INDONESIAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION AND APPLIED SCIENCES (IJIAS)
Journal Homepage: https://ojs.literacyinstitute.org/index.php/ijias
ISSN: 2775-4162 (Online)
Research Article

Volume 5	Issue 2	June (2025)	DOI: 10.47540/ijias.v5i2.1792	Page: 119 – 128

Overcoming Challenges of Peer Assessment Implementation in Online Collaborative Learning in Higher Institutions of Learning

Job Kalema[1], Jane Katusiime[1], Simon Kawuma[1], Deborah Natumanya[1]
[1]Department of Computer Science, Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Uganda
Corresponding Author: Job Kalema; Email: jkalema@faest.bsu.ac.ug

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Group Dynamics, Implementation Challenges, Online Collaborative Learning, Peer Assessment, Student Engagement.

Received : 16 December 2024
Revised : 22 June 2025
Accepted : 24 June 2025

ABSTRACT

Online collaborative learning has become an essential component of higher education, offering students opportunities to engage in peer-based learning activities. Peer assessment, as a tool for enhancing collaborative learning, has demonstrated significant potential but also presents several implementation challenges. The primary objectives of this paper are to identify and analyze the key challenges encountered in the implementation of peer assessment within online collaborative learning environments. This study employed a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative research methods to explore the challenges faced in implementing peer assessment in online collaborative learning environments. Approximately 35% of students in our study reported difficulties related to the peer assessment platforms, including usability issues and limited integration with other learning management systems.35% of students in our study found the assessment rubrics unclear or insufficiently detailed. The challenges identified in this study, particularly those concerning technological limitations, lack of training, and issues with fairness and trust, have significant implications for the implementation of peer assessment in online collaborative learning. Based on the results and expert review, it is clear that overcoming these challenges requires a multifaceted approach. Technological, pedagogical, and social challenges all play a role in hindering the effectiveness of peer assessment, but these challenges can be addressed through targeted strategies.

INTRODUCTION

The rise of online learning in higher education has been accelerated by advances in technology and the increasing demand for flexible learning environments. One prominent feature of online education is collaborative learning, where students work together to achieve common learning goals. Peer assessment, a process where students evaluate the work of their peers, has been integrated into many collaborative learning activities as a way to promote critical thinking, self-reflection, and deeper engagement with course content. However, the successful implementation of peer assessment in online environments remains a challenge for many institutions.

Despite its potential benefits, peer assessment in online collaborative learning environments is often hindered by a range of challenges. These include technological limitations, issues related to the quality and fairness of feedback, lack of student engagement, and difficulties in managing group dynamics. These barriers can prevent peer assessment from being an effective tool for enhancing learning outcomes, especially in the absence of clear guidance and proper support.

Addressing the challenges of peer assessment implementation is essential for enhancing the quality of online collaborative learning. The outcomes of this study can help identify effective strategies and best practices for overcoming these barriers, ensuring that peer assessment becomes a more reliable and valuable tool for both students and instructors.

The primary objectives of this paper are to identify and analyze the key challenges encountered in the implementation of peer assessment within

online collaborative learning environments. These challenges include technological barriers such as limited tool accessibility, pedagogical issues like unclear rubrics and insufficient training, and social concerns, including trust and fairness in peer evaluations. The paper also aims to propose comprehensive solutions to address these challenges, focusing on technological, pedagogical, and organizational strategies. These solutions will include recommendations for improving the functionality of peer assessment tools, enhancing student training on providing constructive feedback, and offering institutional support for peer assessment initiatives. Finally, the paper discusses the implications of these solutions for refining peer assessment practices in higher education, ultimately aiming to foster more effective, equitable, and engaging learning experiences for students.

Peer assessment is widely used in higher education to encourage active learning, develop critical thinking skills, and foster collaboration among students. According to Topping (2017), peer assessment can enhance learning by allowing students to engage in deeper analysis of course material and providing opportunities for self-reflection. Liu et al. (2020) note that peer assessment can also develop students' assessment skills, which are valuable in both academic and professional contexts. However, the effectiveness of peer assessment is contingent on proper implementation, clear guidelines, and the right technological support.

Several studies have highlighted challenges in implementing peer assessment in online collaborative learning. Topping (2017) identified issues with fairness, where students often felt that peer ratings were biased, particularly in the context of group work. Liu et al. (2020) pointed out the reluctance of students to engage in peer assessment, citing concerns about the accuracy and objectivity of feedback. Furthermore, issues such as the low quality of peer feedback, lack of engagement, and difficulties in establishing trust have been identified as significant barriers to effective peer assessment (Boud & Falchikov, 2018).

Technological limitations can significantly hinder the implementation of peer assessment in online learning environments. Low engagement with peer assessment tools, lack of integration with learning management systems, and poor user interfaces are common issues. These technical challenges make it difficult for students to engage with the assessment process and for instructors to monitor and evaluate the quality of feedback provided.

Pedagogical issues include unclear assessment rubrics, insufficient training for students on how to give constructive feedback, and challenges in managing group dynamics in online settings. Without clear guidelines, students may struggle to provide meaningful feedback, resulting in low-quality peer assessments. Additionally, without proper training, students may be unsure about how to engage in the assessment process effectively, leading to disengagement or frustration.

Trust issues and perceptions of unfairness can undermine the effectiveness of peer assessment. Students may feel uncomfortable providing critical feedback to their peers, especially in group-based activities where social dynamics play a significant role. Anxiety about being evaluated by peers can also negatively affect students' willingness to engage in the assessment process (Boud & Falchikov, 2018). This paper identifies and explores these challenges, which include technological, pedagogical, and social factors that affect the effectiveness of peer assessment in online learning environments. Through an analysis of these barriers, the paper proposes solutions, including the adoption of user-friendly assessment tools, the development of clear assessment rubrics, the provision of training for students, and institutional support to foster a culture of feedback and collaboration.

METHODS

This study employed a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative research methods to explore the challenges faced in implementing peer assessment in online collaborative learning environments. The qualitative component involved interviews with instructors and students, while the quantitative component involved a survey of students who had participated in peer assessment activities. Data were collected through online surveys and semi-structured interviews. The survey was distributed to a sample of students enrolled in online courses that included peer assessment as part of their collaborative learning activities. In-depth interviews were conducted with a subset of students and instructors to gain a deeper

understanding of their experiences and perspectives on peer assessment.

The study involved 200 students and 15 instructors from various higher education institutions. Participants were selected based on their involvement in online collaborative learning activities that included peer assessment as a component. The quantitative data from the surveys were analyzed using descriptive statistics and regression analysis to identify common challenges and trends. The qualitative data from the interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify key themes related to technological, pedagogical, and social challenges.

The study commenced after approval from the Mbarara University of Science and Technology Research Ethics Committee (Approval no.MUST-2024-1412) and by the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology (Approval no.SIR341ES). Permissions were also secured from the heads of the participating Universities, and informed consent was obtained from the participants. Detailed information about the study, including its purpose, procedures, potential risks, and benefits, was provided to participants. They were assured that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study without any consequences. To ensure anonymity, unique codes were assigned to each participant, and all identifying information was removed from the data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings revealed several key challenges in the implementation of peer assessment:

Table 1. Showing challenges, Frequencies faced by participants in online collaborative learning

		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
Challenges[a]	Technical issues	115	62.8%	76.2%
	Difficulty coordinating with group members	25	13.7%	16.6%
	Limited communication tools	43	23.5%	28.5%
Total		183	100.0%	121.2%

Source: Data Analysis

The results in the table above reveal several key concerns faced by participants. A prominent issue, identified by 62.8% of respondents, is technical difficulties, highlighting the critical role of reliable technology in facilitating online collaboration. This suggests that many learners experience issues such as connectivity problems, platform usability, or software glitches, which hinder engagement in collaborative activities. Additionally, 23.5% of participants reported limitations in available communication tools, indicating that the existing platforms may not fully meet the needs of all learners, potentially leading to misunderstandings or ineffective interaction. Furthermore, 13.7% of respondents noted coordination challenges with group members, suggesting that while many students manage group activities well, some struggle with organizing and managing group dynamics, possibly due to scheduling issues or a lack of effective collaboration strategies. These findings emphasize the need to address technical and communication limitations to improve the effectiveness of online collaborative learning.

Table 2. Prefered_Instruction_method Frequencies

		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
Prefered Instruction Method[a]	Written instructions	87	57.6%	57.6%
	Video Conferencing	27	17.9%	17.9%
	Live Instruction (synchronous)	37	24.5%	24.5%
Total		151	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Data Analysis

The results above reveal a clear preference for written instructions, with 57.6% of participants selecting this as their preferred choice, indicating that many learners value the clarity and accessibility of written materials, which allow for reference and self-paced learning. 24.5% of respondents favored live instruction, suggesting a segment of learners who appreciate real-time interaction and immediate feedback in synchronous learning environments. Video conferencing, chosen by 17.9% of participants, was the least favored method, possibly due to its limited effectiveness in conveying complex information compared to written or live instruction. Overall, the results highlight the importance of providing clear, comprehensive written materials in online courses, while also acknowledging the value of synchronous and interactive learning formats for some students.

Table 3. Overall Experience in Online Collaborative Learning

Overall experience in OCL rating		Engagement in Online Collaborative Learning EOCL	Most effective online collaborative learning tools	How feedback is received	Benefits of group-based learning	Challenges and obstacles in participating in online collaborative learning
Good	Mean	4.27	2.53	1.00	1.20	1.20
	N	59	59	59	59	59
	Std. Deviation	.906	.704	.000	.406	.406
Very good	Mean	3.59	2.88	1.00	1.48	1.24
	N	95	96	96	96	96
	Std. Deviation	1.685	.465	.000	.858	.429
Total	Mean	3.85	2.74	1.00	1.37	1.23
	N	150	151	151	151	151
	Std. Deviation	1.472	.590	.000	.731	.419

Source: Data Analysis

The analysis of engagement in online collaborative learning (OCL) reveals mixed experiences. Participants who rated their experience as “Good” had a high engagement score of 4.27, while those rating it as “Very Good” had a lower score of 3.59, suggesting varied engagement levels even among satisfied learners. While OCL tools were generally recognized as effective (mean scores: 2.53 for “Good” and 2.88 for “Very Good”), there is room for improvement. Feedback mechanisms were notably ineffective, with both groups scoring 1.00, indicating a lack of meaningful feedback. Benefits of group work were recognized but not strongly felt, with scores of 1.20 (Good) and 1.48 (Very Good). Challenges faced by participants were similar across both groups (scores: 1.20 and 1.24), indicating common difficulties in collaboration. Overall, while engagement in OCL was generally positive (mean score: 3.85), areas such as feedback, tool effectiveness, and group work benefits require improvement to enhance the collaborative learning experience.

Table 4. Satisfaction with the technical support provided in online collaborative learning

Satisfaction with the technical support provided during your online collaborative learning activities		Engagement in Online Collaborative Learning EOCL	Most effective online collaborative learning tools	How feedback is received	Benefits of group-based learning	Challenges and obstacles in participating in online collaborative learning	Preferred method for receiving instructions	Suggestions for improving OCL
Neutral	Mean	3.69	2.69	1.00	2.28	1.64	1.00	1.00
	N	36	36	36	36	36	36	36
	Std. Deviation	.786	.786	.000	.974	.487	.000	.000
Satisfied	Mean	3.73	2.71	1.00	1.12	1.12	1.00	1.00
	N	102	103	103	103	103	103	103
	Std. Deviation	1.684	.536	.000	.322	.322	.000	.000
Very satisfied	Mean	5.00	3.06	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	N	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
	Std. Deviation	.000	.250	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Total	Mean	3.85	2.74	1.00	1.37	1.23	1.00	1.00
	N	150	151	151	151	151	151	151
	Std. Deviation	1.472	.590	.000	.731	.419	.000	.000

Source: Data Analysis

The data on satisfaction with technical support in online collaborative learning activities reveals mixed experiences. Participants who were "Neutral" in their satisfaction had a moderate engagement score of 3.69, but reported lower tool effectiveness (2.69) and consistent feedback reception scores of 1.00, indicating issues in communication and support. In contrast, those "Satisfied" showed a slightly higher engagement score of 3.73 and tool effectiveness (2.71), though feedback reception remained low at 1.00, signaling ongoing challenges in feedback quality. The "Very satisfied" group, with a smaller sample, exhibited a significantly higher engagement score of 5.00 and tool effectiveness (3.06), yet still had a feedback reception score of 1.00, suggesting that high satisfaction did not necessarily correlate with improved feedback processes.

Further challenges were evident in the peer assessment process. 35% of students found the rubrics unclear, leading to inconsistent feedback, while 60% reported lacking proper training to provide constructive feedback. 45% expressed concerns about the fairness of peer assessment, especially in group assignments, with trust issues prevalent among students who felt uncomfortable critiquing peers' work.

The results of this study align with and extend prior research on the challenges associated with the implementation of peer assessment in online collaborative learning environments. The expert review, conducted alongside the survey and student feedback, provides valuable insight into the key obstacles faced by both students and instructors in the adoption of peer assessment. By comparing the findings of this study with previous literature, we can identify several critical themes related to the technological, pedagogical, and social challenges that hinder the effectiveness of peer assessment.

Technological limitations were highlighted as one of the foremost barriers to the effective implementation of peer assessment. Our results corroborate the findings of earlier studies (Zheng et al, 2019) that pointed to the inadequate technological infrastructure in many higher education institutions. Approximately 35% of students in our study reported difficulties related to the peer assessment platforms, including usability issues and limited integration with other learning management systems. These challenges were further emphasized by the expert review, which noted that many institutions lacked the necessary tools for managing peer reviews efficiently. Experts highlighted the lack of integrated tools to facilitate assignments, track reviews, and manage feedback, which resulted in inefficient workflows and a fragmented user experience. The review stressed that upgrading these technological systems is critical for improving the peer assessment process,

particularly as online learning environments continue to expand.

Moreover, technological challenges also manifested in the lack of accessibility to peer assessment tools. Many students, particularly those from underprivileged backgrounds or regions with limited internet connectivity, expressed concerns about equitable access to the digital platforms used for peer assessment. This issue was flagged in the expert review as a significant hindrance to the inclusion of all students in the peer assessment process. These findings are in line with previous research by Topping (2017) and Yundayani (2024), which emphasized the need for robust, accessible technology to support peer assessment in higher education.

In terms of pedagogical issues, our results indicate that 60% of students reported not receiving proper training on how to provide constructive feedback, a finding consistent with previous studies that highlighted the importance of training students in peer assessment skills (Liu et al., 2020). The expert review expanded on this by noting that many students struggle with understanding how to assess their peers' work objectively, which often leads to inconsistent and biased feedback. Furthermore, 35% of students in our study found the assessment rubrics unclear or insufficiently detailed. This aligns with expert concerns about the lack of clear, well-defined rubrics, which are essential for guiding students in giving specific, constructive feedback.

The expert review also identified insufficient guidance for instructors as a significant pedagogical challenge. Many instructors, particularly those new to online teaching, were not equipped with strategies for implementing peer assessment effectively. The study emphasized that instructors often lacked the knowledge or confidence to guide students through the peer assessment process, leaving them with unclear expectations. This gap in instructor preparation has a direct impact on student experiences, as unclear or inconsistent instructions can lead to confusion and disengagement, as evidenced by the findings of this study.

Moreover, 45% of students expressed concerns about the fairness of peer assessment, particularly in group-based assignments. This finding mirrors expert concerns about how group dynamics and unequal contributions from group members can undermine the fairness of peer assessments. Experts pointed out that peer assessments in group work settings are often skewed by students' perceptions of their peers' effort levels, which can lead to biased evaluations. These concerns are also supported by previous research, which has shown that managing group dynamics and ensuring fairness in peer assessments can be particularly challenging (Rifel, 2024; Yundayani, 2019).

The social and psychological aspects of peer assessment were also critical issues identified by both the survey results and the expert review. Trust emerged as a significant challenge, with many students expressing discomfort with critiquing their peers' work. This was particularly evident in group-based assignments, where perceptions of bias and favoritism may impact how feedback is given and received. As highlighted in the expert review, students often feared that providing negative feedback could harm relationships with their peers, leading to reluctance in fully engaging in the peer review process. This concern is consistent with findings from prior studies (Magda, 2021; Tracey, 2007), which highlighted that peer assessment can lead to anxiety and interpersonal conflicts, particularly when trust is lacking.

Additionally, the expert review highlighted that many students struggled with giving constructive feedback, not only due to the lack of training but also because of the underlying power dynamics in peer relationships. Instructors need to create a safe and supportive environment where students feel comfortable providing honest, yet constructive feedback. Without this, the peer assessment process can become superficial or counterproductive, as students may hesitate to provide the critical evaluations necessary for meaningful learning.

The challenges identified in this study, particularly those concerning technological limitations, lack of training, and issues with fairness and trust, have significant implications for the implementation of peer assessment in online collaborative learning. Based on the results and expert review, it is clear that overcoming these challenges requires a multifaceted approach. Technological solutions, such as more integrated and user-friendly peer review systems, could help alleviate many of the technological challenges reported by students. Instructors, meanwhile, should be provided with more comprehensive training and

resources to effectively guide students through the peer assessment process. Clearer rubrics, better communication of expectations, and tools to manage group dynamics and ensure fairness could address many of the pedagogical challenges identified.

Social and psychological barriers, such as trust issues and concerns about fairness, can be addressed by fostering a culture of mutual respect and open communication within collaborative learning environments. Implementing strategies such as anonymous feedback or peer mediation could reduce the social pressures that inhibit honest evaluations. Furthermore, integrating peer assessment into the curriculum with continuous support and feedback from instructors can help alleviate the anxiety that often accompanies this process.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study underscore the complexity of implementing peer assessment in online collaborative learning environments. Technological, pedagogical, and social challenges all play a role in hindering the effectiveness of peer assessment, but these challenges can be addressed through targeted strategies. The expert review highlights the need for institutions to invest in both technological infrastructure and pedagogical training for instructors and students. By addressing these barriers, higher education institutions can create more effective and engaging peer assessment processes that ultimately enhance student learning outcomes in online environments.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

REFERENCES

1. Adesina, O. O., Adesina, O. A., Adelopo, I., & Afrifa, G. A. (2022). Managing group work: the impact of peer assessment on student engagement. *Accounting Education*, 32(1), 90–113.
2. Ahmed, M. R., & Sidiq, M. A. (2023). Evaluating Online Assessment Strategies: A Systematic Review of Reliability and Validity in E-Learning Environments. *North American Academic Research*, 6(12), 1–18.
3. Al Harrasi, K. T. S. (2024). Enhancing learner self-monitoring in self-assessment through the use of pedagogical resources. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1).
4. Andrade HL. (2019). A Critical Review of Research on Student Self-Assessment. *Front. Educ*. 4:87.
5. Babik, D., Gehringer, E., Kidd, J. et al. A systematic review of educational online peer-review and assessment systems: charting the landscape. *Education Tech Research Dev* (2024).
6. Cabero-Almenara, J., Romero-Tena, R. and Palacios-Rodríguez, A. (2020). Evaluation of teacher digital competence frameworks through expert judgement: The use of the expert competence coefficient, *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 9(2).
7. Celeste, R. J., & Osias, N. (2024). Challenges and implementation of technology integration: Basis for enhanced instructional program. *American Journal of Arts and Human Science*, 3(2), 106-130.
8. Chai, K.C., Tay, K.M. and Lim, C.P. (2015). A new fuzzy peer assessment methodology for cooperative learning of students, *Applied Soft Computing Journal*, 32.
9. Chaiklin, H. (1991). Case Study Research: Design and Methods', *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 179(2).
10. Chen, T.L. (2020). Learning programming language in higher education for sustainable development: Point-earning bidding method, *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(11).
11. Chourishi, D. (2011). Effective E-Learning through Moodle, *International Journal of Advance Technology & Engineering Research*, 1(1).
12. Creswell, J.W. (2003a). Creswell, J.W. (2003). Chapter One, "A Framework for Design."', *Research design Qualitative quantitative and mixed methods approaches* [Preprint].
13. Creswell, J.W. (2003b). Research design Qualitative quantitative and mixed methods approaches', *Research design Qualitative quantitative and mixed methods approaches* [Preprint].
14. Demir, M. (2018). Using online peer assessment in an Instructional Technology and Material Design course through social media,

Higher Education, 75(3).
15. Demosthenous, G., Panaoura, A. and Eteokleous, N. (2020). The Use of Collaborative Assignment in Online Learning Environments: The Case of Higher Education, *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science*, 4(2).
16. Donia, M. B. L. (2021). Student satisfaction with use of an online peer feedback system. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(4), 1-15.
17. Double, K.S., McGrane, J.A. & Hopfenbeck, T.N. The Impact of Peer Assessment on Academic Performance: A Meta-analysis of Control Group Studies. *Educ Psychol Rev*. 32, 481–509 (2020).
18. Dudovskiy, J. (2021). Positivism Research Philosophy, *Research Methodology* [Preprint].
19. Elsdaig, M. and Nassar, D.A. (2019). Evaluation of healthcare information system using delone and mclean quality model, case study ksa, *International Journal of Advanced Trends in Computer Science and Engineering*, 8(1.4S1).
20. Erbilgin, E., Robinson, J., Jarrah, A. M., Johnson, J. D., & Gningue, S. (2023). Exploring the type and quality of peer feedback in a graduate-level blended course. *Education Sciences*, 13(6).
21. Gamage, S.H.P.W., Ayres, J.R. and Behrend, M.B. (2022). A systematic review on trends in using Moodle for teaching and learning, *International Journal of STEM Education*.
22. Gielen, S., Peeters, E., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Struyven, K. (2010). Improving the effectiveness of peer feedback for learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 20(4), 304-315.
23. Gweon, G. (2011). A Framework for Assessment of Student Project Groups On-Line and Off-Line, in *Analyzing Interactions in CSCL*.
24. Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Qadri, M. A., & Suman, R. (2022). Understanding the role of digital technologies in education: A review. *Sustainable Operations and Computers*, 3, 275–285.
25. Hermansyah, H., Nurhairunnisah, N. and Dwi Lestari, I. (2022). Analysis of Prospective Teacher's Learning Independence Based on Gender Through the Utilization of Moodle-Based E-Learning, *Jurnal Pendidikan Fisika dan Teknologi*, 8(1).
26. Higgins, R. (2017). The Conscientious Consumer: Reconsidering the role of assessment feedback in student learning The Conscientious Consumer: reconsidering the role of assessment feedback in student learning, *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(1).
27. Hyttinen, K. (2017). Human-centered design model in the development of online learning tools for international security training CASE IECEU New Media based Learning Application (NMLA), in *IC3K 2017 - Proceedings of the 9th International Joint Conference on Knowledge Discovery, Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management*.
28. Ijeoma B. Anumaka. (2013). Institutional Effectiveness: Best Practices and Assessment Strategies in Uganda Universities', *BEST: International Journal of Management, Information Technology and Engineering (BEST: IJMITE)*, 1(2).
29. Jaime, A. (2016). Spiral and Project-Based Learning with Peer Assessment in a Computer Science Project Management Course, *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 25(3).
30. Jakoet-Salie, A., & Ramalobe, K. (2023). The digitalization of learning and teaching practices in higher education institutions during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Teaching Public Administration*, 41(1), 59-71.
31. Jones, A. (2000). Collaborative Learning: Cognitive and Computational Approaches, *Computers & Education*, 35(1).
32. Karami, A., & Rezaei, A. (2015). An overview of peer-assessment: The benefits and importance. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, 3(1), 93.
33. Kearney, S. (2013). Improving engagement: The use of "Authentic self-and peer-assessment for learning" to enhance the student learning experience, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(7).
34. Kerman, N.T., Banihashem, S.K., Karami, M. et al. Online peer feedback in higher education: A synthesis of the literature. *Educ Inf Technol*. 29, 763–813 (2024).
35. Konings, K. D., van Zundert, M., & van Merrienboer, J. J. G. (2019). Scaffolding peer-assessment skills: Risk of interference with

learning domain-specific skills? *Learning and Instruction*, 60, 85-94.
36. Kritikos, V.S. (2011). Intergroup Peer Assessment in Problem-Based Learning Tutorials for Undergraduate Pharmacy Students, *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 75(4).
37. Lagan, S. (2020). Actionable health app evaluation: translating expert frameworks into objective metrics, *npj Digital Medicine*, 3(1).
38. Li, H. (2020). Does peer assessment promote student learning? A meta-analysis, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(2).
39. Limpanuparb, T. (2021). ACAD-Feedback: Online Framework for Assignment, Collection, Analysis, and Distribution of Self, Peer, Instructor, and Group Feedback, *Journal of Chemical Education*, 98(9).
40. Marjo van Zundert, M., Sluijsmans, D., & van Merriënboer, J. (2009). Effective peer assessment processes: Research findings and future directions. *Learning and Instruction*, 19(4), 289–305.
41. Matovu, M. and Zubairi, A.M. (2015). Assessment Practices in the Developing World: Predictors of Assessment Practices in Ugandan Institutions of Higher Learning, *IIUM Journal of Educational Studies*, 3(2).
42. Mayende, G. (2015). Peer assessment based assignment to enhance interactions in online learning groups, in *Proceedings of 2015 International Conference on Interactive Collaborative Learning, ICL 2015*.
43. Mohamed Hashim, M., Tlemsani, I. & Matthews, R. Higher education strategy in digital transformation. *Educ Inf Technol*. 27, 3171–3195 (2022).
44. McKenzie, J., Pelliccione, L. and Parker, N. (2008). Developing peer review of teaching in blended learning environments: Frameworks and challenges, in *ASCILITE 2008 - The Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education*.
45. Moccozet, L. and Tardy, C. (2015). An assessment for learning framework with peer assessment of group works, in *2015 International Conference on Information Technology Based Higher Education and Training, ITHET 2015*.
46. Mota, A.R. (2019). Peer and Self-assessment: A Mathematical Model to Improve Students' Accountability in Laboratory Stations Model, *International Journal of Physics and Chemistry Education*, 11.
47. Nguyen Ngoc, H., Lasa, G. and Iriarte, I. (2022). Human-centred design in industry 4.0: case study review and opportunities for future research, *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*.
48. Nguyen, V.A. (2017). A peer assessment approach to project based blended learning course in a Vietnamese higher education', *Education and Information Technologies*, 22(5).
49. Papinczak, T., Young, L., & Groves, M. (2007). Peer assessment in problem-based learning: A qualitative study. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 12(2), 169-186.
50. Peimani, N. and Kamalipour, H. (2021). Online education in the post covid-19 era: Students' perception and learning experience, *Education Sciences*, 11(10).
51. Pereira, D., Flores, M.A. and Niklasson, L. (2016). Assessment revisited: a review of research in Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education', *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(7).
52. Phelan, S. (2011). Case study research: design and methods, *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 24(3).
53. Putu Ramayasa, I. (2015). Evaluation model of success and acceptance of e-learning, *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, 82(3).
54. Ramayasa, I.P. (2015). Evaluation Model of Success and Acceptance of E-Learning, *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, 3182(3).
55. Rawlusyk, P.E. (2018). Assessment in Higher Education and Student Learning, *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 21.
56. Rezaei, E., Beheshti Shirazi, S.S. The impact of thinking-aloud peer assessment (TAPA) on the development of high order thinking skills (HOTS) in math e-learning. *Educ Inf Technol*. (2024).
57. Roberts, T. S. (2006). *Self, Peer and Group Assessment in E-Learning*. Idea Group Inc.
58. Rosa, S.S., Coutinho, C.P. and Flores, M.A. (2016). Online Peer Assessment: Method and Digital Technologies, *Procedia - Social and*

Behavioral Sciences, 228.

59. Rust, C. (2002). The Impact of Assessment on Student Learning, *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 3(2).
60. Saputra, K.O., Mertasana, P.A. and Rahardjo, P. (2020). Model of Group Peer Assessment on E-Learning, *International Journal of Engineering and Emerging Technology*, 4(2).
61. Saraç, S. and Karakelle, S. (2012). On-line and off-line assessment of metacognition, *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 4(2).
62. Shermin, A., De Silva, B., & Wesumperuma, A. (2019, December). Groupwork Assessment Development (GAD): A framework for developing an effective group work assessment. In *Australasian Conference on Information Systems*. Fremantle, Western Australia.
63. Scott, G.W. (2017). Active engagement with assessment and feedback can improve Group-Work outcomes and boost student confidence, *Higher Education Pedagogies*, 2(1).
64. Sridharan, B. and Boud, D. (2019). The effects of peer judgements on teamwork and self-assessment ability in collaborative group work, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(6).
65. Štilic, A. (2023). An Expert-Opinion-Based Evaluation Framework for Sustainable Technology-Enhanced Learning Using Z-Numbers and Fuzzy Logarithm Methodology of Additive Weights, *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 15(16).
66. Surahman, E. (2019). Design of Peer Collaborative Authentic Assessment Model Based on Group Project Based Learning to Train Higher Order Thinking Skills of Students, in. doi:10.2991/icet-18.2018.6.
67. Tait-McCutcheon, S. and Knewstubb, B. (2018). Evaluating the alignment of self, peer and lecture assessment in an Aotearoa New Zealand pre-service teacher education course, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(5).
68. Tumpa, R. J., Skaik, S., Chaudhry, G., & Ham, M. (2021). Group-based Assessments and Project Management Education: Towards a Dynamic Framework with Best Practices. *International Journal of Innovation and Business Strategy*, 5(4), 275–285.
69. Wanner, T. and Palmer, E. (2018). Formative self-and peer assessment for improved student learning: the crucial factors of design, teacher participation and feedback. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(7).
70. Wei, Z. (2023). Navigating Digital Learning Landscapes: Unveiling the Interplay Between Learning Behaviors, Digital Literacy, and Educational Outcomes. *J Knowl Econ* (2023).
71. Yin S, Chen F and Chang H (2022) Assessment as Learning: How Does Peer Assessment Function in Students' Learning? *Front. Psychol.* (13), 912568.
72. Yundayani, A., Alghadari, F., & Odewumi, M. O. (2019). Technology-mediated peer assessment in a course: A snapshot through the students' lens.
73. Zheng, L., Zhang, X., & Cui, P. (2019). The role of technology-facilitated peer assessment and supporting strategies: A meta-analysis. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(1), 1-15.