a particular school subject and train students to become good peer feedback givers and recipients.

Peer feedback has received extensive attention in research in the 20th century. Sebba, Crick, Yu, Lawson, Harlen & Durant (2008) conducted a systematic literature review analyzing 20 empirical studies in order to investigate the effects of self- and peer feedback. Findings showed positive outcomes in 17 of the 20 studies, such as clarified criteria and increased responsibility over students' own learning. Moreover, students' self-esteem and engagement in the task increased due to the impact of self and peer assessment. One important finding was that the classroom atmosphere had an important effect on students' learning outcomes.

Sebba et al.'s review covered empirical research on all areas of the curriculum. In contrast, this literature review focuses on research on peer feedback in EFL teaching more specifically. In order to optimize students' learning outcomes in the EFL classroom, it is of importance and interest to gain a multifaceted understanding of previous research on peer feedback in EFL-related research. Such enhanced understanding can help teachers choose, employ and organize peer feedback activities in ways that suit their EFL classroom.

1.1   Aim and Research questions

The aim of the present study is to enhance our understanding of peer feedback practices, effects and perceptions by offering a systematic review of the research literature on peer feedback in EFL education. The following research questions function to guide the investigation of the findings of previous research:

- What kinds of learning activities involve peer feedback activities in EFL education?
- What are the effects of peer feedback on EFL students' learning?
- How do teachers perceive peer feedback in EFL education?
- How do students perceive peer feedback in EFL education?

This systematic review also offers an overview of the contexts where previous studies have been performed, the participants involved, the theoretical underpinnings of previous studies and the methods used to collect and analyze data. This review also discusses the implications of previous research for the upper secondary EFL teaching in Sweden.

2 Theoretical and Contextual Background

This section describes key concepts which will be encountered in the theoretical background and literature review. In addition, inclusion of EFL practices in Swedish school context such as descriptions of the steering documents and guidelines for integrating peer feedback in EFL teaching in Sweden will be presented. At last, the theoretical approach of this study will be presented and explained.

2.1 Peer feedback

Peer feedback implicates the activity between peers in which they gather information of a peer's work to then provide and receive comments, suggestions and corrections to their peer's performance (The Swedish National Agency for Education, 2021). Peer feedback transpires in written or oral form and occurs in pairs or small groups (Liu & Hansen, 2002). The aim of peer feedback is to activate learners as resources to one another to improve their individual performance by providing and receiving feedback (The Swedish National Agency for Education, 2021). Peer feedback is also referred to as 'peer review' (Berggren, 2015), and 'peer assessment' (Birjandi & Tamjid, 2012; Black & Wiliam, 2009; Mok, 2011; Panadero & Brown, 2017; Zhao, 2018).

Peer feedback can be employed in various forms such as communicative interaction between learners in pairs or groups. Peer feedback can also be employed anonymously which means that feedback comments and suggestions are provided and received from an anonymous peer or in groups. In peer feedback activities the teacher is minimally present or absent (Philp, Adams & Iwashita, 2014).

In research, peer feedback is commonly referred to as 'peer assessment' (Birjandi & Tamjid, 2012; Black & Wiliam, 2009; Mok, 2011; Panadero & Brown, 2017; Zhao, 2018). The word assessment can be loaded as it is often associated with grades. However, peer assessment does not necessarily entail grades. Peer feedback is one form of assessment as learners assess each other's performance (Black & Wiliam, 2009). Peer assessment is an ongoing process of activity that requires learners to gather information of a peer's work in order to give further comments of what can be improved (Hirsh, 2017). Gathering information of a work is to make an assessment. Therefore, the

assessment is necessary in order to provide feedback. In brief, assessment is required in order to give feedback, but does not necessarily entail grades.

2.2 EFL in Swedish school context

2.2.1 The steering documents in Sweden

The importance of integrating peer feedback in teaching practices is stressed in the steering documents in Sweden. In the curriculum Lgy11 (The Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011a), the importance of students' involvement in learning and assessment practices is highlighted. Educational objectives indicate that students should: "[…] take responsibility over their own learning through assessment practices and processing their own and others' performance" (The Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011a). These notions are in line with Black & Wiliam (2009) who claim students' involvement in the learning and assessment practices to be central in order to develop their learning.

To integrate peer feedback is also implicitly promoted in the syllabi for English at Swedish upper secondary school as learners should interact with each other and use strategies to evaluate language and content in their own and others' speech and writing communications (The Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011b). These learning objectives are in line with the implementation of peer feedback, as peer feedback activities most often involve evaluation, interaction and communication in speech and writing between peers.

The Swedish National Agency for Education (2021) provides available guidelines for integrating peer feedback in teaching. In peer feedback activities, students be given organized directions of how the feedback should be provided. These directions could be organized in terms of checklists, marking guides, matrices and similar. The organized directions such as clarification of requirements, criteria and guidelines for how the peer feedback should be employed are teachers' responsibility. Therefore, the teacher's role is important in feedback activities even though the giving and receiving feedback is between students (The Swedish National Agency for Education, 2021).

To organize peer feedbæck should give students an understanding of what aspects of content, language and structure should be given attention in the peer feedback process, as

well as in their own performance. These organized directions can beneficially be designed in cooperation with the students (The Swedish National Agency for Education, 2021).

2.3 Sociocultural Theory

As it is assumed that learning will take place in a social environment in collaboration with peers, this study links the peer feedback concept to Sociocultural Theory.

Vygotskij (1978), one of the most influential psychologists, developed a sociocultural theory that over time has been interpreted and modified by other psychologists. Yet, the fundamental idea remains the same; linguistic and social interaction are fundamental pillars in learning and knowledge development. Thus, learning occurs between human beings and their social environment (Holt, 2015). From this point of view, interaction, communication and participation in peers or groups play an essential role in EFL learning.

Sociocultural Theory and its approach are influential in the steering documents for Swedish education (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011a). In the curriculum for elementary- and upper secondary school, students are encouraged to work collaboratively which should enhance students' learning. Enhanced learning should occur in social interaction and collaborative work where students can see qualities and potential in each other's performance, and accordingly create new knowledge together (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011a).

Scaffolding is one central concept in sociocultural theory (Holt, 2015). Scaffolding is a learning technique in which a learner is dependent on another learner who has prior knowledge and competence in the field. Thus, learning occurs through social interaction as learners act as 'scaffolders' to one another (Holt, 2015). In addition, teacher scaffolding becomes important as well. The teacher is most often the primary source of knowledge and is therefore an important role in learning and scaffolding strategies. In terms of peer feedback, the teacher's role is to cater organization and structure in order to create as purposive outcome of the activities as possible, which can be linked to teacher scaffolding (Berggren, 2019).

3 Method and Material

This section provides information about the method used in this study: data retrieval and collection, selection of materials and data analysis procedures. This section also includes ethical considerations.

3.1 Method

Since the topic of peer feedback has been researched extensively, this study is designed as a systematic literature review. Therefore, it was suitable to systematically compile, analyze and review the research available in the field (Denscombe, 2014:134). Key factors in the process of systematic literature reviews are to search for the most relevant literature in the field, review the literature using a set of criteria and present results, discussion and conclusion with an objective eye and analysis of the selected material (Denscombe, 2014:132-133).

3.2 Data collection

At an early stage of the project process, the university library's expertise was consulted to ensure optimal search strategies. Search strategies were suggested in terms of appropriate search words and ERIC (*Educational Resources Information Center*) and Google Scholar were identified as the most relevant databases in the initial stage of this project. These databases include publications in didactics and pedagogy and were therefore suitable for this research. Furthermore, most of the publications are accessible in English. Thesaurus was used in order to widen the research scope with a variety of search words. The search words used in the search were "peer feedback", "peer assessment", "English language teaching" and "English as a foreign language". The search words were used in different combinations in order to widen the research scope, yet to limit the number of hits in order to specify and direct the search towards the most relevant publications for the objectives. With this approach, the number of hits could decrease from 6000 hits to 200 hits by using different combinations of the selected search words, which facilitated the selection process. The research publications were limited to peer reviewed research articles with a timeline between 2008-2021. Peer reviewed research was important as articles in scientific publications have been reviewed by experts in the field. The timeline was determined according to Sebba et al.'s (2008) extensive literature review that covers research until 2008. In contrast, this study will include research conducted after 2008. Appendix 1 provides a list of all the primary searches, databases and limitations.

The reference lists of the selected articles were used to search for additional material (Eriksson Barajas et al., 2013:69). Materials that seemed relevant at first glance were manually searched for in the databases. The list of manual searches is provided in Appendix 1.

Categorization scheme 1 (see appendix 2) gives an overview of the literature content of the selected articles. At this point, most of the selected materials covered the effects of peer feedback, yet teachers' perceptions and students' perceptions were lacking in the literature content of this study. Therefore, a regression to the initial search stage was necessary. In combination with "peer feedback" and "English as a foreign language", additional search words such as "teachers' perceptions" and "students' perceptions" were then used. Also, the timeline limit was removed, and searches were conducted in ERIC and Google Scholar.

3.3 Material selection

About 60 abstracts were read from the different combined searches, and 18 of these were selected for the next stage. The next stage required to thoroughly read the articles in order to select which sources to include in the review. This stage of the selection process resulted in a collection of 12 articles, which were processed and systematically coded into a first categorization scheme (see appendix 2). The coding was done in accordance with Eriksson Barajas et al's. (2013:26-27) guidelines for assessing quality and critically valuing the material included in the study. In this phase, two articles were excluded. The two studies that were deselected (Sippel, 2020; Panadero & Brown, 2017) provided good conclusions related to the research criteria for this study; however, they did not fully satisfy the criteria as their findings did not relate to English language teaching. All of the 12 initially selected articles are presented in the first categorization scheme (see appendix 2) which distinguishes articles that did not satisfy the criteria and explains why.

A total of ten articles focusing on peer feedback in English language teaching were selected for this systematic literature review. Articles included are presented in categorization scheme 2 (see appendix 3). Since the selection process had as primary target the topic of investigation rather than the empirical methods used, the resulting selection of articles draws on a range of different empirical research methods.

3.4 Research ethics

Ethical considerations are important when conducting a systematic literature review. First of all, the selected studies need to have approval from the ethical committee, which is one of Eriksson Barajas et al.'s (2013:69) guidelines. All the selected articles include human participants and therefore an ethical discussion is available in all articles. All the studies have adhered to general research ethics standards such as consent from participants, guaranteed anonymity and guaranteed confidentially (The Swedish Research Council, 2002).

As for this study, an impartial approach to the previous research is guaranteed as the literature review includes various studies and the author is free from any preconceived ideology. All studies are presented objectively (Eriksson Barajas et al. 2013:70).

In order to avoid bias, transparency is guaranteed in the search, selection and analysis of materials. Transparency is a quality principle that is important, and each section of the method and materials are enunciated in detail to facilitate the understanding of the process for the reader (Denscombe, 2014:137).

3.5 Material

Ten articles were selected to be included in this systematic literature review. The articles constitute a combination of peer feedback investigations and were analyzed in relation to the research questions of this review. The articles chosen were published after 2008 and accordingly cover research in the field published after 2008 and up until today in order to ensure relevant and up-to-date research.

The initial ambition was to aim attention towards research in upper secondary EFL education in European contexts. However, due to the limited amount of literature in this context, the study was broadened beyond Europe. Therefore, most of the studies reported on here were conducted in Asia (Birjandi & Tamjid, 2012; Kusumaningrum, Cahvono & Pravogo, 2019; Okyar & Eksi, 2019; Jingjing & Fengying, 2015; Singh & Tan, 2017; Mok, 2011;Wang, 2013; Zhao, 2018), one study is conducted in the U.S.(Lundstrom & Baker, 2009) and one study is conducted in Sweden (Berggren, 2015). Most of the studies

were conducted at university level, and three studies are conducted at lower- and secondary level. In the discussion section, the findings from the literature review will be related to EFL upper secondary education in Swedish context, and their relevance will be discussed in relation to this level and context. In appendix 3, a content category scheme is presented providing information of each study's educational level, empirical method, size, theoretical underpinnings, results and conclusions.

3.3   Data Analysis Method

The method of data analysis used is content analysis and follows an analysis of four steps (Denscombe, 2014:283). In accordance with the first two steps of the analysis, the selected materials were thoroughly processed and investigated in order to divide the content into units. Furthermore, core features and patterns were identified that will answer the research questions of this study which are step three and four in the content analysis. In this sense, the materials have been systematically coded in a content categorization scheme (see appendix 2, 3) (Denscombe, 2014:284). Categorization scheme 1 (see appendix 2) was created as an initial step of the analysis and shows features of education level, empirical method, country and year. It also presents an overview of what the articles cover in relation to the research questions (e.g., learning activities, effects, teachers' perceptions and students' perceptions). Categorization scheme 2 (see appendix 3) offers a closer and more detailed presentation of the selected articles as it additionally provides content categories consisting of participants, size, theoretical underpinnings and purposes and summaries of each article. According to Eriksson Barajas (2013:146), the content categories schemes are prominent in systematic literature reviews as they facilitate the writing of results for the author and enhances the reading experience for the reader. Content categories schemes make the literature review findings intelligible (Eriksson Barajas et al. 2013:146).

4   Results

The results have been thematized in relation to the research questions and organized under separate sections treating learning activities, effects, teachers' perceptions and students' perceptions. A summary of the results is provided at the end of this section.

4.1 Learning activities involving peer feedback

The investigation of the studies included in this review showed a majority of peer feedback in writing activities. Seven studies investigated peer feedback in writing activities (Berggren, 2015; Birjandi & Tajmid, 2012; Kusumanigrum et al. 2019; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Singh & Tan, 2017; Wang, 2013; Zhao, 2018). Okyar & Eksi (2019) and Mok (2011) investigated peer feedback in both speaking and writing, and Jinjing & Fengying (2015) investigated peer feedback only in speaking activities. From this research overview, it is shown that the interest of peer feedback tends to be connected to writing activities. According to these findings, it can be assumed that writing activities are the primary activities involving peer feedback in EFL education.

4.1.1 Organization in writing activities

The feedback writing activities in the reviewed research are organized and employed in various forms. Berggren (2015), Birjandi & Tamjid (2012) and Wang (2013) investigated organized feedback provided to the students in terms of feedback criteria such as checklists, instructional rubric guidance, evaluation schemes and other peer-marking instruments. These organizations helped students to direct attention to specific features and suggest solutions to identified issues in the written texts. The feedback criteria were developed by the teacher or the students in accordance with the teacher, and included features as organization, content, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics. Singh & Tan's (2017) and Lundstrom & Baker's (2009) studies were also organized with feedback criteria. However, there was no peer interaction in the activities as the peers' identities were kept anonymous in Singh & Tan's study, and the group of giving feedback and the group of receiving feedback were separated in Lundstrom & Baker's study. Thus, the peer feedback was only in written form in these studies. As for Berggren (2015) and Wang (2013), the feedback was given in both written and oral forms. Birjandi & Tamjid (2012) investigated self-assessment, teacher assessment and peer feedback using experimental methods. Hence, the form of giving and receiving feedback (i.e., written or oral) was exercised differently in each experimental group. The groups using self-assessment and teacher assessment did not receive oral feedback. Only the group exercising peer feedback received both written and oral forms of feedback.

Kusumaningrum et al.'s (2019) study investigated peer feedback in writing activity with oral feedback in full class or in smaller groups. The feedback in this study was not organized in terms of peer feedback criteria.

4.1.2 Organization in speaking activities

Okyar & Eksi (2019) investigated how to organize and provide peer feedback in speaking activities in order to improve grammatical accuracy in oral and written performance. The peer feedback activities were designed as communicative group tasks where the students were assigned to provide and receive feedback to each other. How the feedback was provided in the groups differed depending on which experimental group the students participated in. Okyar & Eksi's study is similar to Jingjing & Fengying's (2015) study as the intention was to investigate how speaking activities should be organized. However, Jinjing & Fengying investigated students' perceptions of peer feedback in speaking activities and not the effects. In order to investigate what forms of feedback were most preferred amongst the students, different learning activities including communicative activities were conducted.

4.2 The effects of peer feedback

In this review, five studies investigated the effects of peer feedback; Berggren, 2015; Birjandi & Tamjid, 2012; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Kusumaningrum et al., 2019; Singh & Tan, 2017). The findings in Berggren's (2015) study indicate that peer feedback improves L2 writing. This is shown by an experimental design as the students provided useful feedback to their peer's written assignment and properly received the feedback in order to revise their assignment into an improved second draft. These findings are in line with Singh & Tan's (2017) study which is also of experimental design and structured in a similar manner. Their findings indicate that peer feedback is beneficial in order to improve students' writing proficiency.

Birjandi & Tamjid (2012) compared peer feedback with self-assessment and teacher assessment by an experimental design in order to investigate which type of activity was more effectful in terms of improving writing. The findings revealed that peer feedback and self-assessment together with teacher assessment showed the maximum improvement in L2 writing. Only teacher assessment was less beneficial.

In addition to comparing different feedback activities, Kusumaningrum et al. (2019) were interested in investigating whether in-class feedback or small group feedback were more beneficial than the other in terms of improving L2 writing. The findings showed that the students improved their writing performance in both feedback activities. However, there was no peer feedback activity that was more effective than the other.

Based on the assumption that peer feedback is effectful in order to improve writing proficiency, Lundstrom & Baker (2009) investigated whether it was more effective to provide feedback to peers or to receive feedback from peers. From an experimental study design, the results revealed that students who provided feedback improved their own writing performance more than students who received feedback. The authors explain the results with transferrable skills that the students develop when providing feedback, which will subsequently be useful in their own writing performance. Notable from this study is that the students providing feedback with lower L2 proficiency improved their own writing more than the students with higher L2 proficiency.

4.2.1 Language areas of improvement

Few of the reviewed studies could discern which language areas improved the most from peer feedback. Aspects included were global aspects such as organization, structure and content, and local aspects such as vocabulary, grammar and mechanics. In Berggren's (2015) study, content showed to be most beneficial from peer feedback activities and local aspects less beneficial. These results are in line with Lundstrom & Baker's (2009) study that also revealed content and other global aspects to be most beneficial in terms of L2 writing improvement. In contrast, Singh & Tan (2017) who conducted a similar study as Berggren (2015), indicated that the most beneficial area was local aspects and less beneficial was global aspects. Berggren (2015) explains the findings in her study by the instructions and purpose of the assignment that focused more on audience awareness (content) rather than language features.

More than language areas, Berggren (2015) found students' transferring of ideas to their own writing as an effect of peer feedback, and Birjandi & Tamjid (2012) found that peer feedback entails critical and analytical thinking in students' own writing performance.

4.2.2 Organization of peer feedback

Most of the reviewed studies included organized peer feedback activities such as checklists, marking guides, rubrics or other feedback criteria that help learners know what to focus on when providing and receiving peer feedback. These studies present findings that show organized peer feedback to be effectful: Berggren, 2015; Birjandi & Tamjid, 2012; Wang, 2013; Singh & Tan, 2017; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009. In contrast, Kusumaningrum et al. (2019) do not include organized feedback criteria in their study of effects of peer feedback. However, the results showed to be effectful as well. As the power of organized feedback was unclear, Okyar & Eksi (2019) investigated how peer feedback should be organized in order to improve grammatical competence in speaking and writing. An experimental design was conducted in which the PI group did not receive any feedback training, the PI+Recast group was trained to give recast (i.e. giving the right answer), and the PI+ MF group trained to give comments or information to the error without explicitly giving the correct answer. The findings in this study showed that the PI+recast and the PI+MF group improved their grammatical competence better than the PI group as the PI+recast and PI+MF groups later were able to assimilate the feedback to improve their own performance in writing and speaking. There was no significant difference between giving recast and giving comments related to the errors. These results indicate that peer feedback improves learners' grammatical competence, but organized peer feedback improves grammatical competence more. The author explains that organized peer feedback improves learners' grammatical competence as learners know what to focus on when providing and receiving peer feedback.

4.3 Teacher perceptions of using peer feedback

Few studies have been conducted to investigate teachers' perceptions of the use of peer feedback in the EFL classroom. Therefore, Zhao (2019) conducted an interview study investigating university teachers' perceptions of implementing peer feedback in writing activities in China. The findings show that teachers do not use peer feedback due to lack of knowledge, incompatibility with the education system, learners' proficiency level and learners' low motivation.

Firstly, the teachers argued for limited instructions and narrow understanding of the purpose and implementation of peer feedback. Therefore, they were not willing to use it. Moreover, education in China is examination-oriented which means that students' grades

are based on their performance on high-stake examinations, and the examinations are based on the syllabus. Due to this educational system, teachers perceived using peer feedback less effective and very time-consuming as the priority was to cover the syllabus before the exams. Therefore, peer feedback was perceived to be incompatible with the examination-oriented education system. Furthermore, China is dominated by a teacher-driven pedagogy which allows teachers to control and govern the syllabus content within the limited period of time. The interviewees explained that learner-centered activities would interrupt this control. In addition to teacher-driven pedagogy, all teachers were convinced that peer feedback would be difficult due to students' lack of confidence and experience in learner-centered activities.

All teachers but two explained that the learners' English proficiency level was too low to give and receive peer feedback. This was specially emphasized amongst the teachers who had groups with lower proficiency level. In addition, due to low proficiency level, the teachers assumed that learners had low motivation and commitment to peer feedback activities.

None of the participating teachers wanted to use peer feedback in the EFL classroom. However, beyond the listed challenges of implementing peer feedback, the teachers cited one beneficial opportunity: Learners could identify some errors such as spelling and grammar in peer's written texts. However, the teachers did not mention opportunities for the students to improve their own writing performance in the feedback process, which was suggested in Lundstrom & Baker's (2009) study, or developing of critical thinking as in Berggren's (2015) study.

As a response to the results, Zhao (2019) suggests to train and engage teachers in how to implement and organize peer feedback activities. With clear purpose and instructions, the teachers might find peer feedback effective and useful in EFL education.

4.4   Student perceptions of using peer feedback

In section 4.2, the presented results are actual effects. In this section, results of students' *perceived* effects will be presented. Therefore, the effect is not tested.

The findings in Jingjing & Fengying's (2015) study indicate that students perceived peer feedback as positive and effective since feedback activities improved their oral language skills. This was shown in a 10-week oral English class in China where students interacted with multiple peers in feedback activities. Jinjing & Fengying's results are in line with Mok's (2011) Chinese study that accordingly indicates that students perceive peer feedback as positive and effective in terms of improving and developing oral and written language skills. Singh & Tan (2017) also investigated Malaysian students' perceptions of peer feedback in writing activities. The questionnaires revealed that students had a positive attitude towards using peer feedback as they believed it improved their written language skills.

In contrast, Wang's (2013) study showed that Chinese students did not perceive peer feedback as very useful. The study intended to investigate students' perceptions of using peer feedback and how this perception changed over time. The findings revealed that students' perceptions of the use of peer feedback decreased over time.

4.4.1 The value of organized peer feedback

In the reviewed articles, it is shown that students perceive organized peer feedback such as guidelines and feedback criteria as useful (Jingjing & Fengying, 2015; Singh & Tan, 2017; Wang, 2013). In Wang's (2013) study, the students' perceptions of the usefulness of peer feedback decreased over time. This was shown by a ten-week period of which students worked with peer feedback processes involving instructions, training, drafts and revisions of drafts. The questionnaire of student perceptions revealed that students found peer feedback more useful in the beginning of the period than in the end of the period in terms of language improvement. Yet, the interview data showed that students discerned some possibilities of using peer feedback such as the rubric. The rubric served as a guide of clear instructions including criteria of content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. This perception of useful guidelines is in line with the results in Singh & Tan's (2017) study, which investigated students' perceptions of structured feedback and found that the students perceived guidelines as useful. These guidelines included instructions and criteria of content, organization, grammar and vocabulary. Furthermore, the students were confident in providing feedback as comments and suggestions and in receiving accurate feedback as the guidelines were designed by the subject expert.

In Jingjing & Fengying's (2015) study, the aim was to explore if any types of peer feedback guided tools were more effective than others in terms of improving oral presentation. The students were given three different types of feedback guided tools with different focus. The results showed that the grading sheet on peers' performance that focused on organization of language was most welcomed as a guided tool. The qualitative feedback sheet focusing on details and suggestions for revision came second. Lastly, the students preferred checklists on peers' performance focusing on content. Thus, it was shown that students perceived feedback guided tools useful to varying degrees. However, no student perceived any feedback guided tool as not useful at all.

4.4.2 Perceived improvement in students' own performance

A recurring perception in the reviewed articles is students' own learning promotion as they transfer ideas, reflection and knowledge to their own learning from providing feedback (Mok, 2011; Singh & Tan, 2017). In Mok's (2011) study, students perceived improvement of their own writing performance as they activated their thinking, reflection and transfer of ideas by identifying errors, mistakes and providing suggestions for improvement to their peers. In Singh & Tan's (2017) study, the students accordingly perceived improved own writing performance as they could identify strengths and weaknesses in their own writing through giving peer feedback. Thus, students perceive peer feedback as effective and useful in terms of improving their own language skills.

In the reviewed studies that include students' perceptions of peer feedback, students reported low proficiency level as a challenge in providing and receiving peer feedback (Jinjing & Fengying, 2015; Mok, 2011; Singh & Tan, 2017; Wang, 2013). Mok (2011) reported that the secondary level students, age 12-14, in her study perceived too low English proficiency level and lack of knowledge in order to provide accurate peer feedback. The students revealed in the interviews that this led to reduced confidence in giving feedback to another peers' work. These findings are in line with Singh & Tan's (2017) study where secondary level students perceived providing feedback as challenging due to their low level of English proficiency. In addition, the students believed that low level of proficiency entailed lack of confidence in providing feedback comments and suggestions to a peer's work. However, the same students did not doubt their peer's accuracy when receiving feedback on their own work as they knew their peer followed guidelines that were designed by the subject expert.

In Jingjing & Fengying's (2015) study, the university students were nervous to provide oral feedback in the target language as they considered their proficiency level low. This led to anxiety in expressing their thoughts and opinions and perceived difficulties in understanding each other. As many students encounter difficulties in understanding one another, Wang (2013) encouraged the participants in his study to use their native language in feedback negotiation so the peers could understand each other's comments and suggestions. However, the university students still experienced difficulties in providing and receiving peer feedback due to their limited target language proficiency. This was explained by the difficulties of identifying errors and providing suggestions in language use in their peer's writing performance. Furthermore, unlike Singh & Tan's (2017) findings, the students did not trust each other to give accurate feedback comments and suggestions as they had low English proficiency level.

The reviewed articles also revealed students' difficulties of providing negative feedback to peers in peer feedback activities as they thought criticism might harm their friendship (Singh & Tan, 2017). Accordingly, students were sometimes concerned with interpersonal relationships as they did not choose partner themselves (Wang, 2013). Findings additionally showed that students perceived peer feedback as time consuming and in order to benefit from using peer feedback, additional in-class sessions are required to read and process another's work. Lastly, students identified low motivation and tedious attitudes towards peer feedback practices as difficulties in feedback activities (Wang, 2013).

4.5   Summary of Results

As shown in the review, research on peer feedback has often focused on writing activities. Research on peer feedback in oral activities is limited but available to some extent. Feedback activities are designed differently depending on educational level and context, but often include organization in terms of guided tools such as content rubrics and checklists in oral or written form.

In order to measure the effects of peer feedback, only three studies in this review (Berggren, 2015; Kusumaningrum et al., 2019; Singh & Tan, 2017) have used experimental design pre-test- post-test to investigate the actual effects of implementing

peer feedback in order to improve written and oral language skills. All these studies indicate that peer feedback is effective in terms of improving students' written and oral performance. In further investigations, studies have compared peer feedback to self- and teacher assessment. Findings show that a combination of these forms of feedback is most effective, and only teacher assessment is less effective in students' language improvement (Birjandi & Tamjid, 2012). In Lundstrom & Baker's (2009) study, it is also shown that giving feedback is more effectful than receiving feedback in terms of improving own writing performance. It is also shown that organized feedback is more effectful as it gives learners clear instructions of what to aim attention to when providing and receiving peer feedback. This can be deciphered from actual effects based on experimental data (Berggren, 2015; Birjandi & Tamjid, 2012; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Singh & Tan, 2017) and perceived effects based on interviews and questionnaires (Singh & Tan, 2017; Wang, 2013).

Teacher perceptions of peer feedback were both positive and negative. Lack of knowledge of how to implement peer feedback, incompatibility with the educational system and learners' low English proficiency level as well as low motivation were designated by teachers who perceived more difficulties than possibilities with peer feedback. One benefit identified was learners' ability to identify some errors such as spelling and grammar in their peer's written texts (Zhao, 2019).

Students also experienced both advantages and challenges with peer feedback. Students perceived peer feedback as beneficial as it is effective in terms of improving language performance. In addition, students found organized feedback guided by specific tools and clear instructions to be useful. Among the difficulties identified were lack of confidence due to limited proficiency level, interpersonal relationships, motivation and time (Jinjing & Fengying, 2015; Mok, 2011; Singh & Tan, 2017; Wang, 2013).

5   Discussion and Conclusion

This section provides a discussion of the findings in this systematic literature review in relation to the purpose and research questions of the study. In addition, a discussion of the selected method will be provided and implications for the teacher practice in Sweden and the need for further research will be presented.

Previous empirical research has mainly explored one or two facets of peer feedback. This systematic literature review draws these findings together and is thereby able to offer a multi-faced understanding of the phenomenon. Furthermore, previous research in the field tends to be conducted in Asian countries and focuses on peer feedback in EFL education on university level. However, the present study will discuss the use of peer feedback in the EFL upper secondary education in Sweden, of which the international perspective will serve as basis for comparison and discussion between contexts.

5.1 Result discussion

All of the studies included in this review measuring actual effects of peer feedback show that peer feedback is effective in terms of improved language skills in L2 speaking and writing (Berggren, 2015; Birjandi & Tamjid, 2012; Singh & Tan, 2017; Kusumaningrum et al., 2019; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Okyar & Eksi, 2019). These results are shown by means of experimental designs in which learners could give necessary and accurate feedback to their peers and receive the feedback properly in order to make improved changes in their second draft. However, the actual effects of peer feedback are not entirely in accordance with students' perceived effects of peer feedback, which could be explained by the different participants as perceived effects were not studies based on the same student cohort as actual effects. Jinjing & Fengying (2015), Mok (2011) and Singh & Tan (2017) revealed that the students agreed that peer feedback is effective as it helped them improve their language skills. In Wang's (2013) study however, the students' perceived usefulness of peer feedback diminished over time. This downward trend might depend on students' focus on challenges and difficulties rather than possibilities in peer feedback activities such as low proficiency level, lack of confidence, concerns with relationships between peers etc. It may also be that they prefer teacher assessment before peer feedback. These challenging factors of peer feedback were identified in the other studies as well (Jinjing & Fengying, 2015; Mok, 2011; Singh & Tan, 2017); yet beneficial and positive aspects were also presented in those studies. From the following findings it can be deciphered that actual effects and perceived effects of peer feedback goes in line, as only one study was deviant from the others.

The findings from this literature review indicate that student involvement in assessment practices is beneficial for L2 improvement. Yet, students doubt their own and their peers'

ability to give accurate feedback and prefer teachers' feedback as the teacher is the subject expert (Jinjing & Fengying, 2015; Mok, 2011). However, Birjandi & Tamjid's (2012) findings show that peer feedback and self-assessment together with teacher assessment give maximum effect in language learning, whereas only teacher assessment gave minimum effect in language learning. These findings are prominent as students most often prefer teacher assessment. Birjandi & Tamjid's findings can be explained by students' engagement and activation in the feedback practice. As students activate their critical and analytical thinking when providing feedback comments and suggestions, their own and their peer's learning improves. These findings are in line with Lundstrom & Baker's (2009) findings that indicate that giving feedback is more effective than receiving feedback in language development. This is accordingly explained by students' involvement in feedback practices as giving feedback develops transferable skills which are useful in learners' own writing. Thus, it can be claimed that learning is enhanced if the learner is active and engaged in the feedback practice. This is interesting as most students prefer teacher assessment due to their expertise, yet the following shows that students' own role in feedback practices is important for enhanced learning.

It can also be discerned from the findings that organized peer feedback is effectful. In Kusumaningrun et al.'s (2019) study, the results indicate that peer feedback is effectful in terms of language development in both groups tested. In this experiment, the feedback is not organized which means that the participants are not assigned any feedback guided tools in the peer feedback activity. These results are in line with Okyar & Eksi's (2019) study that also indicates that non-organized peer feedback is effectful as the group with no instruction or guidance still show improved results. These studies indicate that peer feedback is effective in language improvement regardless of organization. However, Okyar & Eksi (2019) also compared two different types of organization with no organization in peer feedback activities. The two types of providing organized feedback were recast (i.e. giving the correct answer) and metalinguistic feedback (i.e. comments related to the error without giving the explicit correct answer). The findings showed that both groups using organized feedback (i.e. recast group and metalinguistic group) including instructions and guidelines enhanced their learning more compared to the group with no organization. With these findings, it is shown that peer feedback is more effective when it is organized, i.e. when learners know what aspects of language and content they should focus on. Studies in the review also show that peer feedback is effectful without

organization. However, students perceive organized peer feedback activities to be better, as they feel confident with clear instructions and guidance from the subject expert (Jinjing & Fengying, 2015; Mok, 2011; Singh & Tan, 2017). Due to heightened effects and students' perceptions, it can be claimed that peer feedback is best when it is organized.

A recurring theme in the studies that concern students' perceptions, is the students' perceived limitations in peer feedback due to low proficiency level (Jingjing & Fengying, 2015; Mok, 2011; Singh & Tan, 2017; Wang, 2013). Regardless of educational level (i.e.secondary- or university level), students perceive low proficiency level as a limitation as they are not competent enough to provide feedback to their peer. Therefore, students doubted their peer feedback to be useful (Jingjing & Fengying, 2015; Mok, 2011; Wang, 2013). However, in Singh & Tan's (2017) study, the interviews revealed that students who received feedback from their peers did not doubt their peer's feedback accuracy as they were provided with instructions and guidelines from the teacher. Additionally, the students found the comments and suggestions useful. An interesting result is that despite students' and teachers' perceptions of low proficiency level as a limitation in using peer feedback, Lundstrom & Baker's (2009) study showed that students with low proficiency level benefit more from feedback activities as they made more gains than those with higher proficiency level in the second draft. Again, it can be discerned that actual effects and perceived effects of peer feedback are not in accordance. This might be explained by the students' lack of confidence and teachers' lack of trust in students. Furthermore, it could also be explained by students comparing their ability to give necessary and accurate feedback with teachers' ability and therefore students' feedback seems deficient. Students might overlook their contribution in peer feedback as they do not see their language improvement in activating and engaging themselves in peer feedback activities.

The teacher plays an important role in peer feedback activities. The reviewed articles show that students can give necessary feedback such as comments and suggestions to their peers if they are provided with instructions and feedback guided tools from the teacher (Berggren, 2015; Birjandi & Tamjid, 2012; Singh & Tan, 2017; Kusumaningrum et al., 2019; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Okyar & Eksi, 2019). In addition, the students' confidence in giving peer feedback consolidate with support from the teacher (Singh & Tan, 2017). These findings indicate that teachers have an important role in peer feedback activities. However, few studies have been made to investigate teachers' perceptions on

peer feedback in EFL teaching. Zhao's (2019) study indicates that teachers do not receive any instructions of how peer feedback should be implemented in order to make it as successful as possible. Due to lack of knowledge of how to implement peer feedback, teachers are resistant to use it. Therefore, findings in this study are prominent as teachers can understand their important role in peer feedback activities and gain some instructions of how it should be organized for maximum effect.

5.2 Method discussion

For areas with extensive research available, the systematic literature review is appropriate as research design (Eriksson Barajas, 2013:27). The scope of published peer feedback research is extensive. However, in the area of peer feedback in European EFL contexts, available research is quite limited. This review has, by looking into the research field of peer feedback in EFL education, discovered a gap in peer feedback research. This gap will be identified and discussed in relation to the material selection.

5.2.1 Material selection

Ten research articles on peer feedback in EFL context were selected for this systematic literature review. The selected articles vary in focus on effects, teacher perceptions and student perceptions and were chosen in relation to the purpose and research questions of this study. The reviewed articles were published within the timeline 2008-2021. One study was set in the Swedish EFL context, one study was set in the U.S. EFL context and eight studies were set in Asian EFL context. Other than context, the selected articles vary in age, educational level, scope of participants and research method (see appendix 2). The data from the reviewed studies derived from experimental studies, interviews and questionnaires. As the research questions concerning teacher perceptions and student perceptions on peer feedback require a more in-depth understanding, interview studies were of priority. In contrast, the research question concerning effects of peer feedback requires statistical measurements and therefore educational experiments and text analysis were prioritized. These priorities were taken in consideration when selecting the articles for this review. It was important to include a wide range of- and appropriate empirical methods in relation to the topic of investigation. During the selection process, and other sections of the method and materials, transparency was a quality criterion in order to avoid bias. All articles have been reviewed equally and included in the literature review if

agreed with the criteria. Each step of the process is enunciated in detail (Denscombe, 2014:137).

5.2.2 Limitations

Most of the reviewed studies have been conducted in Asian countries. Only one study was conducted in Sweden. As Sweden is different from Asian countries in many aspects such as educational system, proficiency level and cultural context, the findings from this study cannot be generalized to upper secondary school in Sweden.

The selection of materials is additionally a limitation in this systematic literature review. Available peer reviewed articles on peer feedback in EFL context were limited. However, there is a possibility that other articles relevant for the subject have been omitted. Different combinations of search words could have given a wider range of studies to include in the material selection process. For this small-scale review, other articles could have given different outcomes. Moreover, if the study was broadened and more articles were included in the review, the results could have been more generalizable.

The studies included in this review have generally been small-scale studies in the number of participants. As only three of eight studies of quantitative or experimental design included more than 60 participants, the findings are not representative of the population and thereby not generalizable. Although, the studies give a relatively consistent picture which reinforces their credibility.

To adapt the findings from this review to upper secondary EFL education in Sweden is slightly problematic as the studies in this review were conducted in lower secondary-, secondary- or university level of education. The context and conditions of instructions vary in different educational levels in a number of aspects such as scope, time available for a specific task, students' proficiency level etc. Hence, it is necessary to be cautious when applying the findings in this review to upper secondary level.

5.3 Implications for the teacher practice in Sweden and the need for further research

Most of the materials collected for this review are studies conducted in Asian contexts. As EFL teaching in Swedish upper secondary school is different to Asian EFL teaching in higher level of education, prominent differences have to be discussed.

A recurring perception among students in this review is the difficulties in providing and receiving feedback due to low proficiency level. In addition, some students thought it was difficult to understand the feedback received. Unfortunately, no studies in Swedish EFL education of student perceptions were found. As there is a difference in proficiency level in Sweden compared to Asian countries, Asian EFL students' perceptions of proficiency level in peer feedback activities cannot be compared to Swedish EFL learners. However, it is evident that Sweden is higher on the CEFR scale compared to most Asian countries (Council of Europe, 2021). Therefore, it can be assumed that Swedish EFL learners do not perceive low level of proficiency as a major difficulty.

The educational systems are indeed different in Sweden compared to Asian countries. In China, the pedagogy is teacher centered and examination driven, which differs from the Swedish pedagogy that promotes learner centered activities. To activate and invite students to teaching activities and work collaboratively are promoted in the steering documents for Swedish upper secondary school (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011a). Therefore, peer feedback might be more natural to include in the Swedish learner centered pedagogy. As the educational systems are structured very differently, some findings in this study cannot be adapted to the Swedish EFL classroom. It can be assumed that student and teacher perceptions in the Swedish EFL classroom are different from the Asian student and teacher perceptions, and therefore a study concerning these aspects have to be conducted in Sweden.

What can be discerned from the findings in this review is that regardless of cultural context, teachers have an important role in peer feedback activities. Students need organized feedback with clear instructions and guided tools to know what they should focus on in order to gain optimal effect from feedback practices. In addition, it is shown that the students experience more confidence with organized feedback as they rely on the

teacher's expertise. These findings can be related to the notion of scaffolding in Sociocultural Theory, as the learner is dependent on other learners to exchange knowledge and act as "scaffolders" to one another. Furthermore, peers need to receive adequate expert scaffolding from the teacher who are the primary source of knowledge and competence (Holt, 2015). The findings from the reviewed studies suggest that teachers have an important role to cater organization and structure in order for the peer feedback activities to be as efficient as possible. However, from teachers' perceptions, their role in peer feedback practices is uncertain as they state lack of knowledge of how peer feedback should be implemented. Therefore, teachers also need adequate scaffolding from their teacher educators in order to organize and guide peer feedback activities in the most fruitful ways.

In conclusion, since aspects as proficiency level and educational system differ from Sweden to Asian countries, there is need for further research on peer feedback practices in the Swedish EFL classroom. Furthermore, it is shown that the teacher serves an important role in peer feedback practices in order to make it as efficient as possible. However, how this role should be designed is somewhat unwritten as few studies have investigated it. Therefore, there is need for further research in the field of the teacher role in peer feedback.

References

Berggren, J, (2015). *Learning from giving feedback: A study of secondary-level students*. ELT Journal, vol 69 issue 1 p58-70

Berggren, J. 2019. *Writing, reviewing, and revising Peer feedback in lower secondary EFL classrooms*. Department of English, Stockholm University.

Birjandi, P., Tamjid, N.H. (2012). *The role of peer and teacher assessment in promoting Iranian EFL learners' writing performance*. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 37:5, 513-533

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). *Developing the theory of formative assessment*. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21, 5–31.

Council of Europe. (2021). *The CEFR Levels* [online]. Available at: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/level-descriptions> [Accessed 2021-05-05].

Denscombe, M. 2014. *The Good Research Guide - For small-scale social research projects (5th edition)*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Eriksson Barajas, K., Forsberg, C. & Wengström, Y. (2013). *Systematiska litteraturstudier i utbildningsvetenskap: vägledning vid examensarbeten och vetenskapliga artiklar*. (första upplagan). Stockholm: Natur & Kultur.

Hirsh, Å. (2017). *Bedömning i skolan – vad och varför?*. Stockholm: Skolverket.

Holt, N. (2015). *Psychology: the science of mind and behaviour*. (3., revised and updated ed.) Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education.

Jingjing, X., Fengying, M. (2015). *A study into students' views on guided peer feedback in group work*. Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics. 38-2

Kusumaningrum, S. R., Cahyono, B. Y., Prayogo, J. A. (2019). *The effect of different types of peer feedback provision on EFL students' writing performance*. International Journal of Instruction. 12-1

Lauvås, P. & Jönsson, A. (2019). *Ren formativ bedömning*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Liu, J., & Hansen, J. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Lundstrom, K., Baker, W. (2009). *To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing.* Journal of Second Language Writing 18 (2009) 30-43

McMillan, J.H. (2018). *Classroom assessment: Principles and practice that enhance student learning and motivation (7nth ed.)*. Boston: Pearson.

Mok, J. (2011). *A case study of students' perceptions of peer assessment in Hong Kong*. ELT Journal Volume 65(3), 230-239

Okyar, H., Eksi, G. (2019). *Training students in peer interaction and peer feedback to develop competence in L2 forms*. Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand, v58 p62-94

Panadero, E., G. T. L., Brown. (2017). *Teachers' reasons for using peer assessment: Positive experience predicts use*. European Journal of Psychology of Education 32 (1): 133-156

Philp, J., Adams, R.J. & Iwashita, N. (2014). *Peer interaction and second language learning*. New York: Routledge.

Sebba, J., Crick, R.D., Yu, G. Lawson, H., Harlen, W. & Durant, K. (2008). *Systematic Review of Research Evidence of the Impact on Students in Secondary Schools of Self and Peer Assessment*. I: Research Evidence in Education Library, 1–47. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.

Singh, K., B.H., Tan. (2017). *Effects of structured peer feedback on secondary school students' text revision*. Malaysian English Language Teaching Association. 45-3

Sippel, L. (2020). *German learners' beliefs about peer interaction and peer feedback*. A Journal of the American Association of Teachers of German, 53-2

The Swedish National Agency for Education. (2011a). GY11 [online]. Available at: <https://www.skolverket.se/undervisning/gymnasieskolan/laroplan-program-och-amnen-i-gymnasieskolan/laroplan-gy11-for-gymnasieskolan> [Accessed 2021-03-03].

The Swedish National Agency for Education, (2011b). GY11, subject – English [online]. Available at: <https://www.skolverket.se/undervisning/gymnasieskolan/laroplan-program-och-amnen-i-gymnasieskolan/amnesplaner-i-gymnasieskolan-pa-engelska> [Accessed 2021-02-17].

The Swedish National Agency for Education. (2018*). Betyg och betygssättning.* PDF [online]. Available at: <https://www.skolverket.se/publikationsserier/allmanna-rad/2018/allmanna-rad-om-betyg-och-betygssattning> [Accessed 2021-03-03].

The Swedish National Agency for Education. (2021). *Att planera, bedöma och ge återkoppling. Stöd för undervisning*. PDF [online]. Available at: <https://www.skolverket.se/publikationsserier/ovrigtmaterial/2021/attplanerabedomaochgeaterkoppling.4.5a061df817791f8257b1120.html> [Accessed 2021-02-17].

The Swedish Research Council. (2002). *Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.

Vygotskij, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. London: Harvard University Press.

Wang, W. (2013). *Students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing: A longitudinal inquiry*. School of English for International Business, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies.

Yu, S., Lee, I. (2016). *Peer feedback in second language writing (2005-2014)*. Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press, 49(4), pp. 461-493

Zhao, H. (2018). *Exploring tertiary English as a foreign language writing tutors' perception of the appropriateness of peer assessment for writing*. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43:7, 1133-1145

Linnæus University
Sweden

Appendix 1: Search scheme

Database and date	Search words	Timeline	Limitations	Hits and citations	Selected materials	Type of publication
ERIC 21 02 03	("peer feedback") AND ("English language teaching")	2008-2021	Peer reviewed	327 hits 14 citations	Yu, S., Lee, I. (2016). *Peer feedback in second language writing (2005-2014)*. Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press, 49(4), pp. 461-493	Article
ERIC 21 02 28	("peer feedback") AND ("English language teaching")	2008-2021	Peer reviewed	327 hits n. a. citations	Kusumaningrum, S. R., Cahyono, B. Y., Prayogo, J. A. (2019). *The effect of different types of peer feedback provision on EFL students' writing performance*. International Journal of Instruction. 12-1	Article
ERIC 21 02 28	("peer feedback") AND ("English language teaching")	2008-2021	Peer reviewed	327 hits 4 citations	Singh, K., B.H., Tan. (2017). *Effects of structured peer feedback on secondary school students' text revision*. Malaysian English Language Teaching Association. 45-3	Article
ERIC 21 03 03	("peer feedback") AND ("English language teaching")	2008-2021	Peer reviewed	327 hits 1 citation	Jingjing, X., Fengying, M. (2015). *A study into students' views on guided peer feedback in group work*. Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics. 38-2	Article
ERIC 21 03 03	("peer feedback") AND ("English language teaching")	2008-2021	Peer reviewed	327 hits n. a. citations	Sippel, L. (2020). *German learners' beliefs about peer interaction and peer feedback*. A Journal of the American Association of Teachers of German, 53-2	Article
ERIC 21 03 06	("peer feedback") AND ("English language teaching")	2008-2021	Peer reviewed	327 hits n. a. citations	Okyar, H., Eksi, G. (2019). *Training students in peer interaction and peer feedback to develop competence in L2 forms*. Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand, v58 p62-94	Article

Google Scholar 21 03 28	("peer feedback") AND ("English as a foreign language") AND ("teachers' perceptions")		Peer reviewed	911 hits 1 citation	Zhao, H. (2018). *Exploring tertiary English as a foreign language writing tutors' perception of the appropriateness of peer assessment for writing*. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43:7, 1133-1145	Article
21 04 01	("peer feedback") AND ("English as a foreign language") AND ("teachers' perceptions")	2008-2021	Peer reviewed	1380 hits 71 citations	Mok, J. (2011). *A case study of students' perceptions of peer assessment in Hong Kong*. ELT Journal Volume 65(3), 230-239	
Manual search	**Source**	**Timeline**	**Limitations**		**Selected materials**	**Type of publication**
21 02 03	Yu, S., Lee, I. (2016). *Peer feedback in second language writing (2005-2014)*. Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press, 49(4), pp. 461-493	2008-2021	Peer reviewed		Berggren, J, (2015). *Learning from giving feedback: A study of secondary-level students*. ELT Journal, vol 69 issue 1 p58-70	Article
21 02 03	Yu, S., Lee, I. (2016). *Peer feedback in second language writing (2005-2014)*. Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press, 49(4), pp. 461-493	2008-2021	Peer reviewed		Wang, W. (2013). *Students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing: A longitudinal inquiry*. School of English for International Business, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies.	Article
21 03 03	Berggren, J, (2015). *Learning from giving feedback: A study of secondary-level students*.	2008-2021	Peer reviewed		Lundstrom, K., Baker, W. (2009). *To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing*. Journal of	Article

	ELT Journal, vol 69 issue 1 p58-70				Second Language Writing 18 (2009) 30-43	
21 04 06	Berggren, J, (2015). *Learning from giving feedback: A study of secondary-level students*. ELT Journal, vol 69 issue 1 p58-70	2008-2021	Peer reviewed		Birjandi, P., Tamjid, N.H. (2012). *The role of peer and teacher assessment in promoting Iranian EFL learners' writing performance*. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 37:5, 513-533	
21 04 01	Zhao, H. (2018). *Exploring tertiary English as a foreign language writing tutors' perception of the appropriateness of peer assessment for writing*. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43:7, 1133-1145		Peer reviewed		Panadero, E., G. T. L., Brown. (2017). *Teachers' reasons for using peer assessment: Positive experience predicts use*. European Journal of Psychology of Education 32 (1): 133-156	Article

N. a. = No available

Linnæus University
Sweden

Appendix 2: Categorization scheme 1

Thematic content categories relating to research questions.

Author and title	Educational level and age	Empirical method	Learning activities	Effects	Teachers' perceptions	Students' perceptions	Country	Year	Notes
Berggren, J. *Learning from giving feedback: A study of secondary level students.*	Lower secondary level Age 14-15	Educational experiment/ text analysis	Writing	X			Sweden	2015	
Birjandi, P., Tamjid, N. H. *The role of self-, peer and teacher assessment in promoting Iranian EFL learners' writing performance.*	University level Mean age 20	Educational experiment/ text analysis	Writing	X			Iran	2012	
Kusumaningrum, S. R., Cahyono, B. Y., Prayogo, J. A. *The effect of different types of peer feedback provision on EFL students' writing performance.*	University level	Educational experiment/ text analysis	Writing	X			Indonesia	2019	
Lundstrom, K., Baker, W. *To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing.*	University level	Educational experiment/ text analysis	Writing	X			USA	2009	No interaction between peers

Okyar, H., Eksi, G. *Training students in peer interaction and peer feedback to develop competence in L2.*	University level Mean age 18.6	Educational experiment/ observations/ text analysis	Grammatical competence in speaking and writing	X			Turkey	2019	
Jingjing, X., Fengying, M. *A study into students' views on guided peer feedback in group work.*	University level Mean age 19	Educational experiment/ questionnaire/ interviews	Speaking	X		X	China	2015	The effect is not tested, it is only students' perceptions
Singh, K., B. H., Tan. *Effects of structured peer feedback on secondary school students' text revision.*	Secondary level	Text analysis/ questionnaire	Writing	X		X	Indonesia	2017	
Mok, J. A *case study of students' perception of peer assessment in Hong Kong.*	Secondary level Age 12-14	Observations/ case study/ interviews	Speaking and writing			X	Hong Kong, China	2011	
Wang, W. *Students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing: A longitudinal inquiry.*	University level	Educational experiment/ text analysis/ questionnaires/ interviews	Writing			X	China	2013	
Zhao, H. *Exploring tertiary English as a foreign language writing tutors' perceptions of the appropriateness of peer assessment for writing.*	University level	Interviews	Writing		X		China	2018	
Panadero, E., G. T. L., Brown. *Teachers' reasons for using peer assessment: a positive experience predicts use.*	Primary, secondary and upper secondary level	Questionnaire/ text analysis	Writing		X		Spain	2017	Covers teachers' perceptions in general, not directed

									towards EFL learning
Sippel, L. *German learners' beliefs about peer interaction and peer feedback.*	University level	Educational experiment/ interviews	Speaking			X		2020	Covers students' perceptions in general, not directed towards EFL learning
Read – publications that do not meet the requirements	Green - effects	Blue – teachers' perceptions	Yellow – students' perceptions						

Appendix 3 – Categorization scheme 2

Author and title	Educational level and age	Purpose	Empirical method and size	Theoretical approach	Results and conclusion
Berggren, J. *Learning from giving feedback: A study of secondary level students.*	Lower secondary level Age 14-15	To investigate what pupils can learn from giving and receiving organized peer feedback in L2 writing, and how peer feedback can be implemented to improve pupils' writing skills.	Educational experiment/ text-based analysis 26 participants 6 lessons	Sociocultural	The peer feedback activities included preparation by reading sample texts, developing organized feedback criteria, group discussions and written peer feedback. Findings showed L2 writing improves from peer feedback in various aspects; organization, content, structure, grammar, and vocabulary. Organization and content seemed to be more beneficial than other aspects. This might be explained by the task instructions that focused on audience awareness (writing to the receiver) rather than language focus.
Birjandi, P., Tamjid, N. H. *The role of self-, peer and teacher assessment in promoting Iranian EFL learners' writing performance.*	University level Mean age 20	To investigate and compare the effects of self-assessment, peer assessment and teacher assessment.	Educational experiment/ text-based analysis 157 participants 15 weeks	Sociocultural and historical aspects (SLA theories) of language learning, constructivism (self-assessment)	The findings show that self-assessment and peer assessment, in cooperation with teacher assessment give maximum improvement in writing. Therefore, students benefit from several sources. Only teacher assessment was not as effective which is explained by students' active role in the assessment practice. In conclusion it is evident that improved writing skills comes with learner's and teacher's responsibility and involvement in assessment.
Kusumaningrum, S. R., Cahyono, B. Y., Prayogo, J. A. *The effect of different types of peer feedback provision on EFL students' writing performance.*	University level	To investigate which of two types of peer feedback is most effective: in-class- or small group peer feedback.	Educational experiment/ text-based analysis 55 participants 6 weeks	Sociocultural	The feedback activities included pretest and posttest in terms of writing tasks. Included aspects were content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. The results show that students improved their writing performance after both types of peer feedback. Neither of the two types (in-class/ small group) showed to be more effective than the other.
Lundstrom, K., Baker, W. *To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing.*	University level	To investigate if giving feedback is more beneficial than receiving feedback in	Educational experiment/ text analysis	Sociocultural and pragmatism - "learning by doing"	The findings showed that giving feedback was more beneficial than to receiving feedback in terms of improving writing performance. Areas that were most beneficial were global aspects such as organization

		terms of improving writing performance.	91 participants

4 months | | and cohesion and less beneficial were local aspects such as vocabulary, grammar and mechanics. These results are explained by the transferrable ability to "learn by doing". The participants providing feedback at a lower language proficiency improved more. |
| Okyar, H., Eksi, G. *Training students in peer interaction and peer feedback to develop competence in L2.* | University level

Mean age 18.6 | To investigate the effect of training students in peer feedback to develop grammatical competence writing and speaking activities. | Educational experiment/ observations/ text analysis

85 participants

Four weeks | Sociocultural and pragmatism - "learning by doing" | Findings showed that the PI+ recast- and the PI+MF group performed better on the posttest than the PI group. Between the PI+recast- and PI+MF group no significant difference was found. The findings show that *how* to give feedback is crucial in peer feedback activities. Peer feedback is effective when it is organized; learners must be aware of what to pay attention to. |
| Jingjing, X., Fengying, M. *A study into students' views on guided peer feedback in group work.* | University level

Mean age 19 | To gain a deeper understanding of students' perceptions of peer feedback in spoken English group work. In addition, the study explored if different types of tools lead to different results. | Educational experiment/ questionnaire/ interviews

53 participants

10 weeks | Sociocultural in terms of interaction with multiple partners in peer feedback groups | The effect of peer feedback in this study is not tested. It refers only to students' perceptions. Findings showed that students perceive peer feedback as positive in language learning and development. Some thought peer feedback was more useful and some thought it was less useful. However, no student thought it was not useful. The students prefer to organize the peer feedback in grading sheets. |
| Singh, K., B. H., Tan. *Effects of structured peer feedback on secondary school students' text revision.* | Secondary level | To investigate effects and students' perceptions of structured peer feedback. | Text analysis/ questionnaire

20 participants

2 weeks | Pragmatism | Aspects included were content, organization (global aspects), punctuation, spelling and vocabulary (local aspects). The identities of peers were anonymous. Results showed that pupils were unable to give accurate feedback on global aspects. Most of the effective feedback were local aspects. In sum, pupils can, with training and guidelines, give and receive feedback that will improve their own learning and performance. In terms of students' perceptions, they perceived low confidence in giving feedback and they doubted their knowledge. |

Mok, J. A *case study of students' perception of peer assessment in Hong Kong.*	Secondary level Age 12-14	To gain a deeper insight of students' perceptions of possibilities and difficulties in using peer feedback.	Observations/ case study/ interviews 4 participants 3 lessons	Sociocultural and pragmatism	Findings show that students perceived both possibilities and difficulties of using peer feedback. Possibilities were to promote thinking and reflection which improved their own performance. Difficulties were confidence in giving feedback due to lack of knowledge and low proficiency level.
Wang, W. *Students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing: A longitudinal inquiry.*	University level	To investigate students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback and how perceptions might change over time.	Educational experiment/ text analysis/ questionnaires/ interviews 53 participants 36 weeks	Sociocultural	Students were trained to give and receive feedback by teacher instructions and information rubrics. The findings showed a downward trend of the usefulness of peer feedback according to students. Over time students thought peer feedback was less useful. Obstructions were limited English proficiency and concerns with interpersonal relationships as they kept the same peers throughout the investigation.
Zhao, H. *Exploring tertiary English as a foreign language writing tutors' perceptions of the appropriateness of peer assessment for writing.*	University level	To investigate teachers' perceptions of implementing peer feedback in language teaching.	Interviews 25 participants	Sociocultural	Findings showed that participating teachers have limited knowledge of the purpose and implementation of peer feedback. This comes with lack of instructions and education in the area. Due to these circumstances teachers did not want to use it. Teachers also explained peer feedback to be difficult to integrate in the examination-oriented education system, time consuming, and students' low proficiency level in English.