PARADIGM SHIFTS IN PEER FEEDBACK WITHIN LEARNING-ORIENTED LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT

Xiao XIE[a]
Vahid Nimehchisalem[a+]
Shameem Rafik-Galea[b]

[a]Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia

[b]SEGi University, Malaysia

+Corresponding author: vahid@upm.edu.my; nimechie@gmail.com

Abstract

In the development of language assessment in higher education, assessment criteria and tasks have diversified immensely. There has been an increasing acceptance of the importance of learning-oriented assessment (LOA) in facilitating the development of students' potential for effective learning. With the three key principles of learning-oriented assessment processes, namely learning-oriented assessment tasks, development of evaluative expertise, and student engagement with feedback, assessment researchers and frontline teachers could be better equipped with theoretical knowledge to confront the challenges proposed by technology-mediated language assessment. Peer feedback, as one of the central components of LOA, has been heavily researched in recent decades. In this conceptual article, we attempt to outline three major paradigm shifts in peer feedback, as a crucial form of student participation in feedback activities, from monologue to dialogue, from passive to proactive engagement, and from self-regulation to co-regulation and socially shared regulation, through a review of previous research. The aim is to promote the recognition of peer feedback in facilitating dialogue, proactive engagement and regulating learning among researchers and teachers, and, in turn, to better motivate learners to undertake high levels of cognitive involvement not only in the process of language assessment, but also in the explorations of lifelong learning.

Keywords: language assessment, learning-oriented assessment, peer feedback, paradigm shift

Introduction

The COVID-19 outbreak has posed an unprecedented challenge to the practice of language assessment globally, and as both teaching and assessment moved rapidly from the traditional face-to-face classroom to the virtual online environment, researchers and frontline teachers have been forced to come up with responses based on evolving assessment theory and digital technology. Learning-oriented assessment (LOA), with its emphasis on the learning process, helps to compensate for the shortcomings and disadvantages of frontline teachers in conducting class-based assessments in an online environment. This type of assessment particularly highlights the role of feedback in further facilitating student initiatives to improve learning and

clearly remedies the lack of communication in the online assessment process, which is worthy of further research.

Carless (2007) proposed the concept of learning-oriented assessment, which is defined as "assessment where a primary focus is on the potential to develop productive student learning processes" (Carless, 2015a, p. 964). This model of assessment breaks away from the traditional shackles of formative assessment and summative assessment, placing more emphasis on learning factors than measurement factors in the assessment process (Carless et al., 2006). According to this model, motivating appropriate student learning behaviours and attitudes can be achieved not only through formative assessment, but also through summative assessment when it meets certain characteristics (Carless, 2015a). In order to make this theory of assessment more effective for the primary purpose of promoting student learning, Carless (2007, pp. 59-60) proposed three principles. As the concepts were refined and improved, Carless (2015a, p. 965) further simplified the components of learning-oriented assessment into the three strands of the model, namely learning oriented assessment tasks, developing evaluative expertise and student engagement with feedback.

Principle 1: Assessment tasks should be designed to stimulate sound learning practices amongst students.

Principle 2: Assessment should involve students actively in engaging with criteria, quality, their own and/or peers' performance.

Principle 3: Feedback should be timely and forward-looking so as to support current and future student learning.

In learning-oriented assessment processes, students, as agents of assessment and feedback, need to be able to develop a concept of assessment quality close to that of the teachers (Sadler, 2010), and to compensate for the shortcomings and deficiencies of teacher feedback by engaging in peer feedback. Firstly, in the absence of resources, frontline teachers are overwhelmed by the burden of assessment and therefore find it difficult to give specific and timely feedback on the results of each student's assessment; indeed, the content of teacher feedback is often stereotypical and unclear, which makes it difficult for students to understand all of the teacher feedback (Hyland, 1990). Secondly, prolonged teacher interventions result in students developing passive learning habits in which they are overly dependent on the teacher and lack autonomy in their learning. Upon receiving assessment results, students simply make changes based on the teacher's feedback without exploring ways of deeper learning and problem solving. It is because of such drawbacks that more and more researchers and frontline teachers are recognising the importance of peer feedback in facilitating learning-oriented assessment processes.

The cognitive, social and emotional benefits of peer feedback in ESL/EFL assessment, particularly in writing instruction, continue to be confirmed by a growing body of empirical research (Min, 2006). Through a learning model in which peers provide feedback to each other, learners improve their ability to master feedback criteria and promote a deeper understanding

of writing and revision (Min, 2006). The equal status of provider and receiver of peer feedback helps to increase students' sense of audience (Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Tsui & Ng, 2000) and to develop a sense of ownership of the text (Min, 2006; Tsui & Ng, 2000). Peer feedback is effective in reducing students' anxiety (Gao et al., 2019) and emotional defences (Higgins, 2000), resulting in a more positive attitude towards writing (Min, 2005).

While the benefits of peer feedback have been confirmed by a growing body of empirical research, it is undeniable that it comes with a number of drawbacks that need to be overcome in order to be most effective. Increasingly, feedback researchers have recognised that feedback that only provides assessment information may not be sufficient to meet students' needs and interests, that much feedback is wasted or never viewed, or that students may not understand how to use feedback to improve their learning. Over the past few decades, peer feedback has undergone some significant paradigm shifts, which are summarised in this study through a review of the relevant literature as shifting from monologue to dialogue (Carless & Boud, 2018; Laurillard, 2002; Wood, 2020; Zhu & To, 2021), from passive to proactive engagement (Winstone, Nash, Rowntree & Parker, 2017), and from self-regulation to co-regulation and socially shared regulation (Butler & Winne, 1995; Er et al., 2021; Zhu & To, 2021). The paradigm shifts in peer feedback, although coming from different and diverse research perspectives, all emphasise what students can do with feedback to improve learning, and specific literature reviews are described separately below.

From Monologue to Dialogue

Peer feedback approaches to ESL/EFL teaching and assessment have emerged and developed since the 1980s (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1982; Chaudron, 1984; Zamel, 1985). Multidisciplinary theories such as social constructivism (Vygotsky & Cole, 1978); collaborative learning theory (Johnson & Johnson, 1989); theories from a cognitive perspective, namely the interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996), the attention hypothesis (Schmidt, 2001) and the comprehensible input hypothesis (Swain, 1985) all provide research perspectives and theoretical foundations for feedback research. Most of these theories view learning as a social and collective activity in which peer feedback facilitates peer interaction and collaboration and, in turn, students gain language knowledge and skills. Together, these different theoretical backgrounds have provided a solid basis for the rapid development of peer feedback research, making it increasingly important and widely used in ESL/EFL teaching and assessment.

Among the many theoretical schools of thought, the social constructivist perspective has laid the cornerstone for the development of peer feedback and has had a profound impact. Social constructivism views all higher forms of learning and cognitive development as social in nature (Lantolf, 2000) and emphasises that individuals cannot learn and develop cognition outside of their social and cultural context (Storch, 2007). At one end of this continuum are skills that the learner has mastered and at the other end are skills that are too complex and difficult for the learner; at neither extreme is learning likely to occur and in between is the zone of proximal development. Another core concept of social constructivism is scaffolding, a term borrowed from the construction industry and applied to the field of education. Scaffolding refers to the

support and assistance provided for students to complete tasks independently in order for learning to occur and develop, with the aim of enabling students to successfully move through the zone of proximal development. The use of scaffolding, defined as structured supportive interactions that lead to effective learning, is the most effective way to help learners. Learners' interactions with significant individuals can profoundly influence higher-order thinking processes, and peer feedback provides opportunities for learners to improve within the zone of proximal development (ZPD), thus helping learners move from performing with the help of a teacher or peers to independent problem-solving skills (Yu & Lee, 2016). Both parties in peer feedback learn from each other and scaffold each other's progress through a process of apprenticeship. By engaging in scaffolding tasks between peers, learners not only improve their own learning, but also contribute to the language development of their peers.

In social constructivism, peer feedback is constructed through interaction and is therefore seen as a dynamic, interpretative process (Carless & Boud, 2018; Laurillard, 2002; Vygotsky & Cole, 1978). It is therefore necessary to shift feedback from one-way monologue to two-way interactive dialogue. In the old paradigm, feedback was seen as the delivery of a gift or product, or the process of one-way transmission of diagnostic information (Carless, 2015b). This monologic paradigm has obvious drawbacks. Firstly, this feedback focuses only on the final assessment of the learner's work and is not conducive to engaging learners' interest and motivation in feedback practices (Carless, 2015b). Secondly, this paradigm is also based on the idealised premise that feedback receivers can understand and practice feedback accurately (Scott & Coate, 2003), whereas, in fact, feedback receivers often struggle to understand the content of feedback, as Sutton and Gill (2010) compared the difficulty of decoding and understanding feedback to that of learning a new language. Because the old paradigm of peer feedback rejected the dynamic nature of learning (Nicol & Macfarlan-Dick, 2006), a great deal of feedback was ignored and not implemented. In response to the worrying state of student engagement in peer feedback, feedback researchers have begun to emphasise that dialogue can help learners actively construct and interpret the meaning of feedback and jointly decide what actions to take to implement it, thereby improving learning and task performance (Yang & Carless, 2013). In two-way conversations and collaborative learning activities between feedback providers and receivers, peers share responsibility for generating sufficient quantity and quality of feedback and using it effectively (Winston, Nash, Parker & Rowntree, 2017). Thus, rather than simply complaining about the poor quality of feedback, receivers learn to take responsibility for its effective use (Nicol & Macfarlan-Dick, 2006).

This paradigm shift in assessment can be clearly seen by comparing the different definitions of peer feedback in academia over a twenty-year period. Liu and Hansen (2002, p. 1) defined peer feedback as "the use of learners as sources of information and interactants for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained teacher, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing". In contrast to this definition, which only emphasises the agency of students in peer feedback, Zhu and Carless (2018, p. 884) defined peer feedback as "a dialogic interaction between the provider and receiver about the quality of the work being assessed, emphasizing the potential of feedback dialogues as a means of

negotiating meaning and potentially empowering learners". This marks a shift in peer feedback towards a dialogic paradigm that is becoming more and more clearly recognised by researchers. It is undeniable that research on the new paradigm is still emerging and more work is urgently needed to explore in depth how students can engage in dialogic peer feedback activities and take initiative to promote learning-oriented assessment.

From Passive to Proactive Engagement

When the giving and receiving of feedback is seen as a two-way communication and interaction process, the importance of the receivers' engagement in decoding and responding to feedback is further highlighted (Nicol, 2010). Fredricks et al.'s (2004) concept of feedback engagement has been much cited in subsequent research, namely the interrelated triple-dimensional constructs of behaviour, cognition and affect. In addition to this, the psychological, emotional and cultural factors that result in learners' non-engagement with feedback have also been the focus of existing research on feedback engagement. In contrast, despite some seminal research findings, the expanse of research on the factors that facilitate feedback engagement is far from adequate, suggesting that researchers and frontline teachers need to pay more attention to the process and environmental elements that promote students' proactive engagement in peer feedback.

The following research explores the multifaceted and complex nature of feedback engagement from a variety of behavioural, cognitive and affective factors (Fan & Xu, 2020; Wood, 2020). Behavioural engagement focuses on students' behaviour after receiving feedback from their peers (Ellis, 2010), which involves what observable strategies they adopt to revise their assessment products (Han & Hyland, 2015), how they actively seek dialogue with teachers or peers (Nicol & Macfarlan-Dick, 2006) and set goals and action plans (Hepplestone & Chikwa, 2016). Cognitive engagement refers to the extent to which learners are cognitively attentive to feedback (Ellis, 2010), which is subdivided into three components, namely awareness of feedback, cognitive manipulation and metacognitive manipulation (Han & Hyland, 2015), and related research includes grasping learning opportunities from the feedback process (Evans, 2013); improving the understanding of responsibility sharing for effective feedback (Winstone & Nash, 2016); improving the ability to make evaluative judgements (Tai et al., 2018); making feedback-related internal dialogue (Carless, 2016); and engaging learners in the process of feedback loop (Farhady, 2021). The affective dimension, referring to learners' attitudinal responses to feedback (Ellis, 2010), is examined in terms of interest, value and emotion (Kahu, 2013; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003), such as developing a better sense of self-efficacy (Evans, 2016); demonstrating receptivity to feedback that threatens the sense of self-efficacy (Evans, 2013); and feeling valued and showing enthusiasm (Kahu, 2013).

An area that has been extensively researched in terms of the extent of feedback engagement is the factors that lead to learners not engaging with feedback. Through a review of 103 studies met the inclusion criteria, Jonsson (2013) identified five reasons why learners do not engage with feedback: receivers think that (1) the feedback is not useful; (2) the feedback is not specific, detailed or individualised enough; (3) the feedback is too authoritative in tone to be productive; (4) they lack the appropriate implementation strategies for productive use of

feedback; and (5) they fail to understand the academic terminology or jargon used in the feedback. Winstone, Nash, Rowntree and Parker (2017) identified four psychological processes and corresponding barriers to learners' use of feedback, namely: awareness, cognisance, agency and volition, indicating that learners' inability and poor knowledge regarding decoding the meaning and purpose of feedback, implementing appropriate feedback strategies, translating feedback into action, as well as proactivity and receptiveness. In addition, learners may be reluctant to engage in feedback activities for cognitive, emotional or cultural reasons (Wood, 2020). From a cognitive perspective, learners who perceive intellectual factors as a fixed entity or have fixed mindsets tend to exhibit unhelpful response patterns or show avoidance or aversion to feedback (Stewart et al., 2017). On the other hand, those with a growth mindset have a more positive attitude towards feedback and are more likely to view feedback that encourages new perspectives as a positive experience and take action to implement the feedback (Forsythe & Johnson, 2017). Emotions as a powerful mediator of behavioural responses and future intentions (Harrison et al., 2015) also have important implications for feedback engagement; for example, learners may experience a decrease in self-efficacy and raise psychological defensiveness when receiving summative feedback (Chen, 2010) or develop hostility towards the feedback providers (Ryan & Henderson, 2018). Cultural background can also be a potential barrier to feedback engagement, as peer feedback is embedded in a specific socio-cultural context where culture plays a key role (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). These issues relate specifically to collectivism, interpersonal harmony and face-saving (Hu & Lam, 2010; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Yu et al., 2016), for example, Chinese students' reluctance to express critical comments on their peers' writing is an attempt to maintain group harmony, avoid tensions and disagreements, and to not assert their authority (Nelson & Carson, 1998).

While the different dimensions of the research described above are relevant, feedback engagement remains invisible (Price et al., 2011). This is because most of the current feedback effectiveness research focuses on measuring improvements in learning outcomes or changes in satisfaction, while the lack of focus on learner behaviour makes it difficult to directly observe or measure these feedback engagement behaviours (Wood, 2020). There is no doubt that more theoretical and practical findings are urgently needed to explore how students can proactively engage in the process of peer feedback. As agentic engagement refers to the constructive contribution of students to the teaching and learning process they receive (Reeve & Tseng, 2011), Winstone, Nash, Parker and Rowntree (2017) defined proactive recipience as a form of agentic engagement that includes learners sharing responsibility for making the feedback process effective, resulting in a taxonomy of SAGE recipience processes, including (1) self-appraisal, (2) assessment literacy, (3) goal-setting and self-regulation, (4) engagement and motivation. By conducting a systematic review and inductive coding of 195 relevant papers on promoting feedback engagement, the SAGE recipience processes are posited in the descriptive model of key conceptual influences on learners' proactive recipience of feedback, related to feedback interventions and interpersonal communication variables.

Ongoing advances in digital media have provided new opportunities and platforms to promote students' proactive engagement in peer feedback activities. Hung (2016) conducted peer-to-peer video feedback via social media platforms, such as Facebook to stimulate students' enthusiasm to proactively engage in learning activities. Moreover, the explosion of COVID-19 has disrupted the global norm of education and assessment, and as the learning-orientated assessment has been brought to the online environment in many forms, this realistic need for assessment has inspired researchers to further explore the practical possibilities of peer feedback. With the popularity of online testing and blended learning, Wood (2021) adopted SAGE recipience processes to a technology-mediated assessment and learning environment, revealing the ways in which students used cloud applications, represented by Google Docs, to facilitate screen casting peer feedback.

From Self-regulation to Co-regulation and Socially Shared Regulation

How students use regulation strategies to co-construct learning goals with group members and work together to achieve learning outcomes through collaboration has been one of the key topics of research in educational psychology in recent decades. Feedback is an important component of collaborative learning and is closely related to regulating learning. The following section summarises research findings related to peer feedback in three dimensions: Self-Regulated Learning (SRL), Co-Regulated Learning (CoRL) and Socially Shared Regulated Learning (SSRL).

Research on regulation in collaborative learning began with the early proposal of self-regulation. Ashby (1957) proposed that regulation includes monitoring, evaluation and control. With the introduction of Flavell's (1979) metacognitive theory, more and more researchers have focused on the field of social cognition. Zimmerman (1989) identified self-regulated learning as the strategies, metacognitive behaviours, motivation and conscious regulation that individuals perform to accomplish a goal. Winne (2011) divided self-regulated learning into four stages: (1) task perceptions, which refers to the learner's understanding of the task to be performed; (2) developing goals and plans; (3) developing task strategies; and (4) adaption, also known as metacognitive adaptive learning, refers to the need for the learner to make long-term plans for future motivation, beliefs and strategies once the main task has been completed. Intrinsically, self-regulated learners rely on internal standards, self-reinforcement, self-regulatory processes and the building of self-efficacy. On the social side, by observing and learning verbal descriptions, social instruction and feedback, learners begin to stimulate imitation and self-regulation. Self-regulation is influenced by both self and social factors, emphasising the importance of social guidance in knowledge construction, practice and feedback (Zimmerman, 2000). As the models of self-regulation matured, researchers began to focus on the aspects of social interaction and contextualisation, including Zimmerman's (2000) cyclical model of self-regulated learning and Winne and Perry's (2000) model of information processing, both of which view self-regulated learning as an individual's ability to develop in the environment.

Butler and Winne (1995) explained that feedback is an inherent and major determinant in the processes that constitute self-regulated learning, highlighting the active role of feedback receivers in dialogic feedback. They pointed out that feedback receivers learn to develop the skills to self-regulate their learning by playing different roles and not always relying on the evaluation of others. Based on that, Nicol and Macfarlan-Dick (2006, p. 205) proposed a model that combines external feedback, internal feedback and self-regulatory processes with regard to cognition, motivation and behavior, suggesting seven principles of good feedback practice as listed below:

Good feedback practice:

1. helps clarify what performance is (goals, criteria, expected standards);
2. facilitates the development of self-assessment (reflection) in learning;
3. delivers high quality information to students about their learning;
4. encourages teacher and peer dialogue around learning;
5. encourages positive motivational beliefs and self-esteem;
6. provides opportunities to close the gap between current and desired performance;
7. provides information to teachers that can be used to help shape teaching.

Social contexts play a significant role in self-regulated learning. Numerous researchers recognising that self-regulated learning is linked to social interactions, have been focusing on the central role that social contexts play in students' self-regulated learning. This context has led to the development of co-regulated learning, derived from Vygotsky and Cole's (1978) idea of a socially embedded or contextualised higher mental process of self-regulated learning, emphasising that co-regulated learning is the natural interaction within the learner's zone of proximal development and occurs when individuals introduce expertise into new learning tasks. In this process, co-regulation in the zone of proximal development begins to emerge as self-regulation as well as social and cultural accumulation. Learners engage in and control their own self-regulatory strategies, evaluations and processes through interactions such as observing, requesting, prompting or supporting the views of others (Hadwin et al., 2005). Co-regulation refers to the ongoing monitoring and regulation of shared activities by multiple members, including behaviours related to planning, formulating, reflecting and adapting learning strategies, with an emphasis on inter-individual influence (Hadwin & Oshige, 2011; Vauras et al., 2003). Collaborative learning with group participation is negotiated, synchronous, interactive and dialogic, and is the result of a sustained effort to construct and maintain a shared conception of the problem (Reusser, 2001; Roschelle & Teasley, 1995).

Volet et al. (2009) made a distinction between high-level and low-level co-regulated learning, which is instructive for studies related to the different proactive roles of feedback receivers. Merely implying or describing the proactive roles of feedback receivers (Butler & Winne, 1995) does not adequately account for their impact on regulating learning (Zhu & Carless, 2018). In light of this, Zhu and To (2021) in a pioneering effort identified six different proactive roles, namely respondent, verifier, explicator, negotiator, seeker and generator, based on recorded conversations and stimulated recall interview data from 21 first-year university students in China. These roles were identified as having an impact on self-regulated learning

and co-regulated learning with the feedback providers, driving dialogic peer feedback in the direction of mutually beneficial learning activities. For example, when feedback receivers take on the role of the respondent, they may simply respond to providers' comments through facial expressions, tone of voice, gestures and other paralinguistic elements (Zhu & To, 2021). In this case, feedback receivers comfortably exchange information without scaffolding the learning of others. In contrast, when feedback receivers take on the role of the generator, they actively co-construct problem-solving solutions with feedback providers that may be unknown to them, thus enhancing understanding of the problem and scaffolding each other's learning. This suggests that not all co-regulation of content material involves the elaboration and co-construction of knowledge and that when group learning activities are limited to low-level information exchange, sharing of ideas and clarification of understanding, such interactions do not represent negotiation and exchange of content relevant to cognitive and metacognitive processes (Salonen et al., 2005). The three roles of negotiator, seeker and generator exemplify the contribution of feedback receivers in shaping the effectiveness of the feedback, which provides a new perspective on peer feedback research and further promotes the development of student-centred feedback practices, but the delineation and impact of the different roles need to be validated by more empirical research.

At present, in the field of collaborative learning, researchers are particularly interested in the group or community as a whole and use the group as a unit of analysis to explore why some groups succeed and others fail. It is within this context and perspective that socially shared regulated learning has been proposed, which has important implications for successful collaborative learning. Jackson et al. (2000) argued that individual goals are inextricably linked to social goals and are achieved through social interaction. Iiskala et al. (2004) proposed socially shared regulated learning as a process whereby multiple individuals jointly regulate their collective learning activities, with goals and standards being jointly constructed. Learners participate in socially shared regulation by negotiating a shared understanding of the collaborative task, setting learning goals and plans, establishing shared learning strategies, monitoring collective progress, and optimising the process and outcomes of learning in a timely manner.

The theoretical framework of collaborative peer feedback proposed by Er et al. (2021), for the first time, frames peer feedback from a socially shared regulation of learning perspective and provides a detailed description of the dialogic peer feedback process. The theoretical framework divides the dialogic feedback process between peers into three phases, namely: (1) planning and coordination of feedback activities, corresponding to socially shared regulated learning between all participants (Hadwin & Oshige, 2011); (2) discussion around the feedback to support its uptake, corresponding to co-regulated learning between feedback providers and feedback receivers (Hadwin & Oshige, 2011); and (3) translation of the feedback into task engagement and progress, corresponding to the self-regulated learning of the feedback receivers (Winne & Hadwin, 1998). In the first phase of socially shared regulated learning, participants in peer feedback are required to construct a shared understanding of the quality of work through a scoring rubric (Jackson & Larkin, 2002) as a prerequisite for successful group collaboration (Malmberg et al., 2015). In the second phase of co-regulated learning, feedback

providers give comments on the receiver's work, leading to a deep learning strategy, self-reflection, which helps feedback receivers connect the content of the feedback to their own work and thus deepen their understanding (Quinton & Smallbone, 2010). In the third phase of self-regulated learning, feedback receivers strive to accomplish learning goals and they need to monitor their progress in action and make iterative adjustments to their learning strategies (Butler & Winne, 1995). Through self-feedback, they can generate internal monitoring (Winne & Hadwin, 1998). Through dialogue, they can also receive monitoring from their fellow peers. Both internally and externally generated monitoring can help feedback receivers to confirm current progress and modify their subsequent actions.

Reflection

The disturbing practices of peer feedback in previous studies suggest that the longstanding paradigm of treating feedback as evaluative gifts delivered from feedback providers to feedback receivers does not attract sufficient attention from learners, and as a result, there is a low implementation rate of peer feedback and a lack of significant improvement in language assessment performances. However, these shortcomings do not prevent peer feedback research and application from thriving, as it helps to address the realities of large class sizes where teachers are overwhelmed by the workload of giving timely and precise feedback and is in line with developments in higher education and assessment that call for student-centred and learning-oriented reforms.

In our view, the proactive engagement of students in the practice of peer feedback is crucial and the role played by the receivers is often overlooked. In the case of peer feedback training, for example, when researchers and teachers focus solely on how to equip feedback providers to give feedback that is as specific and accurate as that of the teachers, we seem to forget the limitations of their own capabilities as learners. In turn, the voice of the feedback receivers is drowned out in such peer feedback, and they seem to be left as disempowering apprentices to implement the feedback, otherwise, they are considered incompetent learners. Therefore, we would argue that during the peer feedback training, receivers also need to be trained to promote their awareness of how to proactively participate in dialogues and enhance their competence to co-construct knowledge. There are still many examples of peer feedback practices that can be explored from a new perspective, but we believe that only when we change the stereotypical understanding of peer feedback will researchers and frontline teachers be better able to organise peer feedback activities more effectively in traditional face-to-face classrooms or in technology-mediated settings.

Closing Remarks

In the post-pandemic era, assessment researchers and frontline teachers alike need to revisit learning-oriented assessment that focuses on the essence of developing effective learning processes for students. The three principles of this model work as a coherent whole, integrating assessment tasks, students' assessment expertise, and engagement with feedback (Carless, 2015a). Peer feedback fully embodies the three principles of learning-oriented assessment and has undergone paradigm shifts and developments over the decades. Through the review of

previous research, this paper hopes to stimulate more research and exploration of the three paradigm shifts in peer feedback, further promoting peer feedback from monologue to dialogue, from passive to proactive engagement, from self-regulated learning to co-regulated learning and socially shared regulated learning.

References

Ashby, W. R. (1957). An introduction to cybernetics. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, *35*(a).

Brannon, L., & Knoblauch, C. H. (1982). On students' rights to their own texts: A model of teacher response. *College Composition and Communication*, *33*(2), 157-166.

Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, *65*(3), 245-281.

Carless, D. (2007). Learning-oriented assessment: conceptual bases and practical implications. *Innovations in education and teaching international*, *44*(1), 57-66.

Carless, D. (2015a). Exploring learning-oriented assessment processes. *Higher Education*, *69*(6), 963-976.

Carless, D. (2015b). *Excellence in university assessment: Learning from award-winning practice*. Routledge.

Carless, D. (2016). Feedback as dialogue. *Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory*, 1-6.

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(8), 1315-1325.

Carless, D., Joughin, G., & Mok, M. (2006). Learning-oriented assessment: principles and practice. *Assessment and evaluation in Higher Education*, *31*(4), 395-398.

Chaudron, C. (1984). The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. *RELC Journal*, *15*(2), 1-14.

Chen, C. W. Y. (2010). Graduate students' self-reported perspectives regarding peer feedback and feedback from writing consultants. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *11*(2), 151-158.

Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 335-349.

Er, E., Dimitriadis, Y., & Gašević, D. (2021). A collaborative learning approach to dialogic peer feedback: a theoretical framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *46*(4), 586-600.

Evans, C. (2013). Making sense of assessment feedback in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(1), 70-120.

Evans, C. (2016). *Enhancing assessment feedback practice in higher education: The EAT framework*. University of Southampton.

Farhady, H. (2021). Learning-oriented assessment in virtual classroom contexts. *Journal of Language and Communication (JLC)*, *8*(2), 121-132.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive–developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, *34*(10), 906.

Forsythe, A., & Johnson, S. (2017). Thanks, but no-thanks for the feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *42*(6), 850-859.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*(1), 59-109.

Gao, Y., Schunn, C. D. D., & Yu, Q. (2019). The alignment of written peer feedback with draft problems and its impact on revision in peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *44*(2), 294-308.

Hadwin, A. F., Wozney, L., & Pontin, O. (2005). Scaffolding the appropriation of self-regulatory activity: A socio-cultural analysis of changes in teacher–student discourse about a graduate research portfolio. *Instructional Science*, *33*(5), 413-450.

Hadwin, A., & Oshige, M. (2011). Self-regulation, coregulation, and socially shared regulation: Exploring perspectives of social in self-regulated learning theory. *Teachers College Record*, *113*(2), 240-264.

Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *30*, 31-44.

Harrison, C. J., Könings, K. D., Schuwirth, L., Wass, V., & Van der Vleuten, C. (2015). Barriers to the uptake and use of feedback in the context of summative assessment. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, *20*(1), 229-245.

Hepplestone, S., & Chikwa, G. (2016). Exploring the processes used by students to apply feedback. *Student Engagement and Experience Journal*, *5*(1), 1-15.

Higgins, E. T. (2000). Making a good decision: value from fit. *American Psychologist*, *55*(11), 12-17.

Hu, G., & Lam, S. T. E. (2010). Issues of cultural appropriateness and pedagogical efficacy: Exploring peer review in a second language writing class. *Instructional Science*, *38*(4), 371-394.

Hung, S. T. A. (2016). Enhancing feedback provision through multimodal video technology. *Computers & Education*, *98*, 90-101.

Hyland, K. (1990). Providing productive feedback. *ELT Journal, 1990* (4) , 279-285.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing. *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*, 1-19.

Iiskala, T., Vauras, M., & Lehtinen, E. (2004). Socially-shared metacognition in peer learning? *Hellenic Journal of Psychology, 1*(2), 147–178.

Jackson, C. W., & Larkin, M. J. (2002). Teaching students to use grading rubrics. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *35*(1), 40-45.

Jackson, T., MacKenzie, J., & Hobfoll, S. E. (2000). Communal aspects of self-regulation. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 275-300). Academic Press.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1989). Cooperative learning: What special education teachers need to know. *The Pointer*, *33*(2), 5-11.

Jonsson, A. (2013). Facilitating productive use of feedback in higher education. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *14*(1), 63-76.

Kahu, E. R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *38*(5), 758-773.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Second language learning as a mediated process. *Language Teaching*, *33*(2), 79-96.

Laurillard, D. (2002). *Rethinking university teaching: A conversational framework for the effective use of learning technologies*. Routledge.

Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2003). The role of self-efficacy beliefs in student engagement and learning in the classroom. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *19*(2), 119-137.

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

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Cambridge University Press.

Malmberg, J., Järvelä, S., Järvenoja, H., & Panadero, E. (2015). Promoting socially shared regulation of learning in CSCL: Progress of socially shared regulation among high-and low-performing groups. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *52*, 562-572.

Min, H. T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System*, *33*(2), 293-308.

Min, H. T. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *15*(2), 118-141.

Nelson, G. L., & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *7*(2), 113-131.

Nelson, G. L., & Murphy, J. M. (1993). Peer response groups: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts?. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*(1), 135-141.

Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *35*(5), 501-517.

Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, *31*(2), 199-218.

Price, M., Handley, K., & Millar, J. (2011). Feedback: Focusing attention on engagement. *Studies in Higher Education*, *36*(8), 879-896.

Quinton, S., & Smallbone, T. (2010). Feeding forward: Using feedback to promote student reflection and learning–a teaching model. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *47*(1), 125-135.

Reeve, J., & Tseng, C. M. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *36*(4), 257-267.

Reusser, K. (2001). Co-constructivism in educational theory and practice. In N. J. Smelser, P. Baltes & F. E. Weinert (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (pp. 2058-2062). Pergamon/Elsevier Science.

Roschelle, J., & Teasley, S. D. (1995). The construction of shared knowledge in collaborative problem solving. In C. O'Malley (Ed.), *Computer supported collaborative learning* (pp. 69-97). Springer.

Ryan, T., & Henderson, M. (2018). Feeling feedback: students' emotional responses to educator feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(6), 880-892.

Sadler, D. R. (2010). Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *35*(5), 535-550.

Salonen, P., Vauras, M., & Efklides, A. (2005). Social Interaction-What Can It Tell Us about Metacognition and Coregulation in Learning?. *European Psychologist*, *10*(3), 199.

Schmidt, R. (2001). *Attention in P. Robinson (Ed.): Cognition and second language instruction.* Cambridge University Press.

Scott, M., & Coate, K. (2003). Rethinking feedback: Asymmetry in disguise. In L. Björk, G. Bräuer, L. Rienecker & P. S. Jörgensen (Eds.), *Teaching academic writing in European higher education* (pp. 87-99). Springer.

Stewart, C. O., McConnell III, J. R., Stallings, L. A., & Roscoe, R. D. (2017). An initial exploration of students' mindsets, attitudes, and beliefs about public speaking. *Communication Research Reports*, *34*(2), 180-185.

Storch, N. (2007). Investigating the merits of pair work on a text editing task in ESL classes. *Language Teaching Research*, *11*(2), 143-159.

Sutton, P., & Gill, W. (2010). Engaging Feedback: Meaning, Identity and Power. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, *4*(1), 3-13.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, *15*, 165-179.

Tai, J., Ajjawi, R., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Panadero, E. (2018). Developing evaluative judgement: enabling students to make decisions about the quality of work. *Higher Education*, *76*(3), 467-481.

Tsui, A. B., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*(2), 147-170.

Vauras, M., Iiskala, T., Kajamies, A., Kinnunen, R., & Lehtinen, E. (2003). Shared-regulation and motivation of collaborating peers: A case analysis. *Psychologia*, *46*(1), 19-37.

Volet, S., Summers, M., & Thurman, J. (2009). High-level co-regulation in collaborative learning: How does it emerge and how is it sustained?. *Learning and Instruction*, *19*(2), 128-143.

Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Winne, P. H. (2011). A cognitive and metacognitive analysis of self-regulated learning: Faculty of education, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada. In D. H. Schunk & B. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 29-46). Routledge.

Winne, P. H., & Hadwin, A. F. (1998). Studying as Self-regulated learning. In D.Hacker, J. Dunlosky & A. Graesser (Eds.), *Metacognition in Educational Theory and Practice* (pp. 277– 304). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Winne, P. H., & Perry, N. E. (2000). Measuring self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 531–566). Academic Press.

Winstone, N. E., & Nash, R. A. (2016). *The developing engagement with feedback toolkit (DEFT)*. Higher Education Academy.

Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Parker, M., & Rowntree, J. (2017). Supporting learners' agentic engagement with feedback: A systematic review and a taxonomy of recipience processes. *Educational Psychologist*, *52*(1), 17-37.

Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Rowntree, J., & Parker, M. (2017). 'It'd be useful, but I wouldn't use it': barriers to university students' feedback seeking and recipience. *Studies in Higher Education*, *42*(11), 2026-2041.

Wood, J. (2020). *A Dialogic, Technology-Mediated Approach to Supporting Feedback Engagement in a Higher Education Context: Perceived Effects on Learners' Feedback Recipience* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University College London.

Wood, J. (2021). A dialogic technology-mediated model of feedback uptake and literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *46*(8), 1173-1190.

Yang, M., & Carless, D. (2013). The feedback triangle and the enhancement of dialogic feedback processes. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *18*(3), 285-297.

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

Yu, S., Lee, I., & Mak, P. (2016). Revisiting Chinese cultural issues in peer feedback in EFL writing: Insights from a multiple case study. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *25*(2), 295-304.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*(1), 79-101.

Zhu, Q., & Carless, D. (2018). Dialogue within peer feedback processes: Clarification and negotiation of meaning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *37*(4), 883-897.

Zhu, Q., & To, J. (2021). Proactive receiver roles in peer feedback dialogue: Facilitating receivers' self-regulation and co-regulating providers' learning. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1-13.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *81*(3), 329.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13-39). Academic Press.