The Effectiveness of Peer Feedback on Second Language Writing

Yijun Chen*

Beijing Technology and Business University, Beijing 100142, China

**Corresponding author:* Yijun Chen, lyrushuang@163.com

Abstract: Peer feedback is a widely utilized practice in writing classrooms for second languages (L2) that has drawn a lot of attention. While some support the practice because of the clear advantages that peer feedback offers students, others doubt its efficacy. Comparing various forms of feedback is therefore necessary, as is determining the effects that peer feedback has on students and the variables that might affect how successful peer feedback is. This paper focuses on the usefulness of peer feedback for L2 writing, based on a review of studies on the subject. The findings imply that the functions of peer and teacher feedback are distinct, and that peer feedback is advantageous to both parties, particularly to the supplier. The attitudes and cultural backgrounds of the students are among the other factors that affect how effective peer feedback is. Lastly, some implications for future research and education are presented.

Keywords: Peer feedback; Quality; Benefits; Providers; Receivers; Perceptions; Training

1. Introduction

Peer feedback, sometimes referred to as "peer assessment," "peer comment," "peer review," or "peer response," is a significant assignment in which students give and receive written or spoken comments on the writing of their peers in small groups or pairs. In this paper, the term "peer feedback" is defined by Nelson and Murphy (1993), who emphasize that the fundamental aspect of peer feedback is when students provide feedback to each other on their initial drafts through communication, enabling the student writers to reach a larger audience and improve their work [1].

Peer feedback has been shown to be beneficial in enhancing writers' writing quality, developing learners' autonomy, and establishing a learner-centered classroom in an increasing number of studies [2-5]. With the aforementioned advantages and the growing popularity of student-centered learning, peer feedback is becoming a common practice in many second language (L2) writing classes. Its efficiency has, nevertheless, consistently been questioned. Peer feedback has been questioned by researchers due to concerns about its linguistic quality, and students may be reluctant to accept criticism because they believe that teacher feedback is more effective than peer feedback since teachers are seen as the authority in the classroom [6,7]. Therefore, it is imperative to

determine whether peer feedback practices in L2 learning classes are worthwhile.

Given these circumstances, the purpose of this literature review is to investigate the efficacy of peer feedback on L2 writing through two main questions: How helpful is peer review for L2 writing? What other aspects are affecting the effectiveness of peer feedback? This paper starts by reviewing some theoretical frameworks from the body of existing research in order to answer these questions. The benefits of written peer feedback are then examined in several recent research, along with an analysis of some of the relevant components. The key conclusions of those studies are then summarized, and research gaps, divergences, and convergences are noted. Lastly, recommendations for future study and instruction are given.

2. Theoretical frameworks

The use of peer feedback in L2 writing instructions is supported by a number of ideas from a variety of fields, including education, psycholinguistics, second language acquisition (SLA), and cognition [8,9]. Some of these theories include process writing theory, interactionist theory, activity theory (AT), and sociocultural theory (SCT).

In writing classes, the product-oriented approach has historically been prioritized, but in recent decades, a process-focused approach has gained greater traction [10]. Creating multiple drafts and soliciting input from peers and teachers is one of the core tenets of the process writing technique. In addition to enhancing students' writing skills, numerous drafts provide them with peer critique and audience awareness, which adds significance and interactivity to the entire process. The relationship between those who provide and receive feedback is essential for the writing process to become both meaningful and communicative. The function of both implicit and explicit feedback in language learning is examined by the interactionist theory. It is argued that peer feedback has a favorable effect on developing one's L2 writing skills because L2 authors must communicate and compromise with one another [11]. Additionally, it emphasizes how peer interactions give writers understandable feedback as well as both positive and negative remarks. This gives learners the chance to edit their work and identify and close gaps between their interlanguage and the target language [12].

Another supporting theory that also focuses on interaction as a social phenomenon is Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (SCT), which asserts that cognitive development and learning of higher forms are social in nature [8]. The zone of proximal development (ZPD) is the gap between the actual developmental level and the potential level—that is, the ability to solve problems on one's own and the ability to solve problems with the assistance of adults or more experienced peers—may play a social and cultural role in the development of L2 writing skills. Scaffolding is used for the mediation. In particular, students go from being "other-regulated," or relying on others, such as experienced classmates, to being "self-regulated," or developing greater independence and learner autonomy as writers [13].

Activity theory (AT), a development of sociocultural theory, is an additional theory. According to Leontev's classification, human behaviors can be divided into three hierarchical levels: operation, which refers to the particular circumstances in which an action is carried out; action, which is motivated by a purpose; and activity. According to Leontev's method, motive is essential to comprehending human behaviors and activities because it provides an explanation for why people are acting in a certain way [14]. Put simply, students attend classes with varying intentions and goals, which may or may not align with the teacher's. Moreover, depending on the goals and incentives they bring to the classroom, students may ultimately perceive and benefit from peer feedback activities differently.

All things considered, the aforementioned theories aid in illuminating the pedagogical use of peer feedback in the classroom and provide theoretical insights into peer feedback research. In particular, process writing

theory educates teachers on the value of seeing writing as a multi-step process that requires several drafts. Interactionist theory can assist researchers in understanding how peer interaction or negotiation might influence students' viewpoints and the effectiveness of peer feedback, providing clear educational consequences for classroom activities. Additionally, studies that highlight peer interaction, like group dynamics and scaffolding, are clarified by SCT and AT. Examining these theories could help us understand the impacts that peer feedback activities bring.

3. Effectiveness of peer feedback

Understanding how students give feedback and whether it is accepted as helpful enough to be included in later drafts are key to determining if peer feedback is beneficial. Firstly, two different kinds of peer feedback on L2 writing are covered in this section. Next, the investigation focuses on the caliber and integration of peer feedback. Lastly, the advantages of peer review are discussed.

3.1. Focusing on global or local issues

Linguistically, L2 writing and rewriting have two distinct aspects: the local, which refers to grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, and the global, which includes organization, cohesion, and development. Each student pays different attention to these elements. Villamil and Guerrero [15] observed that participants tended to concentrate on grammar and content when editing the narrative mode and on grammar in the persuasive mode after analyzing two distinct writing styles. In all modes, organization received the least attention [15]. In Hanjani and Li's study, participants exhibited comparable tendencies, with the majority of error fixes being done at the micro level, such as vocabulary and grammar, suggesting that precision was prioritized in writing [4]. Furthermore, one of the most obvious differences between the criticism provided by professors and students was that the former tended to concentrate on micro-level issues like grammar, while the latter focused more on macro-level elements like organization and cohesiveness [16]. Similarly, after attentively observing a class of 32 junior English students for a semester and evaluating their numerous drafts, student-written feedback, and interviews, Lei found that feedback was given to address form-related concerns rather than content-related ones. Consequently, more adjustments on forms are made than those on contents [17]. That is to say, feedback from peers regarding lexicon, grammar, and mechanics was most frequently incorporated, whereas feedback about organization and ideas was frequently disregarded.

However, the learner's ability level may influence how certain linguistic elements are changed. Unlike the above-mentioned findings, low-proficiency learners were more likely to provide feedback relating to global writing features, as their developing system had not equipped them with the knowledge to spot problems in local aspects such as grammar and vocabulary [3]. However, because surface-level tasks require less cognitive work, learners generally prefer to concentrate on them.

3.2. Peer feedback quality and acceptance

Peer feedback is often seen as legitimate and beneficial, despite variances in feedback delivery; students' efforts to improve one another's writing are typically valued. 74% of the alterations were made, according to Villamil and Guerrero, who closely observed a class of Spanish college students taking an English writing course [15]. Mendonça and Johnson's study had similar findings, with over half of all recommendations appearing in participants' final papers, 10% not being implemented, and 37% coming from the learners themselves [18]. Furthermore, Min discovered that many of the suggestions made by the providers were included in later versions following the training sessions, after analyzing the impact of trained peer feedback on the writing of 18 EFL college students

in terms of quality and forms of revision. Even better, following training, the comments' caliber significantly improved [2]. 90% of the revisions were made after 77% of the trained peer feedback was accepted in the subsequent drafts. This high percentage suggests that authors respected and were willing to use expert peer feedback in later revisions.

Furthermore, a new study has investigated the feedback provided by learners with lower competency levels. Higher-proficiency participants concentrated on the content and quality of the feedback rather than the language proficiency of the lower-proficiency students, according to Yu and Hu's study, which demonstrates that higher-level learners did not prejudge the validity of the feedback provided by their less competent peers [19].

While the majority of students embrace peer feedback, several academics question whether it is reliable. Peer feedback that is inaccurate is defined as a mistake committed by the reviewer when offering feedback; it is also known as "faulty corrections" [20] or "incorrect solutions" [11]. Since giving feedback to others demonstrates not just one's command of the language but also one's feeling of accountability, students typically pay close attention while offering feedback to their peers. When Caulk looked at the peer feedback made by his writing class, he found that students received very little (6%) poor advice from others and that most (89%) of the peer feedback was valid [16]. It is also evident from the results of the study conducted by Villamil and Guerrero that only 7% of all revisions included incorrect corrections [15]. This result is consistent with other studies that looked at the final drafts written by 18 college students in Thailand. The findings indicate that the percentage of erroneous feedback was quite low. Furthermore, while peer review was helpful in improving grammar accuracy, it had little effect on rhetorical or informational precision. Additionally, advice from professors was more helpful in correcting grammatical errors than self-feedback. However, there was no appreciable distinction between peer and instructor feedback [21].

In summary, while it has been questioned by many, peer feedback tends to be more focused on local area errors and can still be valid and valued by other students.

3.3. Benefits of peer feedback

3.3.1. Providers of feedback gain greater advantages than receivers

Peer feedback has been extensively recognized in the literature as being advantageous to writers as well as receivers. According to Kuyyogsuy [22], peer feedback activities are an important social learning opportunity where students can practice employing effective methods, learn how to work together, improve their writing, and sharpen their critical thinking skills. Most importantly, by encouraging complete participation throughout the process, this student-centered approach helps participants chart their own path and develop into more independent learners [22].

More intriguingly, a growing body of research is concentrating on the differences in benefits that feedback providers and receivers experience, suggesting that feedback providers may profit from the process more than feedback receivers [2-4,23,24].

Hanjani and Li observed the performance of 135 college students over various drafts and discovered that while each student ultimately improved their accuracy, the rate of improvement differed among the 135 students [4]. Based on the comments, the receivers revised their work even further. This result appears to support the hypothesis put forth by Villamil and Guerrero that getting feedback from peers increases the likelihood of self-revision, and that the gains made in their final drafts may indicate a transition from other-regulation to self-regulation [15].

Lundstrom and Baker, on the other hand, contend that students who provide feedback to one another improve their writing more visibly than those who merely receive it. After dividing the ESL college students

into two groups, one for feedback-only control and the other for feedback-giving on others' drafts, they discovered that the students who gave feedback improved more on their final drafts. This suggests that providing feedback on others' work on its own can help students improve their writing and was likely the most beneficial aspect of the activity. Furthermore, feedback providers with lower English proficiency gained more than those with higher proficiency. Even better, they discovered that in their final writing assignments, more recommendations were made for fixing global area faults than local ones [3].

It is also supported by Min's research showing writers who review works receive greater benefits. The researcher demonstrated how to provide peer feedback in a college writing course before holding an hour-long interview. Upon examining the participants' initial work, peer feedback, and its integration, it becomes evident that while both the reviewer and the receiver derived benefits from the peer feedback, those advantages were not equal. For receivers, some clear benefits include expanding their vocabulary and developing the ability to approach subjects from several angles. Reviewers, however, appeared to have advanced further. Their enhancements included the acquisition of new skills, an increase in self-assurance, improved accuracy, and the use of several metacognitive techniques [2]. Berggren found that students who provide comments on drafts of two classes of Swedish secondary learners enhance their perception of a sense of audience [23]. This finding is comparable to that of Aghajani and Zoghipour. Activities including peer feedback also encouraged more changes, which strengthened students' work overall. One advantage of fixing other people's faults is that feedback providers might consider their colleagues' work as a resource for learning, giving them the chance to gain knowledge from their mistakes [24].

Some researchers, though, asserted the opposite. For example, Trautmann conducted research to find out how much university students learned when they provided feedback to one another as opposed to when they received input from their peers. According to their research, getting comments was more beneficial than giving them in terms of encouraging changes. Furthermore, 70% of the students said that rather than giving criticism to other students, it was their own comments that spurred them to make adjustments [25].

In summary, recent research supports the claim that those who provide feedback to others are more likely to gain from such actions. However, there are conflicting results, which may be attributed to the different settings in which the research was conducted, such as educational institutions and ESL or EFL settings. This necessitates more empirical study to discover more about the advantages that English language learners could derive from providing feedback and the ways in which this practice could improve their writing skills.

3.3.2. Students' views on the usefulness of self-, teacher-, and peer feedback

Peer feedback is frequently compared to self-feedback or teacher feedback in terms of effectiveness. Personal views on peer feedback differed from person to person. Since teachers are frequently viewed as authoritative people, some students have greater faith in them than in their peers' abilities to offer constructive criticism [26-28]. Others frequently use it as a teaching tool and include it in their writing [24,26].

Tsui and Ng [26] conducted interviews with a sample of secondary L2 learners in Hong Kong and discovered that there were significant differences in the participants' attitudes toward them and how they incorporated feedback from peers and teachers. A considerable quantity of feedback from peers and teachers was welcomed by certain students. Some only include a limited portion of peer feedback, favoring teacher remarks over peer comments. Notwithstanding their misgivings about their peers' abilities, students who took more peer feedback acknowledged and valued it, according to the findings from the interview. More significantly, students acknowledged that peer feedback contributes to writing improvement regardless of the quantity of feedback included [26]. In particular, it fosters a sense of audience, assists students in identifying their assets

and shortcomings, fosters a collaborative learning atmosphere, and increases learner autonomy, which helps students become less reliant on teachers and more self-assured.

Even though peer feedback activities seem to be very important in the classroom, they cannot accomplish all the objectives on their own. In interviews conducted after class, for instance, a few students stated that teachers were more adept at providing assistance with global-level concerns like writing organization. This result is in line with Caulk's study, which proposes that students never comment on how their work is organized as a whole since dealing with global area difficulties is thought to be more cognitively demanding than dealing with local area concerns [16]. To put it simply, peer and teacher feedback serve distinct but complementary purposes in the process of helping students become better writers.

In a related study, Aghajani and Zoghipour discovered that students in the peer-correction group performed better than those in the teacher-correction group [24] after splitting 60 participants into three groups: teacher-, peer-, and self-correction groups. The results of the participants' pre-tests and post-tests were also analyzed. This result is consistent with that of Mendonca and Johnson's study, which suggested that peer feedback can help students become more proficient writers and improve their grammatical understanding. Nonetheless, research has demonstrated that self-corrections are more successful than peer feedback [18]. The most optimal approach to providing feedback that leads to a gain in grammatical knowledge is via self-correction, which is not in harmony with Ganji's study where peer feedback is indicated to be more conducive than self-correction [29]. Students were more involved in both learning processes, which may have made them more beneficial than teacher feedback, even if there were disparities in the efficacy of peer and self-feedback. However, self-feedback seems to be much more advantageous because it may include the greatest amount of learning [30]. Nevertheless, peer feedback continued to be extremely effective because it prompted students to view the writing of others as a resource for learning from one another's faults.

The literature does, however, show a considerable preference for teacher comments. To study the varied impacts that peer feedback and teacher feedback have on learners' self-efficacy, Ruegg [31] separated a class of Japanese college students into two groups. During the same period, one group received comments from their teacher, and the other group offered and received peer feedback on each other's writings. According to the findings, writing self-efficacy increased more significantly among students who received teacher feedback. Interviews also show that students had increased confidence in their writing skills. It seems that students can develop their confidence from teacher feedback alone [31]. This result is consistent with Zhang's study, which found that students tend to favor instructor feedback when the researcher tried to investigate preferences for other types of feedback [28].

In short, even though more and more people are acknowledging the value of peer feedback, instructor feedback is still seen as the preferred choice. This is due to a number of valid factors, one of which is the concern for the caliber of the feedback given. Peer feedback may be less than ideal, particularly in the absence of prior training [32]. It is feasible that peer feedback will be more successful and get more favorable feedback if the right training and other arrangements are made.

4. Factors affecting the effectiveness of peer feedback

Even though peer feedback has been shown to be useful in the literature, students still have concerns about it because they do not trust their peers to evaluate their writing as well as their language skills and capacity to provide constructive criticism [18]. Thus, to increase the application and appreciation of peer feedback, a number of procedures need to be followed before integrating peer feedback activities in the classroom.

4.1. Peer feedback training

Whether or not there is training involved is one of the variables that could affect the caliber of peer feedback. According to Wang, it is unrealistic and perhaps ineffective to expect students to significantly improve their vocabulary or sentence structure by reacting to criticism from peers who are at the same level as them unless there is linguistic input involved[27]. For feedback to be successful, peer feedback training is therefore necessary. Similar findings were made by Min, who led a two-hour feedback-providing session to train 18 sophomore intermediate English major students for four hours in class and conducted 18 hours of post-class interviews with students[33]. Put differently, students demonstrated higher proficiency in recognizing, elucidating, and depicting a solitary problem and suggesting a solution. Furthermore, there was an increase in the number of comments in both the local and global domains, indicating that learners started to see resolving global issues as critical after receiving training. Even better, peer feedback was received and incorporated into the work at a higher rate following the instruction; in fact, 77% of the peer feedback received following training was approved, accounting for 90% of the total revisions. These high numbers show that, on the one hand, participants thought receiving feedback from their peers following training was beneficial. However, in their subsequent productions, they were more willing to incorporate concepts from their peers[2,33]. Rahimi[34], who also observed a change in the type of error feedback provided after training from local-level to global-level, while the untrained group continues to focus more on rectifying local-level errors, supports the significance of peer feedback training. As a result, the trained group adopted more global-level comments, whereas the untrained group incorporated more local-level comments. The results also show that, in the end, students who received instruction generated papers of higher quality than those who did not[34]. Sánchez's study focused on the impact of training on L2 Spanish learners' writing quality, which supports earlier research on the efficacy of training[2,14,31,35]. The study also reveals that, firstly, L2 Spanish learners who participated in peer feedback training received much higher scores in their final drafts compared with students who did not receive training. This is in addition to the trained group providing more comments on global issues and incorporating a significantly higher amount of comments with an improvement in text quality. Furthermore, based on the criticism they received, students seemed to have a deeper comprehension of the reviewer's viewpoint and how to improve their work in order to further clarify their points. Thirdly, by teaching students to provide feedback on other people's work and evaluating the ideas made by those who provided it, a learner-centered environment was created in which learner autonomy could flourish, showing that every student had a "voice" in the classroom. The results also show that when it came to analyzing their own work, the taught group was more likely to acquire critical thinking skills. While the aforementioned results run counter to certain previous research[18,26], they are consistent with research by Rahimi[34] and Min[2]. Most importantly, one of the findings demonstrates how the training enabled students to see themselves in the role of reviewers, fostering a more courteous and equitable connection between writers and reviewers.

4.2. Using rubrics

Activity theory states that students can establish more specific goals and are more likely to benefit from an activity if they are aware of what is expected of them[15]. Including a rubric is another technique that might aid students in comprehending the goal of the peer feedback exercise and making the most of it. Wang trained students to provide feedback on each other's work using a rubric that was derived from Jacobs' ESL Composition Profile[36]. The rubric is divided into five sections: language use, vocabulary, content, organization, and mechanics. To show how the rubric should be applied during the peer feedback activity, a training manual and six annotated writing samples were created. Weigle's feedback form was also implemented, allowing

students to provide comments on the writing of their peers [37]. Students' comments about utilizing the rubric reveal that adhering to it helped them understand the requirements of the writing project and demonstrated what makes a good report. Additionally, applying the rubric forced them to focus on both macro- and micro-level issues. Without it, students might only concentrate on superficial problems.

However, other students expressed skepticism regarding the application of a rubric, claiming that it would restrict their originality and that it is overly exam-oriented. Students also did not know what to do when they came across papers written by native English speakers that did not exactly fit the rubric's specifications.

Overall, employing the rubric makes the requirements for L2 writing evident, which improves their capacity to provide feedback. Nevertheless, excessive usage of it may cause students to become hesitant.

4.3. Group dynamics within peer interaction

According to the interactionist theory [38], the third aspect that could lead to varying opinions about how beneficial peer feedback is is if negotiations occur during the process. Peer feedback may be perceived as having limited value if it is given during poor interactions or negotiations. In contrast to previous research on peer feedback training, which focused on helping students identify mistakes and provide recommendations, Sánchez's study emphasizes that structured instruction and peer interactions help students work together more effectively and generate more useful solutions, which improves writing performance [35]. The significance of negotiation was also covered by Guerrero and Villamil, who emphasized that educators must give students as many chances as possible to engage in social interaction with students who have varying degrees of regulation. Instructors are also expected to have students engage with many peers, since a student may bring up a strategy that another student fails to present [39]. Wang did this by establishing a setting for dyadic peer interactions. In particular, students found the peer feedback activity dull and uninteresting after a few rounds of peer discussion when they bargained with the same partner in class. The feedback that students received in the second round was less enlightening and helpful as they grew more used to the thought processes of their partners. As a result, they began to have doubts about the value of peer feedback [27]. This result was consistent with the findings of Guerrero and Villamil's study, which emphasizes the importance of diverse grouping and suggests that a range of peer review groups could be an additional strategy to improve dyadic peer interaction because they increase the quantity and diversity of peer feedback, potentially lowering the risk of relying solely on one peer for assistance [39]. Regarding negotiation, it is also important to allocate adequate time for negotiation; otherwise, students would not have enough time to engage in conversation and clarify the intentions behind their written recommendations, which will reduce the perceived value of peer feedback. Instructors could require students to complete their written peer feedback at home in order to allocate more time for in-class discussions [30]. In addition, Wang noted that when conversations occurred, students tended to produce more fruitful modifications in their subsequent versions, which is in line with the findings of Goldstein and Conrad's study [40]. Negotiation results in increased retention of the material covered; more importantly, since it involves students asking and answering questions, it gives feedback providers and receivers the chance to gain a deeper understanding of the students' writing intentions, which leads to increased retention as well as self-reflection. These results also support the findings of Nelson and Murphy's study, which further suggested that the degree to which peer feedback was adapted depended on peer contacts [1].

4.4. Culture-related problems on peer feedback

Moreover, while examining the efficacy of peer feedback, variations brought about by different learning backgrounds must be taken into account, according to Vygotsky's sociocultural theory [8]. The interaction

behaviors, feedback strategies, and task orientation of Spanish English learners and Chinese English learners differed, as observed by Carson and Nelson [7] in the interaction features of three advanced Chinese learners in peer review groups in a writing class. This suggests that different first languages and cultural backgrounds may have an impact on how students provide feedback. For instance, because of a desire to keep the peace in the group, Chinese learners were less inclined to offer critical comments or to dispute with peers. They discovered that ESL students from cultures that value collectivism, such as in East Asian nations, typically cooperate for the good of the group as a whole, but Western students are more inclined to work in groups to meet the needs of individual members. Future research on the group dynamics of multicultural writing groups and how these dynamics affect the improvement of nonnative speakers' writing is suggested [7]. Wang's research findings were consistent with those of Carson and Nelson, who observed that East Asian students were hesitant to make recommendations and, when they did, were very circumspect so as not to provoke disagreements with other group members [27]. Therefore, it might be wise to introduce students to web-based peer review platforms where anonymous peer evaluation can be supplied in order to allay their worries about preserving interpersonal interactions during the session. Different perspectives on the usefulness of peer criticism on L2 writing may result from a variety of reasons, including gender disparities and prior exposure to it, training, the use of rubrics, negotiation, and cultural variations.

5. Discussion and implication

The impact of peer feedback on L2 writing is examined in this overview of the literature. Existing research indicates that students' writing can be enhanced by receiving feedback from their peers. First of all, peer feedback is not the same as low-quality feedback, and it is not appropriate to compare it with teacher feedback because the former is more likely to address global issues while the latter focuses more on local ones. As a result, they have different roles to play in assisting students in improving their writing [16]. Additionally, as they developed a sense of audience, feedback providers and receivers both learned to be more accountable for their own and other people's work. This helped them to gradually increase their learner autonomy and, in the end, shift from other-regulation to self-regulation, which is a demonstration of the idea in sociocultural theory. It is also noteworthy that providers typically gain more from the process. More specifically, compared to feedback receivers, feedback providers made more changes to their final drafts. Additionally, participants mentioned that they were able to grow from the mistakes made by their peers, which encourages greater introspection [24].

Peer feedback is useful, but inconsistent results about its effectiveness imply that it is not always effective. Researchers have been doubting peers' abilities to make useful advice due to their insufficient language skills [7]. Numerous factors that could affect peer feedback's efficacy and people's opinions of it were compiled in this literature study. For instance, providing adequate training beforehand might make the practice more beneficial because it would enable students to realize the importance of feedback and make the most of it, in addition to improving their capacity to provide and receive it. Min discovered that when making recommendations, feedback providers became more specific and were able to concentrate on both local and global issues [33]. Nonetheless, most empirical research on peer feedback training places an emphasis on assisting students in identifying mistakes and making recommendations. Subsequent research endeavors may prioritize the instruction of students in social interaction and teamwork. However, before implementing peer feedback activities, a rubric could be added because a clear rubric helps students know which component of the activity they should be focusing on [27]. Therefore, before allowing students to participate in the activity, instructors could create a customized rubric and explain how it should be applied. Another component that can improve the

efficiency of peer feedback is encouraging students to communicate and negotiate with each other as much as possible according to interactionist theory. Misunderstandings between feedback providers and receivers can be resolved through negotiation, allowing both sides to examine the situation from multiple angles and improving their appreciation of peers' advice [33]. Teachers should therefore provide the space and time necessary for students to discuss during peer feedback sessions. Cultural differences are the final factor influencing how peer feedback is perceived. According to Carson and Nelson's research, students with different cultural backgrounds respond differently to peer criticism; some were afraid to start arguments within their groups, while others felt more at ease voicing their opinions [7]. Future studies may examine cultural concerns in EFL environments, while the majority of current research is undertaken in ESL contexts. Furthermore, many study approaches, such as quasi-experiments, conversation analysis, and questionnaires, may be employed to collect data and provide insights into how learners manage culturally related issues and how those issues impact their perspectives on peer feedback. Comparably, it is important to investigate how different genders perceive and respond to the practice of peer feedback. The time commitment is yet another drawback to the empirical research compiled in this literature review. We anticipate longitudinal research on how students improve as a result of peer feedback. Furthermore, further research is needed to determine how students with varying skill levels could affect how beneficial peer feedback is. The final area that requires attention is bridging the knowledge gap between practice and research. Peer feedback on L2 writing has been the subject of extensive research, yet despite this, some students remain unconvinced of its value, and many educational environments do not regularly employ this kind of activity. Therefore, more research should be done to determine why, in some circumstances, those studies have not influenced classroom practice.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1]   Nelson GL, Murphy JM, 1993, Peer Response Groups: Do L2 Writers Use Peer Comments in Revising Their Drafts? TESOL Quarterly, 27(1): 135. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586965

[2]   Min HT, 2006, The Effects of Trained Peer Review on EFL Students' Revision Types and Writing Quality. Journal of Second Language Writing, 15(2): 118–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.01.003

[3]   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(1): 30–43.

[4]   Hanjani AM, Li L, 2014, Exploring L2 Writers' Collaborative Revision Interactions and Their Writing Performance. System, 2014(44): 101–114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.03.004

[5]   Zhu W, Yu S, Zheng Y, 2023, Exploring Chinese EFL Undergraduates' Academic Emotions in Giving and Receiving Peer Feedback on Writing. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 48(8): 1339–1355. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2235635

[6]   Lockhart C, Ng P, 1995, Analyzing Talk in ESL Peer Response Groups: Stances, Functions, and Content. Language Learning, 45(4): 605–651. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00456.x

[7]   Carson JG, Nelson GL, 1996, Chinese Students' Perceptions of ESL Peer Response Group Interaction. Journal of Second Language Writing, 5(1): 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743(96)90012-0

[8]   Vygotsky LS, 1978, Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

[9]   Lantolf JP, 2000, Second Language Learning as a Mediated Process. Language Teaching, 33(2): 79–96. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444800015329

[10] Graham S, Sandmel K, 2011, The Process Writing Approach: A Meta-Analysis. The Journal of Educational Research, 104(6): 396–407.

[11] Swain M, Lapkin S, 1995, Problems in Output and the Cognitive Processes They Generate: A Step Towards Second Language Learning. Applied Linguistics, 16(3): 371–391. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/16.3.371

[12] Hyland K, Hyland F, 2019, Feedback in Second Language Writing Contexts and Issues, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[13] Wertsch JV, 1979, From Social Interaction to Higher Psychological Processes: A Clarification and Application of Vygotsky's Theory. *Human Development, 22*(1): 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1159/000272425

[14] Leontev AN, 1978, Activity, Consciousness, and Personality, Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

[15] Villamil OS, De Guerrero MCM, 1998, Assessing the Impact of Peer Revision on L2 Writing. Applied Linguistics, 19(4): 491–514. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.4.491

[16] Caulk N, 1994, Comparing Teacher and Student Responses to Written Work. TESOL Quarterly, 28(1): 181. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587209

[17] Lei Z, 2017, Salience of Student Written Feedback by Peer-Revision in EFL Writing Class. English Language Teaching, 10(12): 151. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n12p151

[18] Mendonça CO, Johnson KE, 1994, Peer Review Negotiations: Revision Activities in ESL Writing Instruction. TESOL Quarterly, 28(4): 745. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587558

[19] Yu S, Hu G, 2016, Can Higher-Proficiency L2 Learners Benefit from Working with Lower-Proficiency Partners in Peer Feedback? Teaching in Higher Education, 22(2): 178–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2016.1221806

[20] Rothschild D, Klingenberg F, 1990, Self and Peer Evaluation of Writing in the Interactive ESL Classroom: An Exploratory Study. TESL Canada Journal, 8(1): 52. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v8i1.578

[21] Jacobs GM, Zhang S, 1989, Peer Feedback in Second Language Writing Instruction: Boon or Bane. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED306766).

[22] Kuyyogsuy S, 2019, Promoting Peer Feedback in Developing Students' English Writing Ability in L2 Writing Class. International Education Studies, 12(9): 76. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n9p76

[23] Berggren J, 2015, Learning from Giving Feedback: A Study of Secondary-Level Students. ELT Journal, 69(1): 58–70. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu036

[24] Aghajani M, Zoghipour M, 2018, The Comparative Effect of Online Self-Correction, Peer- Correction, and Teacher Correction in Descriptive Writing Tasks on Intermediate EFL Learners' Grammar Knowledge the Prospect of Mobile Assisted Language Learning (MALL). International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 7(3): 14. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.3p.14

[25] Trautmann NM, 2006, Is It Better To Give Or To Receive? Insights into Collaborative Learning Through Web-Mediated Peer Review, Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.

[26] Tsui ABM, Ng M, 2000, Do Secondary L2 Writers Benefit from Peer Comments? Journal of Second Language Writing, 9(2): 147–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743(00)00022-9

[27] Wang W, 2014, Students' Perceptions of Rubric-Referenced Peer Feedback on EFL Writing: A Longitudinal Inquiry. Assessing Writing, 2014(19): 80–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.008

[28] Zhang S, 1995, Reexamining the Affective Advantage of Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class. Journal of Second Language Writing, 4(3): 209–222. https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(95)90010-1

[29] Ganji M, 2009, Teacher-Correction, Peer-Correction and Self-Correction: Their Impacts on Iranian Students' IELTS

Essay Writing Performance. The Journal of Asia TEFL, 2009(6): 117–139.

[30] Wei W, Cheong CM, Zhu X, et al., 2022, Comparing Self-Reflection and Peer Feedback Practices in an Academic Writing Task: A Student Self-Efficacy Perspective. Teaching in Higher Education, 2022: 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2042242

[31] Ruegg R, 2014, The Effect of Peer and Teacher Feedback on Changes in EFL Students' Writing Self-Efficacy. The Language Learning Journal, 46(2): 87–102. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.958190

[32] Chen J, 2021, Research on the Effect of Peer Feedback Training in English Writing Teaching: A Case Study of Students in Business English Major. English Language Teaching, 14(6): 12. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n6p12

[33] Min HT, 2005, Training Students to Become Successful Peer Reviewers. System, 33(2): 293–308. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.11.003

[34] Rahimi M, 2013, Is Training Student Reviewers Worth its While? A Study of How Training Influences the Quality of Students' Feedback and Writing. Language Teaching Research, 17(1): 67–89. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168812459151

[35] Sánchez-Naranjo J, 2019, Peer Review and Training: Pathways to Quality and Value in Second Language Writing. Foreign Language Annals, 52(3): 612–643. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12414

[36] Jacobs HL, 1981, Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach. English Composition Program, Newbury House Publishers, Inc., Rowley, MA 01969.

[37] Weigle S, 2002, Assessing Writing (Cambridge Language Assessment), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511732997

[38] Long MH, 1983, Native Speaker/Non-Native Speaker Conversation and the Negotiation of Comprehensible Input. Applied Linguistics, 4(2): 126–141. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.126

[39] De Guerrero MCM, Villamil OS, 1994, Social-Cognitive Dimensions of Interaction in L2 Peer Revision. The Modern Language Journal, 78(4): 484–496. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02065.x

[40] Goldstein LM, Conrad SM, 1990, Student Input and Negotiation of Meaning in ESL Writing Conferences. TESOL Quarterly, 24(3): 443–460. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587229