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The Issue

Feedback
• Teacher time
• Student learning
• Hulme & Forshaw (2009), O’Donovan, (2015)

Feedback delivery
• Dialogue (Nicol, 2010)
• Recipience (Winstone, 2016)
• Feedback Literacy (Carless & Boud 2018)

Inner feedback
• Self regulation (Butler & Winne, 1995)
• Generating internal feedback (Nicol, 2013)

How can we improve inner feedback generation without increasing teacher workload?
Peer review – giving and receiving feedback (Liu & Carless, 2006)

Most research on receipt of feedback but since 2010 increasing studies about value of reviewing and producing feedback (Cho and MacArthur, 2011: Cho and Cho, 2011)

Key finding: when students review others’ work they generate feedback on own work (Nicol et al, 2014)

Two benefits of reviewing – students learn to make judgements of others work at same time activate inner feedback on own work from many different perspectives
Research questions

1. How do different components of peer review (reviewing, self-review & receiving reviews) contribute to perceived learning? (Nicol, 2014)

2. How does the quality of the work reviewed contribute to perceived learning? (Sadler, 2010)

3. What are the challenges and concerns about peer review from the student perspective? (Hovardas et al, 2014; Purchase & Hamer, 2018)
Thematic analysis and brief discussion

Criteria
– Themes and evidence
– Research question and prior literature
– Methodological limitations

• Provide one feedback comment for each criteria
• Identify how the writer could improve their work, explain why you think this and how it could be achieved.
• Explain what is especially good about it.

Review your own submission in the light of the peer review you have just completed using the same criteria.
Questionnaire N = 28

Contribution of peer review process to learning; motivations; future plans; concerns.

Open questions

Comment on answers

Focus Group N = 4

"..can you say more about…"
1. **How do different components of peer review contribute to perceived learning?**

**Contribution of each aspect of the peer review process to learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Self Review</th>
<th>Receiving reviews</th>
<th>Self-reviewing after receiving feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most positive learning experience</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which is most effective for learning?</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. How do different components of peer review contribute to perceived learning?

Learning from the reviewing processes

- Reading/evaluating three different peer reports
- Comparing one peer’s work with another peer’s work
- Comparing peers’ work with your own
- Comparing peers’ works against the criteria outlined in the rubric on AROPA
- Writing out feedback comments for peers

- Contributed little or nothing
- Contributed moderately
- Contributed a great deal
1. How do different components of peer review contribute to perceived learning?

- Getting different perspectives on your work
- Receiving feedback which you could not deduce yourself
- Seeing how peers write feedback comments

Legend:
- Contributed little or nothing
- Contributed moderately
- Contributed a great deal

* p < 0.05
ns

Graph showing the contribution of different components of peer review to perceived learning.

- Getting different perspectives on your work contributed a great deal.
- Receiving feedback which you could not deduce yourself contributed moderately.
- Seeing how peers write feedback comments contributed little or nothing.
Reviewing: Benchmarking
This was brilliant in letting me see the extent of the referencing required and how to structure arguments for the need for our work to address questions raised or tackled by others. Having seen other people in my cohort and what they’ve written, you know the angles and perspectives that they’ve you know—viewing it from an entirely different lens is definitely very helpful.

Reviewing: Developing a skill
Having to do that for the first time and kind of being thrown into the deep end because having to criticise someone without really knowing what you're doing at first then having a few goes at it, you kind of pick out things that, like, where you're good and you've to be critical.

Reviewing: Critical Thinking
Learned more from reviewing others, easier to critique others and then apply that to my own work than to just critique mine normally.
Self Review: Encouraged reflection at different time points

_in the moment when I was writing the self-review, I was thinking, "It not help much", [sic]…But then..later…when I was looking again at my—at my report, I remember what I kind of had to write and what I was missing, and I think then it helped me.._

_Oh even giving feedback to someone saying 'oh you could improve this by doing that"", I would think, "Oh actually I could do that as well". So, I already knew kind of the points that I wanted to improve._

Receiving Reviews: Reassurance: was this helpful?

_Sometimes when you constantly are looking at your own work it's hard to see mistakes, so it's good to get an outside opinion_

_the only reply I got was, "Good work." [laughs] Whereas I spent like—the—the biggest input I got, or the good thing I got from it was how to articulate what is actually wrong with something._
2. How does the quality of the work reviewed influence the perceived contribution to learning?

Facilitating learning

![Bar chart showing the perceived contribution to learning for different quality of work reviewed.]

- **Comparing your own work against peer work of high quality**
  - Facilitates my learning most: 70%
  - Facilitates my learning: 30%
  - Facilitates my learning least: 0%

- **Comparing your own work against a range of peer work of different quality**
  - Facilitates my learning most: 80%
  - Facilitates my learning: 10%
  - Facilitates my learning least: 0%

- **Comparing your own work against peer work of low quality**
  - Facilitates my learning most: 60%
  - Facilitates my learning: 30%
  - Facilitates my learning least: 10%
2. How does the quality of the work reviewed influence the perceived contribution to learning?

Quality of work: setting a standard
It set a standard for the other peer reviewing tasks. Without it I would have only judged work of others by my own standards, which are very unclear.

…when you see something that's good, you know it's good….. But it was the most helpful bit of the whole thing because there was—there was nothing negative we could say about it and we were like, "Ah that's—that's what we need to—that's the level we need to aim for",

Quality of work: building confidence
Cause I thought, "Oh I'm not so good, like I know there's things wrong with my writing", and then when I saw the—what other people had produced, I was like, "No I'm fine."
3. What are the challenges and concerns about peer review from the student perspective?

Concerns about peer review

- My own ability to produce quality comments
- Quality of comments I receive from peers
- The absence of teacher feedback
- Ending up not knowing what is good quality work
- Sharing my work with other students

* Not concerned
* Moderately concerned
* Very concerned
3. What are the challenges and concerns about peer review from the student perspective?

Challenges & Concerns: Quality of comments
I was giving them advice on what they should do to improve it. What if I give them bad advice?

generally people were just like, "Yeah, this is great," or, "Yeah, maybe improve this", but not—it wasn't very in-depth.

…it felt like I had put in more effort and given better stuff than I received

Challenges & Concerns: Non-graded assessment
"-it wasn’t an actual piece of coursework, it was this extra thing”
“..It should be formal, it should be submitted.”

Challenges & Concerns: Teacher input
I would have benefitted from comments by someone who knows exactly what they are doing
Summary

1. Contribution of peer review to learning

• Reviewing and receiving reviews both helpful
• All aspects of reviewing and getting different perspectives on your work (receiving) : developing critical thinking.
• Writing out self review comments less helpful: self-review more useful after reflection

2. Quality

• Reviewing high quality work most helpful, range of quality work is moderately helpful : setting standards
• Low quality reviewing built confidence.

3. Challenges

• Quality of comments (both ways)
• Absence of teacher feedback
• Non-graded
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Changes in 2018-19

• Reduced and simplified the submission & review rubric
• Peer review done in own time
• Extended review period
• Self review Qs changed to encourage more detailed answers
Peer & Self review 2017-18

1) Themes and Evidence  Are there some clear themes identified and proposed based on the data analysis?  Are the themes convincingly supported by evidence from the transcript? (e.g. in a way that conveys some aspects of the lived experience of the participants in the study).

2) Research Question and Prior Literature  Have the main and subsidiary research questions been outlined clearly?  Do you explain how the thematic analysis addresses the research questions?  Do you explain how the analysis relates to and/or informs existing theory and research in this area?

3) Methodological Limitations  Have any methodological limitations and improvements been identified?

Explain why this aspect of your work needs improved and what could be done to improve it OR explain what is especially good about it and how you will continue this practice.
1) Analysis: Overall the analysis should demonstrate an understanding of the purpose and implications of a qualitative methodology. Evaluate this section using the following criteria.

- Themes are identified and clearly presented
- Themes are supported by verbatim evidence from the transcript (e.g., in a way that conveys some aspect(s) of the lived experience of the chosen phenomenon).
- Themes are described and interpreted within a narrative
- Clear headings/sub-headings outlining themes. Balance between narrative and quotes.

2) Discussion: Overall the discussion should demonstrate evaluation of relevant theory, research and methodology. Evaluate this section using the following criteria.

- Explains how the analysis addresses the research question(s) and beyond to contribute to understanding of social and psychological phenomena
- Explains how the analysis relates to and/or informs existing theory and research in the topic area.

Consider these criteria in your review and explain why one aspect of the analysis needs improved and say what could be done to improve it OR explain what is especially good about it.
Self review 2018-19

- What are the key differences between the thematic analysis you just reviewed and your own thematic analysis? **Note two key differences and clearly explain clearly what they are.**
- What did you learn about your own thematic analysis by reviewing this peer’s thematic analysis and from the differences you noted in question 1? **Please give a reason for your answer in a few sentences.** [Remember, you can learn from a poor as well as a good thematic analysis].
- Overall, which thematic analysis is better, yours or this one? **Please give a clear explanation for your decision.**
## Student engagement 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Submissions</th>
<th>Student peer &amp; self-review</th>
<th>Exemplar peer &amp; self-review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L3H</td>
<td>95.4 %</td>
<td>54.6 %</td>
<td>40.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msc</td>
<td>96.4 %</td>
<td>63.4 %</td>
<td>58.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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