

Exploring the Role of Received Peer Feedback for Students' Learning Outcomes in Online Higher Education

Citation for published version (APA):

Taghizadeh Kerman, N., Banihashem, S. K., & Noroozi, O. (2022). Exploring the Role of Received Peer Feedback for Students' Learning Outcomes in Online Higher Education. In A. Ben Attou, L. Ciddi, & M. Unal (Eds.), *Proceedings of International Conference on Studies in Education and Social Sciences 2022* (Vol. 1, pp. 389-397). The International Society for Technology, Education and Science (ISTES).

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2022

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

<https://www.ou.nl/taverne-agreement>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

pure-support@ou.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Downloaded from <https://research.ou.nl/> on date: 26 Apr. 2025

Open Universiteit
www.ou.nl



Proceedings of International Conference on
**Studies in
Education and
Social Sciences**

NOVEMBER 10-13, 2022

ANTALYA / TURKEY

EDITORS

Amal Ben Attou

M. Lutfi Ciddi

Mevlut Unal



www.icses.net



www.icses.net

Volume 1, Pages 1-719

Proceedings of International Conference on Studies in Education and Social Sciences

© 2022 Published by the ISTES Organization

ISBN: 978-1-952092-41-1

Editors: Dr. Amal Ben Attou, M. Lutfi Ciddi, & Mevlut Unal

Articles: 1-58

Conference: International Conference on Studies in Education and Social Sciences (ICSES)

Dates: November 10-13, 2022

Location: Antalya, Turkey

Conference Chair(s):

Stephen Jackowicz, University of Bridgeport, United States

Richard Thripp, University of Central Florida, United States

© 2022 Published by the International Society for Technology, Education, and Science (ISTES) Organization

The proceedings is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercialShareAlike 4.0 International License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Authors alone are responsible for the contents of their papers. The Publisher, the ISTES Organization, shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of the research material. All authors are requested to disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest including any financial, personal or other relationships with other people or organizations regarding the submitted work.

The submissions are subject to a double-blind peer review process by at least two reviewers with expertise in the relevant subject area. The review policy is available at the conference web page: www.icses.net

Presidents

Stephen Jackowicz, University of Bridgeport, United States
Richard Thrripp, University of Central Florida, United States

Scientific Board

Janice Fournillier, Georgia State University, United States
Wilfried Admiraal, Leiden University, Netherlands
Elizabeth (Betsy) Kersey, University of Northern Colorado, United States
Anastasios Theodoropoulos, University of Peloponnese, Greece
Arturo Tobias Calizon, University of Perpetual Help System Dalta, Philippines
Brett Buttlere, Technical University Dresden, Germany
Cara Williams, Emirates College For Advanced Education, United Arab Emirates
Chandra Pratama Syaima, University of Lampung, Indonesia
Chris Plyley, University of the Virgin Islands, Virgin Islands
Claudiu Mereuta, Dunarea De Jos University of Galati, Romania
Dana Aizenkot, Ashkelon Academic College, Israel
El Takach Suzanne, Lebanese University, Lebanon
Farouk Bouhadiba, University of Oran 2, Algeria
Frank Angelo Pacala, Samar State University, Philippines
Hou-Chang Chiu, Fu-Jen Catholic University Hospital, Taiwan
Irena Markovska, Assen Zlatarov University, Bulgaria
Irina Andreeva, Peter The Great St. Petersburg Polytechnic University (SPBPU), Russia
Iwona Bodys-Cupak, Jagiellonian University, Poland
Jaya Bishnu Pradhan, Tribhuvan University, Nepal
Jean-Yves Gantois, ICHEC, Belgium
Kassa Mickael, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia
Kemmanat Mingsiritham, Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University, Thailand
Kristyna Balatova, University of Zilina, Slovakia
Milan Kubiato, Jan Evangelista Purkyně University, Czech Republic
Neide Da Fonseca Parracho Sant'anna, Colegio Pedro II, Brazil
Oguz Akturk, Necmettin Erbakan University, Turkey
Ossi Autio, University of Helsinki, Finland
Philomina Ifeanyi Onwuka, Delta State University, Nigeria
Sharif Abu Karsh, Arab American University, Palestine
Shenglei Pi, Guangzhou University, China
Siew Nyet Moi, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia
Sindorela Doli Kryeziu, University of Gjakova, Albania
Siti Sarawati Johar, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Malaysia
Sodangi Umar, Federal University Gusau, Nigeria
Tayfur Ozturk, Necmettin Erbakan University, Turkey
Theodore Chadjipadelis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece
Tryfon Mavropalias, University of Western Macedonia, Greece
Volodymyr Sulyma, Dnipropetrovsk Medical Academy, Ukraine

Organizing Committee

Janice Fournillier, Georgia State University, United States
Wilfried Admiraal, Leiden University, Netherlands
Elizabeth (Betsy) Kersey, University of Northern Colorado, United States
Aehsan Haj Yahya, Beit-Berl College, Israel
Alaa AlDahdouh, University of Minho, Portugal
Augusto Z. Macalalag, Arcadia University, United States
Bhesh Mainali, Rider University, United States
Janez Jamsek, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
Josiah Zachary Nyangau, Louisiana State University, United States
Kent Löfgren, Umeå University, Sweden
Laurie Murphy, Saint Joseph's College, United States
Marelbi Olmos Perez, Universidad Tecnológica de Bolívar, Colombia
Masood Badri, UAE University, United Arab Emirates
Monica Reichenberg, University of Gothenburg, Sweden
Omer Tayfur Ozturk, Necmettin Erbakan University, Turkey
Phu Vu, The University of Nebraska at Kearney, United States
Qian Wang, Manhattan College, United States
Rachid Ait Maalem Lahcen, University of Central Florida, United States
Wei Zakharov, Purdue University, United States
Zhanat Alma Burch, Duke University, United States

Exploring the Role of Received Peer Feedback for Students' Learning Outcomes in Online Higher Education

Nafiseh Taghizadeh Kerman

Ferdowsi University, Iran,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0046-0077>

Seyyed Kazem Banihashem

Wageningen University and Research, The Netherlands; The Open University of the Netherlands

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9978-3783>

Omid Noroozi

Wageningen University and Research, The Netherlands,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0622-289X>

Abstract: In this article, we aim to explore the differences in the received peer feedback among successful, less successful, and unsuccessful students in higher education. This exploratory study was conducted in online settings and in the context of argumentative essay writing. In total, 135 undergraduate students participated in an online module and they completed three tasks in three consecutive weeks. In the first week, they wrote an argumentative essay. In the second week, students provided two sets of feedback on their peers' argumentative essays based on the given criteria. In the third week, students were requested to revise their argumentative essay based on the received feedback. Students' success was defined based on their improvements from the original essay to the revised essay. The results showed that unsuccessful and less successful students received more affective and descriptive feedback from their peers compared to successful students. The findings of this study provide practical implications on how peer feedback approaches should be implemented to help students write better argumentative essays in online learning environments.

Keywords: Argumentative essay writing, Higher education, Online learning, Peer feedback

Citation: Taghizadeh Kerman, N., Banihashem, S.K., & Noroozi, O. (2022). Exploring the Role of Received Peer Feedback for Students' Learning Outcomes in Online Higher Education. In A. Ben Attou, M. L. Ciddi, & M. Unal (Eds.), *Proceedings of ICSES 2022-- International Conference on Studies in Education and Social Sciences* (pp. 389-397), Antalya, Türkiye. ISTES Organization.

Introduction

Writing a good argumentative essay is a crucial skill for university students (Akhteh et al., 2022; Noroozi et al., 2012; Valero Haro et al., 2022). A high-quality argumentative essay should include a clear introduction, a position that is supported by arguments and evidence, followed by presenting counter-arguments against the

position, and a response to the counter-arguments against the position, which could lead to a conclusion on the issue (Noroozi et al., 2016; Noroozi, 2018; Noroozi et al., 2020). In real educational settings, It is challenging for students to perform well and include all elements of argumentative essays in their report (Fan & Chen, 2019; Ferretti & Graham, 2019; Noroozi, 2022).

In the literature, peer feedback is found to be a successful learning strategy in higher education to enhance students' argumentative essay writing skills (e.g., Latifi et al., 2020, 2021; Latifi & Noroozi, 2021; Noroozi et al., 2011, 2016; Taghizade et al., 2020). For example, Latifi and Noroozi (2021) showed that supported peer feedback enhances students' argumentative essay writing quality. This supported peer feedback guided students to encourage in the learning process by allowing them to review the quality of peers' essays, discover gaps in their essays, and suggest improvements based on the given criteria (Latifi et al., 2021; Lizzio & Wilson, 2008; Noroozi & Hatami, 2019). However, providing high-quality peer feedback is also a challenging task for students especially for argumentation tasks that demand high level of cognitive processing. Some students lack knowledge of feedback, and others simply cannot translate this knowledge into practice (Latifi et al., 2021; Noroozi et al., 2016). A review of prior studies reveals that the success of feedback mainly depends on its quality (Kerman et al., 2022; Carless et al. 2011; Er et al., 2021; Taghizadeh Kerman et al., 2022). Effective feedback should include elements like affective statements (such as compliments or praise), a brief overview of the work, identification and localization of the problem(s), solutions to the problem(s), and action plans for future improvements (Lu & Law, 2012; Patchan et al., 2016; Wu & Schunn, 2021). Students normally reject comments that do not include high-quality feedback elements (Dominguez et al., 2012; Patchan et al., 2016; Wu & Schunn, 2020). This may results in a lack of uptake of the feedback and as a result the whole feedback process may be considered as ineffective.

According to the literature, few studies have attempted to examine the effects of the quality and features of the received peer feedback on students' uptake of peer feedback in the learning processes and outcomes (e.g., Misiejuk et al., 2021; Nelson & Schunn, 2009; Wu & Schunn, 2020; 2021). The literature provides little evidence on how features of received peer feedback can influence students' performance, particularly in the context of argumentative essay writing in online settings. This study was conducted to further explore and address these issues by answering the following research question:

What are the differences in the features of received peer feedback among successful, less successful, and unsuccessful students in the context of argumentative essay writing in online settings?

Method

Participants

In this study, 135 undergraduate students participated, however, only 101 students completed the module. About 69% of participants were female ($N = 70$) and 31% of participants were male ($N = 31$). To comply with ethical

considerations, participants were informed about the research setup of the module. They were assured that no data could be linked to any individual participant. Furthermore, ethical approval from the Social Sciences Ethics Committee at Wageningen University and Research was obtained for this study.

Procedure

A module called “*Argumentative Essay Writing*” was designed and embedded in an online learning platform called Brightspace in the selected course. The module was followed for three consecutive weeks, and in each week, students performed one task. In week one, students were invited to write an argumentative essay on one of the three offered topics (task 1). In week two, students were requested to provide feedback based on the criteria embedded in the platform on two argumentative essays of their peers (task 2). In week three, students were asked to revise their essays based on the feedback sets they received from their peers (task 3).

Measurements

Quality of Students’ Argumentative Essay

In this study, a coding scheme developed by Noroozi et al (2016) was used to analyze the quality of students’ argumentative essays. This coding scheme was developed using the elements of high-quality argumentative essay writing (e.g., Noroozi et al., 2016; Toulmin, 2003), including eight elements: (1) introduction on the topic; (2) taking a position on the topic; (3) arguments for the position; (4) justifications for the position; (5) arguments against the position; (6) justifications for the position; (7) response to counter-arguments; and (8) conclusion and implications. The coding scheme is scored from zero (the lowest quality level) to three (the highest quality level) for each element.

All the points obtained by students for these elements were summed up together and indicated the students’ overall scores for the quality of the written argumentative essay. Students’ argumentative essays were assessed in two steps: the original argumentative essay and the revised essay. Cohen’s kappa coefficient analysis was used to measure the inter-rater reliability between the coders, and the results showed that there is a reliable agreement between the coders (Kappa = 0.70, $p < 0.001$).

Quality of Students’ Received Peer Feedback

The authors developed a coding scheme to assess the quality of students’ peer feedback based on a review of relevant recent studies (e.g., Nelson & Schunn, 2009; Patchan et al., 2016; Wu & Schunn, 2020). This coding scheme analyzes the features of peer feedback, which includes three elements: (1) affective, (2) cognitive (description, identification, and justification), and (3) constructive. The features of this coding scheme were scored from zero (poor quality) to two (good quality).

All the given points were summed up and represented the students’ overall score for the quality of their received

peer feedback. Since each student received two sets of feedback, the average score from the two sets of feedback was considered as the overall score for the quality of the received peer feedback. Similar to the argumentative essay analysis, the same two coders participated in the coding process for peer feedback analysis, and Cohen's kappa coefficient results for inter-rater reliability among coders were found to be significant ($Kappa = 0.60, p < 0.001$).

Analysis

In this study, we first controlled the effects of gender on the relationship between the independent grouping variable and the continuous dependent variables. Second, we used a percentile rank measurement to categorize students into three groups: Successful (students whose progress in argumentative essay writing from pre-test to post-test was higher than 67th percentile) ($N = 34, 34\%$), less successful (students whose progress in argumentative essay writing from pre-test to post-test was between 33th to 67th percentile) ($N = 23, 23\%$), and unsuccessful students (students whose progress in argumentative essay writing from pre-test to post-test was between less than 33th percentile) ($N = 42, 42\%$).

Then, the MANCOVA test was conducted to compare the differences in the quality of received peer feedback features among the successful, less successful, and unsuccessful students. Since the sample sizes were unequal, we used the Tukey-Kramer test to determine the pairwise comparisons. In addition, the Levene test showed that the groups were homogeneous and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that the data were normally distributed ($p > 0.05$). Also, Box's Test of equality of covariance matrices showed that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups (Box's $M = 38.42, F(30, 18426.45) = 1.17, p = 0.23$).

Results and Discussion

What are the differences in the features of received peer feedback among successful, less successful, and unsuccessful students in the context of argumentative essay writing in online settings?

The results showed that unsuccessful, less successful, and successful students differed in terms of mean scores of their received peer feedback quality (Wilks' $\Lambda = 0.82, F(10, 182) = 1.86, p < 0.05, \text{Partial } \eta^2 = 0.09$). This difference was mainly due to the affective and descriptive features of feedback. Unsuccessful students received more affective and descriptive feedback than successful students. Less successful students received more affective and descriptive peer feedback than successful students (see Table 1).

This study found that students' success in writing argumentative essays is significantly influenced by the type of feedback they receive. According to this study, students should be encouraged to provide more cognitive and constructive comments than affective feedback to perform well in writing argumentative essays. Students often tend to give more affective feedback, despite the efficiency of the cognitive and constructive comments. This

suggests that teachers should encourage students to give more complex forms of feedback. These findings are consistent with and supported by previous research indicating that the effectiveness of peer feedback depends on its type and features (see Carless et al., 2011; Taghizadeh Kerman et al., 2022; Wu & Schunn, 2020).

Table 1. Differences among Successful, Less Successful, and Unsuccessful Students in Terms of Mean Scores for Received Peer Feedback Quality

Variables	Group	Received peer feedback quality		Pairwise comparisons	Difference among unsuccessful, less successful, and successful statistics
		Mean	SD		
Affective	Unsuccessful	1.66	0.17	Successful< Unsuccessful * Successful< Less successful **	F (2, 95) = 4.27, p < 0.05*, Partial η ² = 0.08
	Less successful	1.70	0.17		
	Successful	1.57	0.14		
	Total	1.64	0.17		
Cognitive Description	Unsuccessful	1.40	0.28	Successful< Unsuccessful * Successful< Less successful *	F (2, 95) = 3.91, p < 0.05*, Partial η ² = 0.07
	Less successful	1.44	0.32		
	Successful	1.22	0.36		
	Total	1.35	0.33		
Identification	Unsuccessful	0.67	0.29		F (2, 95) = 0.33, p = 0.71
	Less successful	0.69	0.29		
	Successful	0.73	0.39		
	Total	0.69	0.32		
Justification	Unsuccessful	0.02	0.04		F (2, 95) = 2.75, p = 0.07
	Less successful	0.04	0.06		
	Successful	0.06	0.08		
	Total	0.04	0.06		
Constructive	Unsuccessful	0.78	0.36		F (2, 95) = 0.50, p = 0.60
	Less successful	0.76	0.31		
	Successful	0.84	0.41		
	Total	0.80	0.36		

(P<0.01)**, (P<0.05)*

Future research should compare the effects of the provided and received feedback elements on students' performance in writing argumentative essays. This can give insight into the roles that the assessor and assessee play in the feedback process and how it affects how well students perform in writing essays for higher education.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study adds to our understanding of the peer feedback process and performance of students and sheds light on the differences among successful, less successful, and unsuccessful students in their peer feedback performance for writing argumentative essays. This study highlights the importance of high-quality feedback in the success of writing argumentative essays. Based on this research, it is necessary for students to be sufficiently trained and encouraged regarding the elements of high-quality feedback and how to provide it, especially providing cognitive and constructive feedback.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science, the Netherlands, the SURF organization, and Wageningen University and Research with the funding number: 2100.9613.00. OCW. This fund was awarded to Omid Noroozi. The authors also would like to thank the teachers and students who dedicated their time to participating in this research.

References

- Akhteh, M. P., Farrokhnia, M., Banihashem, S. K., & Noroozi, O. (2022). The Relationship between Students' Satisfaction and Motivation and their Perceived Learning Outcome in an Online Peer Feedback Module. *Studies on Education, Science, and Technology* 2022, 297.
- Carless, D., Salter, D., Yang, M., & Lam, J. (2011). Developing sustainable feedback practices. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(4), 395–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075071003642449>
- Dominguez, C., Cruz, G., Maia, A., Pedrosa, D., & Grams, G. (2012). Online peer assessment: An exploratory case study in a higher education civil engineering course. *2012 15th International Conference on Interactive Collaborative Learning, ICL 2012*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICL.2012.6402220>
- Er, E., Dimitriadis, Y., & Gašević, D. (2020). Collaborative peer feedback and learning analytics: theory-oriented design for supporting class-wide interventions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1764490>
- Fan, C. Y., & Chen, G. D. (2019). A scaffolding tool to assist learners in argumentative writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(1–2), 159–183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1660685>
- Ferretti, R. P., & Graham, S. (2019). Argumentative writing: theory, assessment, and instruction. *Reading and Writing* 32:6, 32(6), 1345–1357. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11145-019-09950-X>
- Ghasemi, M., Mehraji, N., Banihashem, S. K., & Badali, M. (2016). The effect of integration of Merrill's first principles of instruction with team based learning on the achievement of recall and application of nursing students. *Journal of nursing education*, 5(1), 62-71.
- Hatami, J., Farrokhnia, M., & Hassanzadeh, M. (2016, September). Select-and-fill-in concept maps as an evaluation tool in science classrooms. *In International Conference on Concept Mapping* (pp. 169-180). Springer, Cham.

- Hassanzadeh, M., Hatami, J., Latifi, S., Farrokhnia, M. R., & Saheb, T. (2016, September). Teaching science for understanding: The positive impact of simultaneous use of concept mapping and computer simulations. In *International Conference on Concept Mapping* (pp. 192-202). Springer, Cham.
- Huisman, B., Saab, N., van Driel, J., & van den Broek, P. (2018). Peer feedback on academic writing: undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(6), 955-968. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1424318>
- Kerman, N. T., Banihashem, S. K., Noroozi, O., & Biemans, H. J. (2022). The effects of students perceived usefulness and trustworthiness of peer feedback on learning satisfaction in online learning environments. In *8th International Conference on Higher Education Advances, HEAd 2022* (pp. 263-271). Universidad Politécnic de Valencia.
- Latifi, S., & Noroozi, O. (2021). Supporting argumentative essay writing through an online supported peer-review script. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 58(5), 501-511. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2021.1961097>
- Latifi, S., Noroozi, O., Hatami, J., & Biemans, H. J. (2021). How does online peer feedback improve argumentative essay writing and learning? *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 58(2), 195-206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2019.1687005>
- Latifi, S., Noroozi, O., & Talae, E. (2020). Worked example or scripting? Fostering students' online argumentative peer feedback, essay writing and learning. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1799032>
- Latifi, S., Noroozi, O., & Talae, E. (2021). Peer feedback or peer feedforward? Enhancing students' argumentative peer learning processes and outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(2), 768-784. <https://doi.org/10.1111/BJET.13054>
- Lu, J., & Law, N. (2012). Online peer assessment: Effects of cognitive and affective feedback. *Instructional Science*, 40(2), 257-275. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-011-9177-2>
- Misiejuk, K., Wasson, B., & Egelandsdal, K. (2021). Using learning analytics to understand student perceptions of peer feedback. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106658>
- Nelson, M. M., & Schunn, C. D. (2009). The nature of feedback: How different types of peer feedback affect writing performance. *Instructional Science*, 37(4), 375-401. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9053-x>
- Noroozi, O., Biemans, H. J. A., Busstra, M. C., Mulder, M., & Chizari, M. (2011). Differences in learning processes between successful and less successful students in computer-supported collaborative learning in the field of human nutrition and health. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(1), 309-318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.08.009>
- Noroozi, O., Biemans, H., & Mulder, M. (2016). Relations between scripted online peer feedback processes and quality of written argumentative essay. *Internet and Higher Education*, 31, 20-31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2016.05.002>
- Noroozi, O., Banihashem, S. K., Taghizadeh Kerman, N., Parvaneh Akhteh Khaneh, M., Babayi, M., Ashrafi, H., & Biemans, H. J. (2022). Gender differences in students' argumentative essay writing, peer review performance and uptake in online learning environments. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1-15.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2034887>

- Noroozi, O., Hatami, J., Bayat, A., van Ginkel, S., Biemans, H. J., & Mulder, M. (2020). Students' online argumentative peer feedback, essay writing, and content learning: does gender matter? *Interactive Learning Environments*, 28(6), 698-712. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2018.1543200>
- Noroozi, O., Dehghanzadeh, H., & Talaei, E. (2020). A systematic review on the impacts of game-based learning on argumentation skills. *Entertainment Computing*, 35, 100369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcom.2020.100369>
- Noroozi, O. (2022). The role of students' epistemic beliefs for their argumentation performance in higher education. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*.1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2022.2092188>
- Noroozi, O. (2018). Considering students' epistemic beliefs to facilitate their argumentative discourse and attitudinal change with a digital dialogue game. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55(3), 357-365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2016.1208112>
- Noroozi, O., McAlister, S., & Mulder, M. (2016). Impacts of a digital dialogue game and epistemic beliefs on argumentative discourse and willingness to argue. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17(3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v17i3.2297>
- Noroozi, O., Weinberger, A., Biemans, H.J.A., Mulder, M., & Chizari, M. (2012). Argumentation-based computer supported collaborative learning (ABCSCCL). A systematic review and synthesis of fifteen years of research. *Educational Research Review*, 7(2), 79-106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2011.11.006>
- Patchan, M. M., Schunn, C. D., & Correnti, R. J. (2016). The nature of feedback: How peer feedback features affect students' implementation rate and quality of revisions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 108(8), 1098-1120. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000103>
- Taghizade, A., Hatami, J., Noroozi, O., Farrokhnia, M., & Hassanzadeh, A. (2020). Fostering learners' perceived presence and high-level learning outcomes in online learning environments. *Education Research International*, 2020.
- Taghizadeh Kerman, N., Noroozi, O., Banihashem, S. K., Karami, M., & Biemans, H. J. A. (2022). Online peer feedback patterns of success and failure in argumentative essay writing. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2093914>
- Tian, L., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Learner engagement with automated feedback, peer feedback and teacher feedback in an online EFL writing context. *System*, 91, 102247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102247>
- Shahali Zadeh, M., Dehghani, S., Banihashem, S. K., & Rahimi, A. (2016). Designing and implementation of blending of problem solving instructional model with constructivism's principles and the study of its effect on Learning and creative thinking. *Journal of Innovation and Creativity in Human Science*, 5(3), 83-117.
- Valero Haro, A, Noroozi, O., Biemans, H. J. A., & Mulder, M. (2022). Argumentation Competence: Students' argumentation knowledge, behavior and attitude and their relationships with domain-specific knowledge acquisition. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 35(1), 123-145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10720537.2020.1734995>

- Wu, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2020). When peers agree, do students listen? The central role of feedback quality and feedback frequency in determining uptake of feedback. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *62*, 101897. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101897>
- Wu, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2021). From plans to actions: A process model for why feedback features influence feedback implementation. *Instructional Science* 2021 49:3, 49(3), 365–394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11251-021-09546-5>