



Peer feedback in higher education: Student perceptions of peer review and strategies for learning enhancement

Nicholas Ardill

To cite this article: Nicholas Ardill (28 Jan 2025): Peer feedback in higher education: student perceptions of peer review and strategies for learning enhancement, European Journal of Higher Education, DOI: [10.1080/21568235.2025.2457466](https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2025.2457466)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2025.2457466>



© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 28 Jan 2025.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Peer feedback in higher education: student perceptions of peer review and strategies for learning enhancement

Nicholas Ardill 

School of Architecture, Technology and Engineering, University of Brighton, Brighton & Hove, UK

ABSTRACT

This article explores student perceptions and experiences of peer review, the influences on potential feedback uptake, and the value attributed to discourse and collaborative learning processes in personal development. Higher education is increasingly promoting active student engagement in feedback, yet perceptions of the quality of feedback experiences, as voiced in evaluations and national student surveys, appear to contradict this movement's aims, calling into question the effectiveness of current practice. This article aims to contribute to the development of dialogic feedback approaches by identifying potential barriers and enablers to effective peer review, with this insight significant for improving student learning experiences. Based on a qualitative study and thematic analysis of formative peer review practice by undergraduate students, it found that peer reviews are valued as a dialogic feedback practice because they encourage independent learning, and that they offer significant value in developing critical thinking skills and self-reflection. Key student engagement factors include constructive learning environments, emotional management, tutor-student power relations, and iterative cycles of developmental learning. The theoretical and practical implications of these findings are discussed. The article contributes novel strategies for advancing peer review practice and embedding dialogic feedback within higher education to increase student agency over their own learning.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 2 July 2024
Accepted 16 January 2025

KEYWORDS

Peer feedback; dialogic feedback; peer review; peer learning; higher education

Introduction

Feedback practices aim to be informative and actionable, while introducing different kinds of learning and skill development, resulting in improvement of student learning. However, research has shown that there is a continuing dissatisfaction with established theories and modes of feedback among students in higher education, which has an impact on feedback uptake and productive actions (see, e.g. Esterhazy and Damşa 2019; Smith 2022; Winstone et al. 2017). This perspective is supported in the National Student Survey in the United Kingdom, which found that assessment and feedback is one of the thematic areas that students are least satisfied in (OfS 2023).

CONTACT Nicholas Ardill  n.m.ardill@brighton.ac.uk  School of Architecture, Technology and Engineering, University of Brighton, Mithras House, Lewes Road, Brighton, BN2 4AT, UK

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

Recent pedagogic studies and thinking about student engagement in feedback processes argue that there needs to be a move away from the ‘old paradigm’ of tutor feedback transmission which does not allow opportunities for a response (Carless 2022). Student engagement is understood to involve more than participation as not only does it require students to take part and contribute to learning activities but also requires meaningful, emotional and cognitive engagement from them through an investment in their learning and active dialogue with feedback processes (Zepke 2015). In fostering student-centred learning, dialogic feedback is promoted for supporting individual agency and shared responsibility in feedback processes (Wood 2024), with increased student capabilities seen to be influencing their learning environments (Klemenčič 2021), though has been found to need an adjustment in the power dynamic between tutor and student (Steen-Utheim and Wittek 2017). In order to increase engagement, feedback should be integrated in learning environments where feedback exchanges between students encourage more interaction and self-reflection (Boud et al. 2018). As such, formative student peer reviews, often used in creative disciplines, are positioned as a significant strategy for enhancing learning through discursive interaction, negotiation, and collaboration as students become more actively engaged in feedback processes (Smith 2020).

The increased attention of pedagogic discourse on ‘new paradigms’ of feedback practice can be attributed to the theoretical move away from viewing feedback as transmission and towards focussing on students’ actions and sense of agency in shared dialogue and socially constructed meanings (see, e.g. Nicol, Thomson, and Breslin 2014; Sadler 2010). The interest around dialogic feedback and socio-constructivist alignment, where learning is co-constructed through negotiation and discussion, raises questions about how students perceive, value, and engage in formative peer feedback, as well as the cognitive processes that are activated when students collaborate in reviewing activities. Furthermore, the recent findings of student surveys in higher education pose broader questions about student experiences with feedback practices in what they value and the influence of learning environments, peer relationships, and dynamics on dialogue and development. The understanding of student views and feedback experiences is also understood to be important for aligning contemporary knowledge on the utility and uptake of feedback (Winstone and Carless 2020).

This article presents the findings of a qualitative study on formative peer review practice by full-time BA (Hons) Architecture students at the University of Brighton, U.K., a city-based university with around 18,000 students. The aim was to explore first-year undergraduate perceptions of peer reviewing as a novel learning experience, with the objectives of identifying factors that influence the value and engagement of peer feedback, and how learning experiences might be improved. The study contributes to both theory and practice in synthesising contemporary research to advance current thinking and offers recommendations for discursive feedback practice centred on peer review. The following questions guided this investigation:

1. What were student perceptions and experiences of peer review, in giving, receiving, and discussing peer feedback?
2. What motivates and discourages students to engage with peer feedback and reviewing processes?

3. Why and how do students value peer feedback and peer review processes in personal development?

The article proceeds to outline the pedagogic rationale for peer feedback and peer review and the study's attention on student-centred learning in creative disciplines, which is followed by an explanation of the methodology undertaken. The findings categorise the study data into thematic groups and the discussion cross-examines and contextualises the findings using contemporary pedagogy theories and research. The conclusions synthesise the main insights, and implications for practice are summarised in relation to student experiences of peer review. Recommendations for facilitating effective dialogic peer feedback and peer review practice in higher education are offered.

Peer feedback

Feedback in higher education research is recognised as the process through which students interpret both internal sources of information in knowledge and experience, and external sources from tutors and peers, and use this knowledge to develop their work or learning strategies (Race 2019). The contemporary understanding goes beyond the traditional feedback perspective in appraising a student's task performance or comprehension and suggesting ways to improve, and emphasises the significance of the student's role in sensemaking and their active engagement in the feedback process so as to be able to act productively (Carless and Boud 2018).

Peer feedback is the mutual process through which students learn and cooperate through shared dialogue. Discourse is recognised as a platform for co-constructing knowledge, with students using various written, oral and visual communication and conversation strategies to appraise performance and standards (Huisman et al. 2018). Peer interaction and collaboration are argued to support deeper learning and self-monitoring in formative assessment (Gielen et al. 2010; Sadler 2010). The peer feedback rationale offered is that it encourages students to take an active role in self-regulating their own learning through which they monitor the progress of their own work by making comparisons with others and using multiple sources of feedback as stimulus (McConlogue 2015). Students with strong self-regulation abilities are understood to further reflect on the feedback and modify the learning process as necessary (Mickwitz et al. 2024). Moreover, internal feedback is found to be generated through this process and used by students to inform their own work, develop internalised standards from which to evaluate peers work, and support critical self-judgment (Nicol and McCallum 2022).

Peer feedback connects to the pedagogic strategy underpinning peer learning in that students will collaboratively learn from and with each other through discursive interaction and aligns with a social constructivism theory of learning (see, e.g. Orr and Shreeve 2017). Peer learning includes various strategies, such as peer feedback, peer review and peer assessment, discussion seminars, and group projects, and suggests a reciprocal and mutually beneficial learning activity in which students collaborate and openly share knowledge, ideas, and experiences with each other. For creative disciplines, peer feedback processes can often occur informally in the studio environment between students though can be ad hoc, misunderstood, dependent on interpersonal relationships, and may not involve or benefit students of different abilities, and as such, do not

always enable students gain the full advantages that such activities can offer. A more formalised approach to peer activities is argued to help students to learn effectively as it gives students more practice in taking responsibility for their own learning and learning 'how to learn' in higher education (Boud, Cohen, and Sampson 2013). As such, tutor guidance is considered to play an important role for effective peer learning, and structured peer reviews integrating peer feedback processes have been found to enhance students' evaluative experiences through tutor facilitation and training (Mulder, Pearce, and Baik 2014), as well pre-defined procedures and questions that are seen to support engagement with assessment criteria and learning outcomes (Nicol and McCallum 2022).

Peer review

Peer review involves students reviewing each other's work by giving and receiving peer feedback comments, while offering suggestions for development, and thereby enhancing their opportunities to make academic judgements. The exchanged feedback may be given orally and/ or in writing and will typically involve a discussion between peers on this feedback. The perspective offered here emphasises that reviewing is a reciprocal process with peer interaction and dialogic feedback being central to student learning. Peer review uses similar appraisal processes to peer assessment (see, e.g. Falchikov 2013; Race 2019), and the terms are sometimes used interchangeably in pedagogic literature. While both approaches require students to make critical judgments, the latter is distinguished by the award of peer marks and grades which may be compared with those of the tutor, as well as opportunities for dialogue on feedback not necessarily being integrated. Furthermore, the potential learning benefits of peer evaluation processes have been found to be undermined by the addition of peer marks (Nicol, Thomson, and Breslin 2014), with students also having concerns about fairness and reliability in peer grading (Kaufman and Schunn 2010), potentially impacting student power relations and engagement with peer feedback.

Peer review is viewed as an active strategy to improve the student feedback experience by emphasising engagement and agency as key to their learning, while fostering a more student-centred environment (Smith 2020). Reviewing processes are argued to improve student ability to make academic judgements due to the engagement with assessment criteria, goals, and implicit or explicit standards (Winstone and Carless 2020). Through reviewing, students have been shown to identify strengths and weaknesses to formulate solutions regarding the work of their peers, and these analytical skills are then applied to their own work (Cho and MacArthur 2011). Reviewers evaluate the work of peers from a viewer's or reader's perspective, which enables them to take a more detached view in re-examining their own work (Cho and Cho 2011). Because there is a requirement to construct a feedback response for peers, this is found to prompt students to revisit and reconsider their own thoughts about the subject matter and develop additional understandings about it (Roscoe and Chi 2008). As students have often already undertaken comparable work in the same subject area, the ideas and new knowledge they generate by evaluating and comparing are argued to cause them to activate internal feedback (Nicol, Thomson, and Breslin 2014). Moreover, the group processes that comprise peer review have been shown to influence individual learning as they enable students to evaluate and regulate their own learning through critical self-reflection (Nicol and McCallum 2022).

Peer review is proposed in this study as well-matched with the goals of student centred-learning in giving students more control over learning methods, enriching the student experience and supporting recognition of the advantages and disadvantages in their creative practice. For architecture, art and design students formative peer review activities are markedly promoted in supporting the development of self-judgment and higher critical thinking skills required for current and future practice (see, e.g. McClean and Hourigan 2015; Smith 2021). While various studies have highlighted the value presented in peer review approaches, there are potential obstacles to their implementation. For example, because evaluating work requires students to take a more active role in managing their own learning this can be a cause of discomfort for some due to feeling offering judgement is not their responsibility (Biggs and Tang 2011), or in doubting their ability to critique the work of their peers (Cartney 2010), which can represent a significant issue for creative disciplines, because a primary goal of formative feedback is critical appraisal. Increasing the understanding of how students perceive peer review is important to exploit the various learning gains they can present. Additionally, the insight into student perceptions and experiences is argued to be useful for developing strategies to increase student engagement in feedback processes and help support the implementation of peer review (Mulder, Pearce, and Baik 2014). Despite this, it has been shown that there are relatively few qualitative studies on creative student perceptions and understanding of formative peer reviews (Smith 2020). With cohort sizes continuing to expand and university resources becoming increasingly stretched, it is valuable to develop a deeper understanding of pedagogic strategies that can enable and empower students to learn productively from each other. This insight can also be used to challenge the power dynamics of traditional, lecture-style instruction and other transmission-based teaching activities, whilst providing students with more opportunities for dialogic feedback and student-centred learning.

Methodology

Context

This article reports on a peer review study undertaken by seminar class of first-year BA (Hons) Architecture students completing a module in Architectural Humanities. The study was approved by the University's Learning and Teaching Hub Ethics committee. Participants provided informed consent by signing an open-ended questionnaire given to students a week after the peer review. The students confirmed that they had read the Participant Information Form, which provided an overview of the research project and what participation would involve, and understood that by answering the questionnaire, they gave their consent to participate in the study. Students were offered the opportunity to discuss the study in more detail in person to confirm their understanding, with participation being on a voluntary basis and responses anonymous. Secure storage of the questionnaire data was maintained on university servers and password protected with access to data limited to the researcher.

The investigation into first-year student insights of peer reviewing was based on the aim to explore undergraduates' perceptions of dialogic feedback as a novel learning

experience. Students' initial experiences of feedback interactions, whether positive or negative, are understood to influence their future learning experiences, including their openness and receptiveness to feedback processes in higher education (Shields 2015). For the students undertaking the peer review, the learning activity represented their first opportunity in higher education to give and receive peer feedback. The module duration was 12 weeks, and the assignment was a 1200 word essay on an architect and a building for summative assessment at its conclusion. Student learning activities included one-day-a-week cohort lectures in the morning, and tutor group seminars in the afternoon, with all activities delivered face-to-face in the same lecture theatre or seminar room. A single seminar involved a student peer review (week 9 of 12) and took place in the second term of a three-term academic year which meant the student cohort were acquainted. The review lasted three hours, with a 20-minute break.

Peer review activity

In this study, the participating students in the peer review were not required to grade each other's work to avoid potential implementation problems related to grading involved in peer assessment, such as perceived fairness and reliability as shown by Kaufman and Schunn (2010). The focus is on student perceptions and experiences of formative peer review, feedback exchanges and discussion. The peer review activity was adapted from HEA (2023) and designed to enable students to receive a large amount of formative feedback on their architecture presentations in real time. Students also stay engaged as audience members during each other's presentations as they have a meaningful task to complete.

For the peer review, each student had to give a pre-prepared PowerPoint presentation of their chosen essay topic and research so far to the class of 28 students. Students were arranged in groups of four which meant they would give and receive feedback between three other students, though would watch all class presentations. At the start of the seminar, all students were talked through the purpose of the peer review, the learning outcomes, the structured peer feedback sheet used to provide scaffolding to the student written comments (paper format), and each of the criteria prompts to ensure their understanding and to answer any questions. The tutor acted as a facilitator only during the reviews and the student groups wrote peer feedback during and immediately after the presentations. In using the structured peer feedback sheets, student reviewers were asked to identify and offer a rationale for: (1) key elements they found effective, (2) pose one or two questions for discussion afterwards, and (3) areas that were unclear or required further explanation and suggestions on how the presentation could be enhanced for summative assessment. The structured feedback sheet was arranged as three criteria prompts to support student feedback and minimise fatigue in reviewing (Appendix 1). The tutor collected the peer feedback sheets at the conclusion of the presentations, checked to ensure all feedback was constructive before returning the feedback sheets to the students. Students subsequently engaged in group conversations on the presentations and the feedback they had given and received, whilst asking questions of each other to seek clarification and support understanding. A class-dialogue was mediated by the tutor at the end of the peer review activity to synthesise student learning.

Data collection

A questionnaire on the peer review activity was given in-person to the seminar class a week afterwards to allow time for reflection, self-review, and potential use of student feedback. Students were asked to write a few sentences on eight open-ended questions (see Appendix 2), and all sheets were completed and returned to the researcher.

The questionnaire was used to gain qualitative insights into student self-reported behaviours, attitudes, and opinions on peer reviewing. The questions explored student perceptions and experiences of peer reviewing, including giving and receiving formative feedback, due to the argued need to understand more about the dynamics of reviewing and their possible contribution to learning (Nicol and McCallum 2022). By recognising factors that can influence these processes this may help to develop learning activities. Furthermore, based on the view that feedback needs to be integrated into higher education learning environments that encourage more interaction and self-reflection (Boud et al. 2018), the research examined student motivations and reasons for potentially using (or not) peer feedback and the influences on student engagement as their active participation and development of literacies has been shown to be limited (Molloy, Boud, and Henderson 2019). Due to the perceived personal learning benefits associated with exchanging feedback, such as the suggested increased critical thinking skills (Nicol and McCallum 2022), student views were also investigated on how peer reviewing processes might affect their future learning and development.

A participant screening of 28 students who completed the questionnaire was based on the inclusion criteria: (1) the student had to have participated in the peer learning activity; and (2) the student's overall module attendance and engagement met (or was higher) than the threshold of 65% in adhering to the University's Attendance and Engagement Policy. Three student questionnaires were excluded from the data set which resulted in a study group of 25 students (13 male, 12 female), ages ranging from 18-25, from a first-year cohort of 108 students (23% of the overall cohort). This group size is representative of a seminar class and tutor group in architecture and creative courses.

Data analysis

An inductive process of thematic analysis was based on Braun and Clarke (2022). The data set was the study group written responses to the questionnaire transcribed verbatim. A realist approach was taken to analysis, searching iteratively to identify emerging themes in the perceptions and experiences of participant responses to address the research questions. The questionnaire transcripts were coded manually using NVivo data management software. NVivo was used as a tool for efficiency to support analysis with interpretation being determined by the analyst.

The questionnaire transcripts were read and re-read to familiarise with the data, while noting down initial ideas for codes. Initial codes were generated while using NVivo through a coding of relevant features of the data across the entire data set. The working list of codes included phrases such as 'internalise learning', 'quality of feedback, and 'criticality and judgment'. Next, an identification of potential themes and classification of codes was undertaken, marking participant responses with labels, assigned to

responses, and gathering all data relevant to each potential theme. The themes were reviewed to ensure they worked in relation to the coded extracts and the entire data set, whilst generating a thematic map of the analysis. The data was re-read to identify key themes, and sub-themes created where required, and the coded data was grouped into broader structured hierarchal themes with the aim of making sense of the coded data. The themes were defined through an on-going analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, including what they capture and how they relate to the research investigation and the overall narrative the analysis communicates. Clear descriptions, definitions and names were generated for each theme, while assigning data to themes and concepts to represent meaning. Codes were then combined into a thematic framework, before writing analytical memos which were tested, validated and revised to self-audit proposed findings to ensure they were based on robust evidence prior to write-up in following the recommendation of Bazeley (2009). Lastly, a selection of explanatory extracts was taken from the data, and a final analysis of selected extracts in relating the analysis back to the study aims, questions, and literature to support the drawing of conclusions.

The analysis codes were verified through a process of reading and re-reading of the transcribed data to become immersed in the content and reach saturation, until confident that the codes had established all relevant content from the data set. The validity of the identified themes was checked against the coded data and the complete data set, while the data was analysed across the codes and in relation to the thematic map.

Findings

The findings are categorised into an analytical framework of three identified key themes (Figure 1). Perception of Learning describes respondent views on giving and receiving peer feedback and includes the sub-themes of ‘Skills Development’, ‘Standards and Exemplars’, and ‘Engagement’. Experiences of Feedback Environment describes respondent feelings about the learning setting, including the sub-themes of ‘Community’, ‘Relationships’, ‘Emotions’, and ‘Capabilities and Know-how’. Understanding of Feedback Processes describes respondent interpretation of peer reviewing, including the sub-themes of ‘Discursive Interaction and Critique’, ‘Accessibility and Quality of Comments’, and ‘Power Dynamics and Hierarchies’. The nature of the qualitative data suggests that some characteristics may overlap. The analysis findings are illustrated by using representative examples of the transcribed comments with a student reference number given in brackets.



Figure 1. Thematic map analysis, showing the three key themes and connected sub-themes.

Perceptions of learning

The students were first asked to express their opinions about the peer review activity in general. This initial enquiry received a variety of responses that are grouped under the key theme of Perceptions of Learning, which includes the sub-themes of 'Skills Development', 'Standards and Exemplars', and 'Engagement'.

All students perceived that there was potential value in peer feedback, in both giving and receiving feedback, for skills development and supporting learning as shown by these typical views:

Writing and receiving student feedback is very helpful and benefits all parties. (S5)

We may learn socially more faster or more efficiently than through other methods. (S14)

Students frequently commented that the peer review was useful for developing communication skills through the actions of listening, speaking, writing, and observing:

It can show and teach you how to communicate better. (S1)

Good Idea. Keeps the one is doing feedback attended and listen to who is presenting. (S7)

Writing the feedback was effective in that I would focus more on the presentation and notice parts I could include/ might avoid doing. (S9)

Students also felt that the peer feedback helped them to develop critical thinking skills, especially in making judgements on developing their own work:

It was useful to give feedback to others because it can help in giving feedback on ourselves, and improving our work [...] Using feedback we give to others on ourselves, learning from ourselves by 'teaching' others. So, we can learn to give and take critique. (S4)

It helps me to develop analysing methods that may not be taught as well as giving you lots of points to improve on [...] Allows the people reviewing to learn techniques useful in evaluating your work. (S9)

Exchanging comments with peers was also seen as beneficial in exposing areas of progress for work that might otherwise go unnoticed if only receiving tutor feedback:

Feedback on aspects the tutor may miss. (S25)

It also means more opinions, taking the workload away from the lecturers. (S3)

Exposure to standards in exemplars of work was valued, and it was understood that seeing others' working processes and outputs of different standards can generate ideas and support learning. For example, students felt that the visibility of others' work through peer reviewing supported their own task recognition and motivated them to advance their work:

It influences me because I have a better grasp of what exactly I am meant to be doing in a task and I have rough ideas/ exemplars to take inspiration from. (S24)

Students further commented that they had already anticipated some of the peer feedback they would receive on their work, based on their engagement with exemplars and prior awareness, judgment, and interpretation in reviewing cycles of others' work:

I agreed 100% with the feedback I received as I could also somewhat tell what I needed to improve about my presentation from observing the other presentations before mine. (S13)

Another aspect of peer learning valued by some students in their responses was the view that it helped them to engage with the learning activity through activating internal feedback, whilst taking more ownership of module assessment criteria:

It can help me focus on [assessment] criteria and it will allow me to be able to in some way give feedback to myself. (S2)

Experiences of feedback environment

The evaluation proceeded to examine student experiences of peer review in more detail, including possible influences on their engagement and interaction with learning and are grouped under the key theme of Experiences of Feedback Environment. Sub-themes include ‘Community’, ‘Relationships’, ‘Emotions’, and ‘Capabilities and Know-how’.

The shared importance of a community of learners in the perception of an engaged audience, investment in each other’s work, and supportive atmosphere for increasing motivation and interaction, is highlighted in the following comments:

To engage and to make students feel their work matters and they’re not doing it for the sake of it. (S10)

It encouraged us to pay more attention to our own peers and listen to them. (S1)

Interacting with your peers to attain your personal and educational goals. (S13)

As the first-year students valued their shared experiences and sense of community built within the cohort, this implies there might be a potential for developing the use of collaborative learning processes as students proceed through education levels:

Learning from people at similar stages in study and helping each other to improve. (S8)

Learning from, for and because of my peers and helping them. (S12)

Students felt that relationships, including social connection and familiarity, were important to promoting critical commentary:

It’s nice to have it affirmed that people were listening, also nice to receive positive and critical feedback. (S23)

It was also more comfortable to get feedback from people we know [...] Feedback from people you are comfortable with/ friends. (S2)

Environmental considerations for peer learning were shown to include not only the physical spaces but also the interpersonal spaces of students. The relationship between the feedback giver and receiver is suggested as a factor in determining whether feedback will be potentially acted on. The study showed that students receiving feedback needed to feel that they can trust the feedback giver in that their comments are honest for establishing mutual support and agreed-upon actions, while helping the

receiver to develop strategies for acting on feedback, as suggested by the following views:

I feel it is a very helpful task when done honestly and correctly. (S3)

I thought all the feedback was true, fair, and helpful. (S11)

You get honest and precise feedback from your peers, and they are more targeted. (S22)

The students emphasised the significance of their emotions in feedback being understood as potentially helpful to the recipient's learning to promote feedback exchanges and not fearing that peers will respond negatively to accepting critical feedback, or be left with hurt feelings and possible resentment:

So, we can learn to give and take critique. (S4)

Make it anonymous – people will find it easier to be critical. (S9)

Feedback should be constructive. If you can take feedback constructively it can eradicate mistakes or flaws and allow someone to improve [...] Anonymous sounds like a good idea, however without a name or actual understanding given from a person it is often hard to take anything useful from it. (S6)

While students mainly indicated that reviewing work can assist progress, some did not feel capable or comfortable in being given this responsibility. For example, in their practical knowledge of giving constructive critique or their ability to manage feelings and emotions in accurately critiquing peers, as well as having to evaluate and comprehend multiple feedback sources:

I feel that we, as students were not critical enough when it came to giving feedback [...] I didn't enjoy giving the feedback, I also felt guilty giving any criticism. I do, however, see the importance of it. (S3)

[Disliked] having to pick apart other people's presentations. (S12)

It might leave you with mixed feelings if the crowd has not decided on the consensus. (S21)

Understanding of feedback processes

The evaluation sought insight into student understanding of the learning processes associated with reviewing and dialogic feedback, as well as the possible effects of this cognitive process on individual learning and subsequent actions. These responses are grouped under the key theme of Understanding of Feedback Processes, including the sub-themes 'Discursive Interaction and Critique', 'Accessibility and Quality of Comments' and 'Power Dynamics and Hierarchies'.

All respondents understood that the opportunity for discursive interaction and critique between peers was helpful for supporting their individual interpretation and understanding, as demonstrated by this shared recognition:

The discussion of feedback was useful since it was an opportunity to ask the reviewers, potentially, to expand on any comments. (S2)

The discussion of the feedback allowed us to understand what exactly people meant by their comments. (S20)

The receiving of peer critique on work was mainly identified as being positive as the variety of external perspectives encouraged students to be open to new ideas and to reconsider and critically reflect on their own work. By increasing perspectives and broadening the scope of feedback, the process is implied to enhance student engagement and motivation to learn and develop work:

Can help you think about a thing from a different perspective. (S11)

The best aspect of the peer learning activity was receiving more than one sheet of feedback back, as it meant that I was given a range of advice and thoughts. (S19)

I found the feedback useful as it gave insight into an outsider's perspective. (S12)

However, the external criticism received on work can be internalised as a judgment of themselves, suggesting a possible negative connotation of peer feedback:

'[Disliked] Judgment from others. It wasn't my favourite to feel as though people were having to judge me and my presentation. (S4)

The students valued exchanging peer feedback comments because they may be potentially more accessible, and straightforward to understand than tutor feedback. They also implied it can be easier to openly share and accept critical opinions with each other due to their shared experiences, mutual support, and empathy:

To get feedback from someone on the same level is often easier to understand, as one can relate to it easier. (S6)

They [peers] are in the same boat. (S5)

It seems less official so it's easier to take criticism and accept your failures. (S3)

Students also largely valued the perceived reduction of power dynamics and hierarchies, with power seen potentially as detrimental to their previous learning. Especially, in moving from formal to informal feedback approaches, and deciding whether to act on feedback:

I think it helps you improve quicker, but also, it's easier to ignore feedback you don't agree with, yet still taking it into account. (S18)

Because your peers are a good middle ground they won't be as harsh as lecturers or as lenient as yourself. (S17)

While students valued the variety of feedback given by peers and its informal quality, they were also critical around the clarity of comments received and highlighted the importance of receiving additional tutor feedback for developing work and supporting learning. In this regard, the tutor is considered the authority and whose knowledge and guidance the students will further obtain and value for added meaning in evaluating their progress:

Students aren't professors or masters of the task, leading to vague feedback. (S16)

It can sometimes feel like the things we do learn from peers is basic, or things we already know. Feedback may feel unqualified or not from an expert. While peer learning is important, it is still important to learn from someone with a higher level of knowledge and experience in the subject. (S4)

Discussion

This discussion expands on the reported findings around student perceptions and experiences of peer review, the influences on peer feedback engagement, and the value attributed to peer feedback and peer review processes in personal development. The identified themes and key findings are cross-examined and contextualised through a synthesis of contemporary pedagogical theories and research, as well as studies from creative disciplines.

Perceptions of learning

The first key finding from this study was that the student perceptions of learning through peer review processes are understood to be contributing to their skill in active and self-regulatory learning. Key to the collaborative learning approach is the reciprocal exchange of critical ideas and opinions and students evaluating others work with their own. The study demonstrates how this process helps students to develop a sense of control over their own learning, while also implying a potential reduction in the need for receiving feedback from others. This finding supports the argument of Nicol and McCallum (2022) for using peer reviews in that learners in the study perceive that they are becoming more independent in recognising areas of work for development through generating inner feedback.

An important factor enabling peer review learning was observed in that students value exposure to standards and exemplars while perceiving reviewing as a collaborative and iterative learning process across multiple student reviews. Comparative judgements of each other's presentations were used to give students internal feedback on how to improve their essay assignment work and increase awareness of academic standards, e.g. 'I expected the result'. This observation emphasises the importance of building on cognitive learning processes by which students will return to previous learning and understandings in the light of new learning and shared experiences. Ardill (2022) proposes that these 'feedback spirals' will support innovative thinking and behaviours and are temporal and repetitive in the cyclical re-evaluation of problem-solving approaches. The students here were required to distribute and collect new evidence, adjust values, and potentially modify practice based on new understanding. This finding helps to reinforce existing theories and research, which propose that formative feedback should spiral through different levels of task complexity within a course to develop feedback literacies (see, e.g. Carless and Boud 2018).

Students indicated that they were actively engaged in the peer review processes, as well as the presentation requirements and assessment criteria. In general, this observation contrasts with the study by Megahed (2018) who suggests that students can struggle with acceptance of peer evaluations, especially in their perceptions of the reliability and value of peer critique. The students, in preparing feedback responses, also compared their own work to that of others and used the criteria provided by the tutor. Significantly, the students applied both methods at the same time in combining their emerging constructs of quality and internalising benchmarks and standards to develop a deeper understanding. These reflective learning processes were perceived to have improved student critical thinking and analytical skills, as well as

their engagement with criteria. This view is consistent with undergraduates' preferences for alternative approaches to evaluative judgement in relation to increased levels of assessment engagement (Pereira et al. 2022).

The study also indicates another possible solution to student engagement with formative feedback and assessment criteria by using peer reviews and exemplars at various intervals during modules in alternating the timing of feedback. This strategy has been advocated for in research in that students will value feedback when utilising exemplars and generate feedback by comparing exemplars to the assessment criteria (To, Panadero, and Carless 2022). The architecture students here perceived that viewing exemplars was a useful technique for increasing their skills in recognising high-quality work and to develop their cognitive abilities for making critical judgments. Their production of generative feedback was encouraged by this experience and connects to how work is progressed in creative disciplines and practice. For example, the development of ideas, critical self-reflection and self-appraisal are significant to 'the acquisition and application of all architectural knowledge' (QAA 2020, 17). Future architects must also develop the professional attributes of personal responsibility, decision making, and the ability to evaluate and communicate information (McClellan and Hourigan 2015).

Experiences of feedback environment

The second key finding was on student experiences of their feedback environment. The value attributed by students to a community of learners in a supportive environment, as well as the familiarity between peers and social connections to openly share and discuss critical commentary, were indicated to be significant factors for learning and are reinforced by pedagogic research. Peer learning, for example, has been shown in existing studies to foster a course-based learning community through regular active, collaborative interaction, supporting home and international students' transition and learning in higher education (Chilvers 2016). International students however, have been found to face integration challenges in variations of teaching methods and cultural behaviours (Sin and Tavares 2019), while language proficiency has also been suggested to significantly impact their learning experiences and ability to fully engage in classroom interactions (Huisman et al. 2022).

For architecture education, student relationships are particularly important with McClellan and Hourigan (2015) suggesting that peer dialogue will continue to increase over time as students build relations with others who share common interests and ideas. Smith (2022) points out that the main approach of the discipline to education centres around reciprocal and conversational exchange, and therefore it is not surprising if there is an appreciation of the value of feedback dialogue between students. A contributing factor for the peer review in this article is suggested in that it was undertaken in the second term of the academic year, meaning that the first-year students were familiar with each other, and social bonds had started to be formed. The students generally appreciated the help and advice they gave each other and the supportive environment within the cohort. Equally, this finding implies that if students are less familiar with each other there may be potential barriers to constructive critique and discursive interaction.

Some students commented on possible merits of making feedback anonymous to support relationships and aid further critique, supporting the suggestion of Nicol,

Thomson, and Breslin (2014). However, the comments generally indicated that making feedback anonymous would make it more difficult to foster peer collaboration and develop a sense of community, particularly among smaller cohorts where intimacy can be beneficial. This explanation also calls into question the suggestion of Falchikov (2013) that familiarity between peers may reduce critical evaluation exchanges. The observations point to a potential practice for peer evaluation in larger classes, particularly where the tutor is unable to supervise and facilitate peer conversations or if anonymity is required, in using technologies such as the PeerMark application, part of the Turnitin suite, though such an approach may limit opportunities for dialogic feedback between peers.

A potential barrier to peer feedback exchange is shown in the importance of emotional management as some students feel awkward in giving critical feedback and openly expressing ideas with peers, differing with the observations around peer review made by Smith (2020). Factors influencing emotional balance were indicated in a student's ability to handle emotions constructively, in both giving and receiving critical feedback, though also in establishing a supportive atmosphere of trust, cooperation and confidence in facilitating feedback. Previous research has highlighted the importance of students developing emotional maturity, management, and resilience in receiving critical feedback in order to remain open to reflecting on performance and engage productively with critical opinions (see, e.g. Pitt and Norton 2016; To 2016). Whereas this study proposes that the act of giving feedback to others can also have a significant emotional impact on students that will likely require self-management. Student learning is further influenced by their reactions to feedback exchanges, indicating an important means by which students evaluate their discursive interactions and interpret the meanings of conversations. These observations do however differ from a recent study by Aben et al. (2022) who maintain that student feelings and emotions around sharing dialogue are more likely affected by an individual's tolerance towards errors in work or improvable performance aspects. Consequently, a greater understanding of student emotions around exchanging critique in peer review is suggested as an area in which further research would be valuable, especially insight into the individual and social construction of emotions and their impact on possible student actions.

Another potential obstacle to the uptake of peer feedback is indicated in some of the first-year students feeling they lack the capability, skill, or know-how for exchanging critical opinions. The development of feedback experience and literacy to help overcome this barrier has been a focus of existing research. For example, Carless and Boud (2018) propose that students require training and support in peer reviews, including an appreciation of the value of peer feedback and effective interactions. The authors' argument is reinforced in this study as students highlighted the benefits of being given clear tutor instruction and objectives related to peer review, e.g. 'time was managed well, and the session was clearly structured'. The structured approach to peer review was important in this regard, including the use of a peer feedback criteria sheet to provide scaffolding and prompt student commentary (see Appendix 1), and its explanation to the students for the purpose of their comments, as well as the organisation of the reviewing activity and its facilitation by the tutor. It is noted however that while the peer review and feedback sheet was structured to support student engagement, there was concern expressed

around their capacity to give written feedback on three consecutive presentations, e.g. 'it was hard to focus on the presentation and writing' and 'lots of repetition'. The finding also recognises that there may be understated time and resource factors for peer review in the need for pre-session planning and training to support student learning encounters and exchanges under supervision, especially for entry level undergraduates, against which any potential learning gains would need to be considered. Implementing these approaches effectively may be subject to further trial and error and require adjustment and refinement.

The comments around student experiences of their feedback environment and the processes involved in shared discourse and critique suggest that students, especially when new to higher education, may benefit from continued guidance and tutor facilitation in peer reviews for exchanging feedback. While this observation is moderated by its relevance to other modes of student learning, the use of cognitive scaffolding and training in peer review is noteworthy, as it can be gradually introduced and adapted as students build confidence and feedback experience in progressing through study levels. This in turn may support their engagement with additional types of feedback. By increasing student understanding over time, this learning process could allow them, based on feedback uptake and use, to take more initiative and responsibility to realise positive results in self-development, rather than experiencing obstacles or personally interpreting negative meanings connected with criticism. For art and design pedagogies, in particular, the implication is that this finding is consistent with feedback studies and social constructivism theory in positioning the students as active co-producers of their learning (see, e.g. Orr and Shreeve 2017; Orr, Yorke, and Blair 2014).

Understanding of feedback processes

The third key finding was around student understanding of feedback processes. The comments suggest an understanding of the significant role for discursive interaction and critique in supporting collaborative learning processes. The experiences of obtaining different opinions were mainly regarded positively on the understanding that peer reviews can open new perspectives and contribute diverse insights on progressing work. In connecting an earlier finding around emotional management in peer feedback and the possible attitude of students in not welcoming this challenge, an important factor influencing engagement with feedback is suggested in whether the aim of peer reviews is perceived solely to judge the work (and an implicit judgement of its author), or more broadly understood as a learning strategy that encourages discussion, evaluation, and self-reflection. It was shown that there is the potential for students to misinterpret critique of their work as a personal comment against them and their abilities, leading to possible negative experiences.

The accessibility of peer commentary and the potential benefits of discursive interactions between students are shown in this study and consistent with the premise that implicit knowledge can be difficult to express to others by means of only writing it down or voicing it and can be supported through collaboration and negotiation. In following the suggestion offered by Carless and Chan (2016), the different views and perspectives of students were first generated by the peer review activity before

being used by the tutor to connect ideas and synthesise insights at the end of the peer review. This approach encouraged student thinking and analysis of the work and showed connections between individual conversations and the whole-group discussion, while making explicit some key qualities of the work. The comments indicate that generative feedback can be explored from different perspectives so that students value a range of comments, and that dialogue supports student collaboration in thinking and reasoning around work. Further research could examine student application of learning from peer reviews in making judgements, for example by having students create an action plan for developing work for summative assessment that can be examined alongside their submissions.

While students valued the accessibility and informal quality of peer comments, a potential barrier in peer commentary to constructive collaboration is suggested in the quality of peer feedback received, as highlighted by students. For example, in it being 'vague' or 'slightly irrelevant', contributing to possible confusion, as well as a perceived lack of fairness in some peer inputs. It is implied that for students to be able to act on peer feedback, it must be clear and understandable. While the peer feedback in general was richer and more detailed than might be expected of first-year students, the selected criticisms were verified by the seminar tutor in reading all the feedback. The observation helps to support the view of Boud, Cohen, and Sampson (2013) in that a peer learning activity 'will only be acceptable to students if they regard it as equitable' (p. 171). Without feedback equity, the effectiveness of peer collaborations can therefore decrease.

In connecting feedback quality to the issue of power dynamics and hierarchies, some students perceived tutor feedback as clearer and more qualified than the advice of their peers due to subject knowledge and expertise. This finding indicates that students may seek this authority as a source of confirmation to increase confidence in acting on internal and external feedback. The student comments also imply there may be additional, understated power hierarchies and dynamics between peers in reviewing which may affect student emotions and resulting actions. Students can consider their explanations to be deficient or their work to be inferior to others, therefore discouraging critical feedback, e.g. '[they] did well, so picking on things to do would be mean' on being asked to offer feedback on peers' work, including to high(er) achieving students. This observation suggests the possible need to further consider the social environment in future research around peer feedback. Factors to consider could include the classroom or studio setting (for creative courses), and whether this environment should ideally have neutral power dynamics for students to manage minimal emotional challenges to exchanging feedback, and whether there may be a need for the tutor as peer review facilitator to articulate to students how power dynamics, relationships, and emotions may affect their feedback exchanges. This finding is significant for architecture and art and design students as Smith (2021) points out the importance of being able to navigate these social interactions and power dynamics in supporting their future practice in creative industries. Additionally, the management of power in peer reviewing processes is important in creative subjects to maximising the efficiency of critical feedback.

Generally, power relations were seen by the respondents as both a support and a barrier. Although peer feedback was often considered more relatable and potentially

easier to understand than tutor comments, which fostered mutual support and empathy among students, it was also suggested as requiring higher approval and insight, and an implied awareness that the tutor is the individual grading work at summative assessment. The finding is supported by existing research that proposes students can value tutor feedback above that of other students (see, e.g. van Ginkel et al. 2017). Winstone et al. (2017) further acknowledges that peer feedback may be limited in identifying areas of work for development and improvement strategies. The architecture students' comments are also consistent with the view that students in creative disciplines will often focus on the experience, qualifications and status of the tutor for taking action (McClellan and Hourigan 2015). In short, the study indicates that power relations and authority figures can be valued in challenging and motivating students in ways that peer dialogue may not.

Conclusions

The aim of this article has been to provide insight into undergraduate perceptions of peer review and peer feedback as a novel learning experience. The research contributes a deeper understanding to the argument for the use of peer feedback in learning strategies, in that the development of critical thinking skills and opportunities for students to become more independent in their learning are fundamental objectives of higher education. The findings of the study show that a more detailed comprehension of students' perceived value of participating in dialogic feedback experiences, as well as the relationships and dynamics driving the learning process, is significant for promoting student-centred learning approaches and peer collaborations. This knowledge can further contribute to developing peer review practices and improving the student learning experience.

The reciprocal learning processes demonstrated in the study support the student perceptions that peer feedback and interaction have the potential to be a valuable practice in enabling active and self-regulated learning. Students reported that they were developing critical thinking skills through giving and receiving peer feedback on exemplars of work. This process also encouraged self-reflection and assisted students in assessing their own progress towards achieving learning outcomes. Likewise, the findings articulate the benefit of facilitating meaningful dialogue between learners, with students becoming active participants in the co-construction of new knowledge. By enhancing their sense of agency within the feedback discourse, it encourages student independence, and responsibility in their learning and that of others rather than being passive recipients. The tutor role is seen as facilitating learning rather than being understood as the single source of knowledge. Possible barriers to the use of peer feedback were found to be the perception that tutors may provide a weightier understanding, clarity, and focus on improving work that their peers did not, the requirement for trust and empathy between peers to accept feedback, and because students must manage their emotions, not only when receiving critique, but also feel comfortable in giving critique to others.

While peer feedback is important for student-centred learning processes, increasing its role in higher education may require structural changes in the power relations between student and tutor, as well as between formal and informal learning environments. Despite the potential to mitigate the negative connotations attributed to

traditional academic hierarchies, the ability to do so effectively was found in this study to be moderated due to the perceived need for an authority figure to reinforce student actions following peer review. The findings suggest peer review and peer feedback should therefore be positioned as a significant yet complementary strategy to tutor feedback in diversifying formative feedback processes and discursive interactions, especially for studio-based pedagogies. Such an integrated approach to feedback practice will provide more opportunities to students for alternative learning environments, structures, and perspectives to enhance their learning experiences.

It is acknowledged that the qualitative study was conducted among a first-year seminar class of architecture students of one university and the findings may be bounded. The self-reported comments also mean that a note of caution is offered around their suggested learning gains from peer review processes in relation to summative assessment as these were not confirmed through an outcome measure and quantitative data set to support triangulation. Because the thematic analysis was conducted by an individual, there was not the provision to cross-reference the data coding with other analysts, which may have a bearing on the robustness of such an approach. As a purposeful mitigation, a recursive process of reading and re-reading the data again was undertaken until it was established that the codes captured all relevant information. The validity of the identified themes was also checked against the coded data set as well as the complete original data set. While outside the scope of this study, further research on peer review may examine connections between student learning, perspectives and experiences of practice in advancing across undergraduate and postgraduate levels of higher education. Such a longitudinal approach could provide insight on students who have a greater understanding of evaluative processes and issues as well as a greater exposure to the possible development of social skills, interpersonal relationships, trust, and value and uptake of peer feedback and resultant learning gains at summative assessment. Another peer review research area that could benefit from further attention is the influence of power dynamics and emotional relations between peers and the classroom environment and how they may affect constructive feedback and exchange of critique. For creative and design subjects, in particular, research into the inclusion of visual feedback in peer review, including annotated sketches and diagrams to augment written feedback, could investigate whether integrated feedback methods can enhance dialogic feedback and student understanding.

Recommendations for practice

Because the pedagogical approach to architectural education centres around dialogic feedback exchanges and review of exemplars, it is believed that the peer review study findings are applicable to students from other universities. Additionally, as architecture pedagogy compares to similar feedback strategies used in other creative disciplines, the insights are expected to be particularly relevant to disciplines across the art and design subject area. The following recommendations are therefore offered to educators to facilitate effective practice in peer reviewing activities with dialogic feedback within their own disciplines (Table 1). These strategies can increase opportunities for the development of

Table 1. Strategies for peer review and dialogic feedback processes.

Strategies	Recommendations
Articulate the value of peer feedback	Articulate the value of peer feedback to students in supporting self-directed learning, community building, meaningful interaction, and collaboration. Enable and empower students in seeing themselves as active participants in analysing, interpreting, and evaluating whether and how to act on feedback received, while explaining how the cognitive process of giving feedback can benefit their own lifelong professional development throughout higher education and future practice.
Understand the student learning experience and emotion	Understand the student learning experience in managing emotions and sensemaking when exchanging critical commentary. Recognise and explain to students that peer feedback requires student skill in managing the emotional effects around reviews, peer interaction (including possible power relations between peers), and the individual, in addition to improving critical judgement and reasoning skills. Establish student expectations, clear guidelines and format of peer feedback, and promote open communication and a positive learning environment. Appreciate that influential factors for emotional and relational support in student experiences and dialogic feedback recipience are trust, respect, empathy, and mutual support.
Provide structure to peer reviews and feedback commentary	Provide structure to enable students in developing their own productive, formative feedback with clear and concise structured feedback criteria sheets related to module learning outcomes and assessment criteria, and feedback rubrics (where applicable). Specific questions on reviewing work can be used as student prompts to encourage detailed feedback and discussion, such as asking feedback givers to explain and substantiate their reasoning. Structured comments, or scripting using exemplar feedback, combined with tutor mediation of peer contributions, will help students gain a deeper understanding of standards and criteria.
Design constructive feedback environments	Design constructive feedback environments that integrate discursive interaction and opportunities for self-reflection within peer reviews to provide meaning. These cognitive activities are valuable as they empower students in reflecting on what they have learned, consider how to improve their work, and process feedback experiences. Feedback conversations encourage students to collaborate by asking each other questions about exemplars. Discourse allows for the clarification of differing viewpoints, and generation of ideas, whilst students expand their critical thinking, and evaluative responses in deciding whether and how to act on feedback. Engaging students in a cohort discussion at the conclusion of peer reviews provides an opportunity for students to co-construct meanings, synthesise what they have learned, and to identify future development strategies.
Increase exposure to standards and exemplars and cycles of developmental peer review	Increase student exposure to standards and exemplars of work and rotation to multiple reviewers and cycles of developmental peer review. Continued practice in dialogic feedback can improve review quality and promote equitable learning. The cyclical actions of writing, receiving, discussing, interpreting, and evaluating peer feedback should be seen as an iterative and collaborative learning process in which students use their shared experiences to support self-appraisal and improvement. Facilitate opportunities for structured and guided peer reviews, as well as regular training and practice for both students and educators to increase feedback literacies in communicating, interpreting and applying feedback.

critical thinking skills, feedback literacy, and active engagement in feedback processes, whilst enhancing the student experience.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the researchers in the University of Brighton Learning and Teaching Hub for their insightful and constructive feedback which helped to improve the quality of this manuscript. I would also like to thank the Architecture students for providing such a deep insight into the perceptions and experiences of peer feedback and reviewing processes.

Disclosure statement

This article has been published under the Journal's transparent peer review policy. Anonymised peer review reports of the submitted manuscript can be accessed under supplemental material online at <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2025.2457466>.

Notes on contributor

Nicholas Ardill is an architect, lecturer and postdoctoral researcher in the School of Architecture, Technology and Engineering at the University of Brighton, U.K. He received his Ph.D. at the University of Portsmouth, UK. His current research focus is on collaborative learning processes, dialogic feedback, and the co-construction of knowledge in higher education. Previous research examined socio-spatial processes and dynamics around social innovation and urban change. Nicholas has authored papers in peer-reviewed journals and international conferences and his book 'Growing Food in Cities: Social Innovation Strategies for Sustainable Development' was published by Springer in 2022.

ORCID

Nicholas Ardill  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6617-4087>

References

- Aben, Jochem E. J., Anneke C. Timmermans, Filitsa Dingyloudi, Mayra Mascareño Lara, and Jan-Willem Strijbos. 2022. "What Influences Students' Peer-Feedback Uptake? Relations Between Error Tolerance, Feedback Tolerance, Writing Self-Efficacy, Perceived Language Skills and Peer-Feedback Processing." *Learning and Individual Differences* 97: 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2022.102175>.
- Ardill, Nicholas. 2022. *Growing Food in Cities: Social Innovation Strategies for Sustainable Development*. Cham: Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-98475-5>.
- Bazeley, Pat. 2009. "Analysing Qualitative Data: More Than 'Identifying Themes'." *The Malaysian Journal of Qualitative Research* 2 (2): 6–22.
- Biggs, John, and Catherine Tang. 2011. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. 4th ed. London: Open University.
- Boud, David, Rola Ajjawi, Phillip Dawson, and Joanna Tai. 2018. *Developing Evaluative Judgement in Higher Education: Assessment for Knowing and Producing Quality Work*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Boud, David, Ruth Cohen, and Jane Sampson. 2013. *Peer Learning in Higher Education: Learning from & with Each Other*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke. 2022. *Thematic Analysis A Practical Guide*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Carless, David. 2022. "From Teacher Transmission of Information to Student Feedback Literacy: Activating the Learner Role in Feedback Processes." *Active Learning in Higher Education* 23 (2): 143–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787420945845>.
- Carless, David, and David Boud. 2018. "The Development of Student Feedback Literacy: Enabling Uptake of Feedback." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 43 (8): 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>.
- Carless, David, and Kennedy Kam Ho Chan. 2016. "Managing Dialogic use of Exemplars." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 42 (6): 930–941. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1211246>.
- Cartney, Patricia. 2010. "Exploring the use of Peer Assessment as a Vehicle for Closing the gap Between Feedback Given and Feedback Used." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 35 (5): 551–564. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602931003632381>.

- Chilvers, Lucy. 2016. "Communities of Practice for International Students: An Exploration of the Role of Peer Assisted Study Sessions in Supporting Transition and Learning in Higher Education." *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*.
- Cho, Young Hoan, and Kwangsu Cho. 2011. "Peer Reviewers Learn from Giving Comments." *Instructional Science* 39 (5): 629–643. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-010-9146-1>.
- Cho, Kwangsu, and Charles MacArthur. 2011. "Learning by Reviewing." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 103 (1): 73–84. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021950>.
- Esterhazy, Rachele, and Crina Damşa. 2019. "Unpacking the Feedback Process: An Analysis of Undergraduate Students' Interactional Meaning-Making of Feedback Comments." *Studies in Higher Education* 44 (2): 260–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1359249>.
- Falchikov, Nancy. 2013. *Improving Assessment Through Student Involvement: Practical Solutions for Aiding Learning in Higher and Further Education*. London: Routledge.
- Gielen, Sarah, Elien Peeters, Filip Dochy, Patrick Onghena, and Katrien Struyven. 2010. "Improving the Effectiveness of Peer Feedback for Learning." *Learning and Instruction* 20 (4): 304–315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.007>.
- HEA. 2023. "HEA Feedback Toolkit." In *The Higher Education Academy*. York: HEA. Accessed 03 July 2023. <https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/hea-feedback-toolkit>.
- Huisman, Bart, Nadira Saab, Paul van den Broek, and Jan van Driel. 2018. "The Impact of Formative Peer Feedback on Higher Education Students' Academic Writing: A Meta-Analysis." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 44 (6): 863–880. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1545896>.
- Huisman, Jeroen, Jef Vlegels, Stijn Daenekindt, Marco Seeber, and Melissa Laufer. 2022. "How Satisfied are International Students? The Role of Town, Gown and Motivations." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 52 (8): 1332–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2020.1867826>.
- Kaufman, Julia, and Christian Schunn. 2010. "Students' Perceptions About Peer Assessment for Writing: Their Origin and Impact on Revision Work." *Instructional Science* 39 (3): 387–406. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-010-9133-6>.
- Klemenčič, Manja. 2021. "Students as Actors and Agents in Student-Centered Higher Education." In *The Routledge International Handbook of Student-Centered Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, 92–108. Abingdon: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429259371-7>.
- McClellan, David, and Neasa Hourigan. 2015. "Critical Dialogue in Architecture Studio: Peer Interaction and Feedback." *Journal for Education in the Built Environment* 8 (1): 35–57. <https://doi.org/10.11120/jebe.2013.00004>.
- McConlogue, Teresa. 2015. "Making Judgements: Investigating the Process of Composing and Receiving Peer Feedback." *Studies in Higher Education* 40 (9): 1495–1506. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.868878>.
- Megahed, Naglaa. 2018. "Reflections on Studio-Based Learning: Assessment and Critique." *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology* 16 (1): 63–80. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jedt-08-2017-0079>.
- Mickwitz, Åsa, Monica Londen, Katarina Perander, and Susanne Tiihonen. 2024. "Understanding the Varieties in First-Year University Students' Experience of Self-Regulated Learning During Emergency Remote Teaching." *European Journal of Higher Education*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2024.2359107>.
- Molloy, Elizabeth, David Boud, and Michael Henderson. 2019. "Developing a Learning-Centred Framework for Feedback Literacy." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 45 (4): 527–540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1667955>.
- Mulder, Raoul, Jon Pearce, and Chi Baik. 2014. "Peer Review in Higher Education: Student Perceptions Before and After Participation." *Active Learning in Higher Education* 15 (2): 157–171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787414527391>.
- Nicol, David, and Suzanne McCallum. 2022. "Making Internal Feedback Explicit: Exploiting the Multiple Comparisons That Occur During Peer Review." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 47 (3): 424–443. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1924620>.

- Nicol, David, Avril Thomson, and Caroline Breslin. 2014. "Rethinking Feedback Practices in Higher Education: A Peer Review Perspective." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 39 (1): 102–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.795518>.
- OfS. 2023. *National Student Survey 2023*. London: The Office for Students.
- Orr, Susan, and Alison Shreeve. 2017. *Art and Design Pedagogy in Higher Education Knowledge, Values and Ambiguity in the Creative Curriculum*. London: Routledge.
- Orr, Susan, Mantz Yorke, and Bernadette Blair. 2014. "The Answer is Brought About from Within You': A Student-Centred Perspective on Pedagogy in Art and Design." *International Journal of Art & Design Education* 33 (1): 32–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1476-8070.2014.12008.x>.
- Pereira, Diana, Irene Cadime, Gavin Brown, and Maria Assunção Flores. 2022. "How do Undergraduates Perceive the use of Assessment? A Study in Higher Education." *European Journal of Higher Education* 12 (1): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2020.1871393>.
- Pitt, Edd, and Lin Norton. 2016. "Now That's the Feedback I Want! Students' Reactions to Feedback on Graded Work and What They do with it." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 42 (4): 499–516. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1142500>.
- QAA. 2020. "Subject Benchmark Statement Architecture." *The Quality Assurance Agency for UK Higher Education: Gloucester*.
- Race, Phil. 2019. *The Lecturer's Toolkit: A Practical Guide to Assessment, Learning and Teaching*. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Roscoe, Rod, and Michelene Chi. 2008. "Tutor Learning: The Role of Explaining and Responding to Questions." *Instructional Science* 36 (4): 321–350. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-007-9034-5>.
- Sadler, David. 2010. "Beyond Feedback: Developing Student Capability in Complex Appraisal." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 35 (5): 535–550. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541015>.
- Shields, Sam. 2015. "My Work is Bleeding': Exploring Students' Emotional Responses to First-Year Assignment Feedback." *Teaching in Higher Education* 20 (6): 614–624. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2015.1052786>.
- Sin, Cristina, and Orlanda Tavares. 2019. "Integrating International Students: The Missing Link in Portuguese Higher Education Institutions." *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education* 11:59–65. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jcihe.v11iWinter.1110>.
- Smith, Charlie. 2020. "When Students Become Critics: Reviewing Peer Reviews in Theory and Practice." *Charrette* 6 (1): 71–92.
- Smith, Charlie. 2021. "How Does the Medium Affect the Message? Architecture Students' Perceptions of the Relative Utility of Different Feedback Methods." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 46 (1): 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1733489>.
- Smith, Charlie. 2022. "Architecture Students' Uptake and use of Formative and Summative Feedback." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 47 (1): 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1892028>.
- Steen-Utheim, Anna, and Anne Line Wittek. 2017. "Dialogic Feedback and Potentialities for Student Learning." *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction* 15:18–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2017.06.002>.
- To, Jessica. 2016. "'This is not What I Need': Conflicting Assessment Feedback Beliefs in a Post-Secondary Institution in Hong Kong." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 21 (4): 447–467. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2016.1226588>.
- To, Jessica, Ernesto Panadero, and David Carless. 2022. "A Systematic Review of the Educational Uses and Effects of Exemplars." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 47 (8): 1167–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.2011134>.
- van Ginkel, Stan, Judith Gulikers, Harm Biemans, and Martin Mulder. 2017. "Fostering Oral Presentation Performance: Does the Quality of Feedback Differ When Provided by the Teacher, Peers or Peers Guided by Tutor?" *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 42 (6): 953–966. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1212984>.
- Winstone, Naomi, and David Carless. 2020. *Designing Effective Feedback Processes in Higher Education: A Learning-Focused Approach*. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Winstone, Naomi, Robert Nash, Michael Parker, and James Rowntree. 2017. "Supporting Learners' Agentic Engagement With Feedback: A Systematic Review and a Taxonomy of Recipience Processes." *Educational Psychologist* 52 (1): 17–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1207538>.
- Wood, James. 2024. "Supporting the Uptake Process with Dialogic Peer Screencast Feedback: A Sociomaterial Perspective." *Teaching in Higher Education* 29 (4): 913–935. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2042243>.
- Zepke, Nick. 2015. "Student Engagement Research: Thinking Beyond the Mainstream." *Higher Education Research & Development* 34 (6): 1311–1323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1024635>.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Structured peer feedback criteria sheet with prompts used by students in the peer review activity

Peer Review Feedback Sheet									
NAME OF STUDENT GIVING FEEDBACK:	NAME OF STUDENT PRESENTING:								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>• Tell the student something you find effective about their work (and explain WHY) <i>E.G. THE PHOTO, DRAWING, OR TALK ON THE ARCHITECT/ LOCATION/ TIME PERIOD/ SOCIAL CONTEXT HELPED ME TO UNDERSTAND REASONS FOR THE BUILDING DESIGN, MATERIAL CHOICE, CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUE, FORM OR LAYOUT ETC.</i></p> <p>• Ask the student a question on their work (for discussion later) <i>E.G. HOW OR WHERE DID YOU FIND THIS OUT? (INFORMATION/ PLANS/ PHOTOS) HOW DID YOU DO THIS? (RESEARCH APPROACH)</i></p> <p>• Give the student a suggestion for development of their work (and improvement for summative assessment) <i>E.G. IS IT CLEAR AS TO WHY THE BUILDING IS ARGUED AS IMPORTANT? - CAN YOU UNDERSTAND THE SOCIAL CONTEXT AND BUILDING KEY SPACES? DID THE VISUALS SUPPORT THE TEXT/ SPEAKING/ ANALYSIS? - DID THE PRESENTATION MISS ANY INFORMATION?</i></p> 									
<p>Module Assessment Criteria (to refer to in writing feedback now and for discussing feedback later with peers)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; padding: 5px; text-align: center;">Assessment criteria 1</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> <p>Originality: The level of originality and initiative Has the work been approached and executed in an original way? What is the level of initiative, personal responsibility, and decision making?</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px; text-align: center;">Assessment criteria 2</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> <p>Exploration: The level of exploration and interpretation What is the quantity and quality of research? What is the level of knowledge, exploration, insight and/or research?</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px; text-align: center;">Assessment criteria 3</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> <p>Synthesis: The level of synthesis and organization What is the level of synthesis of the work and what are the arguments being made? What is the level of the organisation, structure and standard of presentation of the work, including referencing where appropriate, throughout?</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px; text-align: center;">Assessment criteria 4</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> <p>Criticality: The level of criticality and judgement What is the level of contextualisation of your work, including relevant theory/ literature/ artefacts/ performance? What is the level of analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal of the work?</p> </td> </tr> </table>		Assessment criteria 1	<p>Originality: The level of originality and initiative Has the work been approached and executed in an original way? What is the level of initiative, personal responsibility, and decision making?</p>	Assessment criteria 2	<p>Exploration: The level of exploration and interpretation What is the quantity and quality of research? What is the level of knowledge, exploration, insight and/or research?</p>	Assessment criteria 3	<p>Synthesis: The level of synthesis and organization What is the level of synthesis of the work and what are the arguments being made? What is the level of the organisation, structure and standard of presentation of the work, including referencing where appropriate, throughout?</p>	Assessment criteria 4	<p>Criticality: The level of criticality and judgement What is the level of contextualisation of your work, including relevant theory/ literature/ artefacts/ performance? What is the level of analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal of the work?</p>
Assessment criteria 1	<p>Originality: The level of originality and initiative Has the work been approached and executed in an original way? What is the level of initiative, personal responsibility, and decision making?</p>								
Assessment criteria 2	<p>Exploration: The level of exploration and interpretation What is the quantity and quality of research? What is the level of knowledge, exploration, insight and/or research?</p>								
Assessment criteria 3	<p>Synthesis: The level of synthesis and organization What is the level of synthesis of the work and what are the arguments being made? What is the level of the organisation, structure and standard of presentation of the work, including referencing where appropriate, throughout?</p>								
Assessment criteria 4	<p>Criticality: The level of criticality and judgement What is the level of contextualisation of your work, including relevant theory/ literature/ artefacts/ performance? What is the level of analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal of the work?</p>								
Seminar: Presentation Peer Review									

Appendix 2. Questionnaire with open-ended questions used to obtain student insights on the peer review activity and peer feedback

1. What do you think about the peer reviewing activity in general, in writing, receiving and discussing peer feedback?
2. What were the best aspects of the peer reviewing activity, and why?
3. What were the worst aspects of the peer reviewing activity, and why?
4. How much did you agree or disagree with the peer feedback you received for your presentation, and why?
5. What do you think peer feedback is?
6. Why do you think peer feedback is used as an education method?
7. Do you think peer feedback can influence or effect your personal learning, and if so, how?
8. Do you have any other comments or suggestions to improve peer feedback and peer reviewing activities?