Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)

Vol. 28, No. 1, March 2025, 1-22

Peer Corrective Feedback: A Learning Resource for Learners, an Emotional Concern for Teachers

Sajjad Sepehrinia[*]

Nahavand Higher Education Complex, Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran.

Ali Arab Mofrad

Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Golestan University, Gorgan, Iran.

Abstract

A significant advantage associated with peer corrective feedback (CF) is the opportunity it provides for teachers in terms of increasing the opportunities for language learning and practice. Studies have even proved its influential role and higher impact for effective learning compared to the teacher-provided feedback. Nevertheless, teachers seem to practice caution in using it in their classes. One of their significant concerns is the emotional repercussions associated with this correction resource. The present study is an attempt to shed light on the dark parts of teachers' perception of peer correction by seeking learners' views and comparing them with those of teachers. For this purpose, semi-structured interviews were carried out with 31 Iranian EFL teachers as well as 159 Iranian EFL learners on the most critical issues discussed in the literature in relation to peer CF. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed using Braun and Clark's (2005) thematic analysis framework. The results pointed to teachers' misconceptions about how their learners might react to correction from peers; while teachers had a conservative attitude to peer-provided correction due to their emotional concerns, learners looked at it as an effective learning resource and their major concern was related to the quality of the provided peer corrections. The findings have valuable implications for language instructors and teacher development program.

Keywords: Oral error correction, teachers, learners, peer correction, emotional

[*] *Corresponding author:* Nahavand Higher Education Complex, Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran.

Email address: s.sepehrinia@basu.ac.ir

1. Introduction

Studies on peer (CF) have provided convincing evidence as to the positive effects of peer-resourced correction on interlanguage development. Learners, though, do not seem to trust it as much as they trust teacher-provided correction (Kaivanpanah et al., 2012). According to Zuniga and Simard (2022), when learners are striving to express their meaning using their still developing linguistic resources, negative evaluation from interlocutors may bring about anxiety making it even more difficult for learners to focus on the meaning they are going to make. This is more serious in oral speaking-based activities where, according to Bodnar et al. (2017) anxiety is normally high. Previous studies have not delved deeply into the factors that make learners doubtful about the corrections coming from their friends. Furthermore, although teachers have been found to have a less positive attitude toward peer correction (Kaivanpanah et al., 2015), their views have not been specifically compared their concerns in relation to the feedback coming from learners' classmates. The results can provide insightful information about the two groups' attitude and concerns regarding peer error correction, which can help to reduce the gap between the two groups' preferences for a well-resourced learning opportunity, i.e., peer error correction, which can provide the opportunity for engaging learners 'affectively, behaviorally, and cognitively' in peer error correction (Cheng & Zhang, 2024) considering the need for teachers to understand and take into account students' emotions or reactions caused by correction (Atai & Shafiee, 2017). This is particularly important for teachers to understand given the detrimental effects of negative emotions such as anxiety on learners' ability to notice and benefit from error correction (see Rassaei, 2013; Sheen, 2008). The results can provide insightful information about the two groups' attitude and concerns regarding peer error correction, which can help the reduce the gap between the two groups' preferences for a well-resourced learning opportunity, i.e., peer error correction, providing the opportunity for learners' affective, behavioral, and cognitive engagement in peer error correction (Cheng & Zhang, 2024).

2. Background

The role of peer interaction in language acquisition has been supported by research now. It is recognized as a significant facilitator of authentic communicative practice (Adams & Oliver, 2023). The results of studies on teacher perceptions identified multiple pedagogical advantages associated with peer

interaction in vocabulary acquisition, creating the opportunity for provision of peer feedback, application of grammatical rules, authentic language use, fluency development, socialization, confidence-building, and increased motivation. Given the concern of the study, the present study first presents an overview of the studies examining its effectiveness in improving learning and teachers and learners' preferences for peer correction.

2.1. Empirical Investigations into PCF Efficacy

The capacity of peers to serve as effective sources of error correction remains a contested issue. Yüksel et al. (2021) found that Turkish and Kaivanpanah et al. (2012) found that instructors have a lower preference for peer correction. Nonetheless, experimental studies by Lynch (2007), Sato and Lyster (2012), Sato and Viveros (2016), and Sipple and Jackson (2015) support the efficacy of peer correction. Sipple and Jackson (2015) reported that peer CF yielded superior long-term gains over teacher feedback in learning German present perfect tense, attributing this to enhanced attention to form and learner engagement through both providing and receiving feedback. Sato and Lyster (2012) similarly found that peer interaction involving corrective feedback (recasts and prompts) promoted second language (L2) development, proceduralized explicit knowledge, and improved speech rate and fluency.

Given the concerns about the quality of peer CF considering limited knowledge of the learners providing correction compared to their teachers, research on written peer CF indicates that learner proficiency does not inherently preclude providing useful feedback. Yu and Lee (2016), as an instance, observed that low-proficiency Chinese learners offered comments perceived as beneficial by peers, with subsequent revisions improving writing quality in 88.1% of the cases.

Overall, the number of studies examining the effects of peer error correction on classmates' performance is rather limited. The limited number of studies notwithstanding point to equal if not higher effectiveness of peer correction compared to teacher CF. This confirms the quality and understandability of peer correction for learners indicating learners' cognitive and behavioral engagement in this corrective practice. Attitude to peer CF is also important because learners or even teachers may not accept peer correction; given the significance of attending to learners' preferences in increasing learners' motivation (Lee, 2013; Schulz, 1996; Sepehrinia and Mahdizadeh, 2016), it is essential to examine and take into account learners' expectations and preferences in relation to the CF they receive from their peers.

2.2. Attitude toward peer CF

Despite the supportive research evidence for its benefits, peer error correction occurs much less frequently than teacher CF. The major reason for this seems to be perceptions of lower quality and reliability associated with this source of correction (Brown, 2009; Yoshida, 2008). According to observational and survey studies peer CF tends to be less explicit and frequent than teacher or native-speaker correction (Tan et al., 2022). Peers often provide input-providing feedback (e.g., recasts) rather than output-prompting types, potentially limiting developmental benefits. Additionally, learners may fail to notice communication breakdowns or may provide inaccurate corrections due to limited linguistic knowledge (Adams, 2007; Bruton & Samuda, 1980). Some scholars question PCF's comparative effectiveness for grammatical development, though it may aid oral skills (Toth, 2008). Philp et al. (2014) suggest that during meaningful interaction, learners' focus on form may diminish, reducing feedback explicitness and, therefore, noticeability.

Research on learner attitudes toward peer CF depicts a complex picture. While learners often prefer teacher feedback for its perceived authority (Brown, 2009; Kaivanpanah et al., 2012), studies show attitudes can be positively mediated by collaborative learning environments and strong peer relationships (Sato, 2013). In other words, when learners have more intimate relationships with their classmates, they may be more receptive to peer correction.

Another point is that learners may not know how to provide effective correction since they are not trained to do so. In fact, they may need to be trained on how to approach correcting their peers' errors. Sato and Lyster (2012) demonstrated that training learners to provide peer CF significantly improved outcomes, with peer CF groups outperforming interaction-only and control groups on measures of pruned speech rate and self-initiated output modification. Nevertheless, this shortcoming may not necessarily be specific to learners; Shirkhani and Tajeddin (2016) found that teachers do not know how to provide correction and what linguistic targets to focus on in their corrections pointing to the need to train teachers in this respect.

Teacher attitudes also vary. Méndez and Cruz (2014) found teachers held generally positive views on oral corrective feedback but were concerned about student affect, leading them to prefer unfocused and implicit correction. Most teachers in their study did not view peer CF positively, especially for beginner learners, citing trust issues and social dynamics, though over half did not consider teacher

correction inherently more effective. Kaivanpanah et al. (2012) found that Iranian EFL teachers held less positive attitudes toward peer error correction than their learners did.

Interventions targeting attitudes have shown promise. In other words, when learners are trained to provide peer correction, they develop more positive feelings and attitudes in this respect. Sippel (2021), for instance, found that training learners in providing peer CF enhanced learners' confidence and motivation to correct peers without altering their pre-existing positive beliefs about peer interaction. Martin and Sipple (2021) reported that learners generally held positive attitudes toward PCF, which became more favorable after acting as feedback providers. In other words, providing rather than receiving peer correction leads to the development of more positive feelings; providers believed peer CF aided their own development despite some discomfort in correcting peers. Zaccaron and Xhafaj (2024) highlighted that learner perceptions of feedback validity—specifically, trust in the source—critically mediate its utility, more so than the feedback's objective quality. In other words, when learners have a positive attitude to correction from peers, they are more likely to benefit from it.

2.3. The Present Study

As pointed out by Soruc et al. (2024, p. 3), a synthesis of existing research reveals "considerable divergence among teachers in their decisions on whether or not to offer oral corrective feedback." The authors suggest these divergent findings may stem from teachers' distinct cognitive perspectives shaped by their specific teaching contexts. Notably, few studies have systematically examined the factors influencing teachers' corrective decisions, indicating a need for further research in this area (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2019; Ha & Murray, 2021).

Furthermore, the results of studies show that the most important issue with respect to peer error correction seems to be the trust either teachers or learners in the quality of corrections provided by learners; positive attitudes of learners have been found to mediate learners' use of peer-provided correction (Zaccaron and Xhafaj, 2024). On this basis, there is a need to, first of all, delve more deeply into learners' attitude and the concerns they have regarding the provision of correction by peers, which helps to identify and resolve these concerns and prepare the ground for creating a more productive learning environment.

While the beneficial effects of peer CF are substantiated in the literature with peer correction being as effective and, in some cases, more effective than teacher correction, the significant gap in the literature concerns learners' and teachers' preferences for this source of correction. No studies, however, have specifically investigated and compared teachers and learners' attitudes towards peer CF. Comparing the two groups' preferences and concerns in this regard helps to reduce the possible gaps between their preferences, which helps to increase learners' motivation (Lee, 2013; Schulz, 1996). In other words, there is a need to understand whether the concerns expressed by teachers are really an issue to learners. In other words, if teachers are found to be concerned about an issue that is not, in fact, important to learners, then the misconceived sources of hindrance to the use of peer error correction can be identified and resolved convincing the teachers to take advantage of this valuable source of input. The leaner-related factors teachers deem as important in this decision-making process (Atai and Shafiee, 2017) including learners' expectations and attitude to peer correction need to investigated and compared with those expressed by learners themselves so identify the possible mismatches. This oversight is critical, as implementing peer correction without considering learner attitudes and preferences risks provoking negative emotional responses. Indeed, Kaivanpanah et al. (2012) and Sepehrinia and Arab Mofrad (2023) found that teachers are often hesitant to permit students to correct each other's errors. This hesitation likely relates to the social and contextual factors teachers weigh when planning their corrective practices, though current understanding of these factors is limited. If learners are found to have no concerns about an issue that prevents teachers from allowing peer correction, the sources of hindrance to effective peer corrective practice can be removed given its established potential to significantly expand learning opportunities. Therefore, the foundational step for the effective classroom implementation of peer CF is to identify and resolve the areas of mismatch between learners' and teachers' preferences in this regard. To address this gap, the present study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are Iranian EFL teachers' and learners' views about peer CF?
2. Is there consistency between teachers' and learners' views about peer CF?

3. Method

To investigate and compare teachers' and learners' views, attitudes, and preferences regarding peer error correction, a survey-based research design utilizing semi-structured interviews was employed.

3.1. Participants

The sample population included Iranian EFL teachers and learners in schools and language institutes. The teacher participants were selected using convenience sampling method and consisted of 31 Iranian EFL teachers (aged 22-43). They held either a BA (*no*=19) or MA (*no*=9) or were PhD candidates (*no*=3) in fields such as Applied Linguistics, English Literature, or Translation Studies. The learner participants included the teacher participants' students (*no*=159), who were willing to participate in the present study. They were selected based on their teachers' and their own willingness to participate in our interviews; the teacher interviewees were told to ask their learners about their willingness to participate in the interviews; about 10 classes were included in the study. Two classes in schools (*no*=73) and eight classes in language institutes (no=86) in Hamedan and Ahwaz participated in the study. The learners were reported to be at elementary, intermediate, and advanced proficiency levels.

3.2. Instrument

Individual semi-structured interviews were conducted with all teacher participants to allow for in-depth, personal exploration of their professional judgments and concerns. For the learner participants, interviews were conducted in a group format. This decision was made for two primary reasons: (1) practical constraints, including limited available time within the classroom schedule as recommended by the participating teachers, and (2) the methodological advantage of accessing data on peer dynamics directly. Since the research focus includes perceptions of feedback from peers, group interviews provided a naturalistic setting to observe and elicit discussions about social interactions, shared norms, and collective attitudes that might be less accessible in one-on-one settings (Kitzinger, 1995).

The semi-structured interview protocols for teachers and learners (see Appendices A & B) were developed through a systematic process to ensure content validity and relevance. First, a comprehensive review of the literature on peer corrective feedback was conducted to identify key constructs and gaps, particularly focusing on perceptual studies involving teachers and learners. Based on this review, an initial pool of questions was generated to address the study's research questions concerning perceptions of effectiveness, quality, trust, and emotional reactions related to peer CF. Before the main data collection, the revised protocols were piloted with two EFL teachers and six EFL learners who were not part of the main study. The pilot interviews were conducted under similar conditions as planned for the

main study. The goals of the pilot were to: (1) check the clarity and comprehensibility of the questions, (2) estimate the time required, and (3) identify any unintended leading or ambiguous phrasing. The interviews lasted between 15 and 30 minutes.

Considering group interview dynamics, we acknowledge that the group format may have introduced specific influences on the data. Peer pressure and the desire for social conformity may have led some learners to withhold dissenting opinions or to align their stated views with perceived group consensus, particularly on sensitive topics like embarrassment or trust in classmates. Conversely, the group setting may have also facilitated richer discussion, where one participant's comment prompted others to elaborate, compare experiences, and collaboratively construct meaning around peer correction. To mitigate potential bias, the interviewer explicitly encouraged all participants to share their individual views, assured confidentiality within the group context, and paid close attention to moments of agreement, disagreement, and hesitation in the dialogue. The analysis considered the group context as a factor in interpreting the data, recognizing that the responses represent perceptions articulated within a social setting, which is itself highly relevant to the phenomenon of peer feedback.

4. Results and discussion

After transcribing the interviews and noting down the points made by teachers and learners regarding the subject under study, the interviews were subjected to analysis drawing on Braun and Clark's (2005) thematic analysis framework. To enhance the trustworthiness of the analysis, an intercoder reliability check was performed. A second researcher, experienced in qualitative analysis and familiar with the study's aims but not involved in the initial coding, independently coded a randomly selected subset of transcripts (approximately 20% of the total: 6 teacher and 3 learner group transcripts). The two coders then met to compare their coding frameworks and the application of codes to specific text segments. Discrepancies were discussed in detail until a consensus was reached. This process led to the clarification of code definitions and minor refinements to the thematic structure. The high level of agreement achieved after discussion (estimated consensus >90%) supports the consistency and credibility of the identified themes.

The major themes and subthemes extracted from the interviewees' comments are presented in Table 1. As presented in Table 1, three major themes were extracted from the interviews including

effectiveness of peer CF, quality and trust in peer CF, and emotional reactions produced by peer correction.

4.1. Peer CF effectiveness

4.1.1. Teachers' perception of peer CF effectiveness

All the surveyed teachers without exception maintained that peer CF can be effective in producing learning and helping learners to notice and correct their errors. Peer correction and feedback, according to teachers, gives learners a sense of responsibility toward each other, motivates them to learn and compete with others in showing their linguistic ability, which gives them self-confidence, and promotes a sense of collaboration and participatory learning. This sense of collaboration is different from competition and trying to prove they are superior and better than others, which may even cause correction to be interpreted as criticism and even mockery. "If the learners feel that one of the students is always correcting them and showing off their linguistic ability to others, they usually try to ignore them and do not pay attention to their correction," one of the teachers said. Critical comments coming from every side may cause learners to become conserved and less willing to participate in the communicative activities. This aligns with recent research by Wang et al. (2024), which identified classroom social climate, including peer relationships and feelings of emotional support, as a key factor involved in promoting classroom participation.

Another advantage associated with peer CF provision, according to some of the interviewed teachers, concerned the provider of peer correction; according to teachers, the provider becomes involved in deeper analysis of language creating more involvement and learning; "the provider of correction needs to analyze the error, understand it and explain, which leads to deeper processing," one of the teachers noted. This was also pointed out by Martin and Sippel (2021); the providers of peer correction believed that provision of peer correction led to their own linguistic development. Lundstrom and Baker (2009) also concluded that learners benefited more from providing peer CF than from receiving it.

Nevertheless, some teacher interviewees (*no*=11) contended that, within emotionally supportive learning environments, peer correction may yield learning outcomes that are equally or more effective than teacher feedback. These respondents argued that because learners share a similar proficiency level and because "a peer, rather than an authority figure such as a teacher, is indicating the error," students

may better comprehend the corrective intent of the feedback. In contrast, during teacher-led correction, learners might not fully discern the nature of their mistake or even recognize that a correction has been offered. This perspective implies that learner uptake following peer correction could be higher than after teacher feedback, a hypothesis that lends itself to empirical investigation through comparative studies of uptake rates or learning outcomes following feedback provided by peers and teachers.

4.1.1.1. Teachers' Concerns Regarding Limitations of Peer CF

The teachers acknowledged that not all learners are capable of providing appropriate peer CF. This limitation, as it will be discussed, was not just related to learners' linguistic ability although it was also a key factor. In fact, the major limitation constraining the effectiveness of peer CF was learners' proficiency level. They did not recommend practicing peer correction in all proficiency groups. The teachers believed learners in lower proficiency groups may not be equipped with the knowledge required for correcting their classmates. One of the teachers stated: "The correction by advanced learners is more accurate, reliable and linguistically precise. This gives the peer CF provider a sense of self-confidence, which even makes other learners trust his/her feedback more. I mean, when others know that this person has higher linguistic abilities, they accept his/her correction more easily and trust it more." But at lower levels, learners normally wait for the teacher to confirm the accuracy of the classmates' corrections. Another limitation mentioned by teachers about the ability to provide peer CF was related to other considerations such as emotional ones; some teachers believed learners usually do not know how to provide emotionally appropriate correction and their feedback is likely to be perceived as sarcasm or even mockery. One of the teachers commented, "Students look at their classmates' correction with suspicion and usually do not welcome it because they think the person did not really intend to help but to show off or say that I know better than you do."

4.1.2. Learners' perception of peer CF effectiveness

Learners, on the other hand, were divided in their views about the effectiveness of their classmates' comments on their linguistic performance. The majority believed peer comments are beneficial. As one of the learners stated, "We are here to learn and whoever helps me to learn something new, I will appreciate it." Another learner noted: "Sometimes I say something and my friend corrects me and I thank

him." Even some of the learners who said they did not have a good feeling about being corrected by their friends believed their classmates' corrections are normally to-the-point and accurate.

Another group of learners, however, maintained that classmates' corrections are absolutely helpful but may not be as reliable and beneficial as teacher-provided feedback. They wanted their teachers to have the final word on their errors. "Sometimes my classmates are wrong about my mistake but insist that they are right; I do not accept it," one of the learners commented. Another learner pointed out that peers "may be able to correct my error, but they do not explain why my sentence was wrong." A study by Sadoughi and Hejazi (2023) further substantiates the importance of perceived teacher support for student achievement. This finding indicates that students may not fully trust the validity of peer feedback, underscoring the need for teachers to maintain a supportive and supervisory role.

A large number of the student interviewees expected to understand the source of their error and the grammatical rule related to their committed error and why their utterance was wrong; a female adult learner commented: "When I make an error, I want to understand why it was wrong and I need to receive clear explanations on my error for me to understand what exactly was wrong about my utterance. This might be particularly so at lower proficiency groups. As discovered by XU and Fan (2021), proficiency level shapes both the amount and function of L1 use in peer interactions; While low-proficiency learners, constrained by limited grammatical knowledge, used their L1 almost exclusively for vocabulary searches, their high-proficiency counterparts engaged in deeper discussions about language forms (metacognitive and grammar talk), leading to more substantial L1 use for analytical purposes. Ultimately, this pattern reflects a fundamental gap in the metalinguistic resources available for learners at different proficiency levels to utilize during collaborative tasks. This was one of the reasons why learners preferred teacher over peer feedback. Studies confirm a strong learner preference for input-providing corrective feedback including metalinguistic feedback (Katayama, 2007; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2014; Sepehrinia et al., 2018; Ye & Hu, 2025). Even learners favoring self-correction desired teacher hints to facilitate it (Katayama, 2007), and others expected extended explanations to fully understand their errors (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2014) using metalinguistic explanations, which clarify the reasons for the learners' utterance being wrong helping learners to more deeply understand their error. The learners also stated that they are better able to understand and correct their errors following teacher rather than peer CF; "the teacher has higher knowledge and I know that I can correct my error after he refers to it," one of the learners commented. According to Kaivanpanah et al. (2015), learners' doubtful attitude to the

effectiveness of peer correction along with concerns about negative emotional reactions may explain why teachers tend to be less receptive to peer CF than their students are.

4.1.2.1. The Role of Proficiency Level and Peer Status

The role of proficiency level was also noted by some learners; the learners' concern was different, though. They felt downgraded by being corrected by a classmate who they believed is less proficient than them; one of the learners commented: "if the person correcting me is lower than me in proficiency, I do not like it and do not take it seriously." "When someone who is weaker than me corrects me, I feel bad. I do not think she is right about my mistake," another learner commented. This concern was not related to the quality of feedback provided by less proficient classmates, as implied by a comment from an adult learner: "when I am talking and someone tells me that I have made a mistake, I do not accept their feedback if I know that the person does not have the required competence to comment on my speaking even if I am sure that they are right about my mistake." This finding is supported by the findings of a study by Aben et al. (2023), which confirms preconceived notions about a peer's language skills affect how their performance is judged. In their study, participants assigned different scores to identical pieces of writing based on whether they were led to believe the author had high or low proficiency, consistently awarding higher grades to those they perceived as more capable.

Table 1. Teachers' versus learners' views about peer CF

Themes	**Subthemes**	
Effectiveness of peer CF	Teachers	Peer CF can be effective in producing learning, but in advanced levels; It may be even more understandable to learners as they are almost at the same level; If there is a friendly relationship between learners, it is more recommendable; Not all learners can provide reliable and appropriate CF.
	Learners	Peer CF can be as beneficial as teacher-provided feedback; Peer CF is helpful but may not be as reliable; Peers cannot explain why an utterance was wrong; Learners said they are better able to understand and correct their errors following teacher rather than peer CF;

		They did not like being corrected by a classmate perceived to be weaker than them.
Quality and trust in peer CF	Teachers	Teachers believed learners do not trust feedback from peers; Learners do not consider it as valid and ask for teachers' confirmation; Not all learners can provide peer CF; Proficiency level is a determining factor and lower-proficiency groups cannot provide accurate corrections; Peer CF is not normally provided in an emotionally appropriate way.
	Learners	Learners trusted peer CF but not as much as teacher CF; If they know the person providing correction intends to help rather than to show off his linguistic abilities, they are more likely to trust it; Peer corrections are usually accurate although some may provide inaccurate corrections; They may be able to correct the error, but are unable to provide clear explanations; Peer CF is not as qualified as teacher CF; Teachers know better where, when and how to correct.
Emotional reactions caused by peer CF	Teachers	Most of the learners react negatively to peer correction; Classroom atmosphere is determining; The number of students and the relationship between them is important; They become anxious and embarrassed and reserved by peer correction; Their willingness to contribute to classroom discussions decreases;
	Learners	Embarrassment and anxiety were mentioned as dominant feelings caused by peer correction; Most learners said they were comfortable with peer correction; School students had more adverse feelings toward correction by peers; The way correction is provided is more important than who provides it; The tone of correction is important; Correction needs to be perceived with good intentions.

4.2 Quality and trust in peer CF

Irrespective of their proficiency level, a substantial proportion of the teacher interviewees (*no*=27) believed that teacher-provided feedback is more trustable to learners than peer CF, attributing this

advantage to instructors' superior linguistic knowledge although some noted that peer CF may be more understandable given their comparable language proficiency. As one participant noted, "I think teacher feedback is absolutely more effective particularly because learners consider their teacher as more proficient, knowledgeable and capable." Another teacher pointed out that "Based on my personal experience, I should say about 90% of the time, when a learner is corrected by a classmate, they ask the teacher to say whether the classmate was right or wrong!" Consequently, learners were perceived to place greater trust in teacher feedback than in peer feedback.

An important theme emerging from the interviews related to learner expectations. Teachers reported that students often look to them to validate peer corrections. In other words, not only did some teachers question the efficacy of peer feedback relative to their own, but they also believed that learners themselves regard peer comments as insufficiently reliable. Consequently, the teacher, as the more authoritative knowledge source, is expected to monitor and confirm the accuracy of peer feedback. One instructor stated, "Most of the time, my students glance at me, awaiting a confirming nod in response to a classmate's correction." This tendency is corroborated by Sadoughi and Hejazi's (2023) findings concerning the role of perceived teacher support in academic achievement, suggesting that learners do not fully trust the validity of peer feedback. Thus, teachers are perceived to fulfill a crucial supportive and supervisory function in peer-correction contexts. Such learner skepticism, alongside concerns about potential negative emotional reactions, may explain why teachers are generally less receptive to peer feedback than their students are, a pattern also noted in the study by Sepehrinia and Mahdizadeh (2016).

Finally, teachers noted that teacher-led correction typically occurs in front of the entire class, a situation that may induce anxiety and inhibit willingness to speak. In contrast, peer correction often takes place within smaller cooperative learning groups, potentially reducing such affective barriers. The detrimental role of anxiety in learners' ability to notice and benefit from corrective feedback has been well documented in quasi-experimental studies (e.g., Luquin & Roothooft, 2019; Rassaei, 2013; Sheen, 2008). This effect is particularly pronounced during oral activities, given that anxiety levels tend to be elevated during second-language speaking tasks (Bodnar et al., 2017, p. 4).

Overall, both teachers and learners expressed significant reservations about the reliability, depth, and pedagogical effectiveness of peer CF. While learners are more optimistic about basic accuracy, a shared consensus emerges that peer CF is inherently less qualified, less explanatory, and less

professionally delivered than teacher CF. This creates a fundamental trust deficit that undermines its perceived value.

Teachers, from their pedagogical vantage point, focus on the systemic limitations of peers as sources of feedback, questioning their capability and the very legitimacy of their corrections. According to them, not all learners can provide peer CF, identifying proficiency level as a determining factor. Their concern is that in lower-proficiency groups, learners may lack the necessary linguistic knowledge to provide accurate corrections. For teachers, this is a fundamental logistical and pedagogical hurdle.

A critical issue is that some learners also do not consider peer CF as valid. Most learners, however, believed learners' corrections are accurate and to-the-point. Nevertheless, they viewed teachers as the authority, not trusting peers' comments as much as teachers'. This suggests that even if a correction is accurate, it may be questioned or ignored because it lacks the institutional authority of the teacher, which undermines the entire purpose of the activity.

Beyond mere accuracy, teachers highlight a deficit in delivery: Peer CF is not normally provided in an emotionally appropriate way. Peers lack the teacher's training in delivering feedback sensitively. Corrections may be blunt, mocking, or delivered in a way that causes embarrassment, focusing more on "catching a mistake" than on supportive collaboration. This ties directly to the emotional reactions theme, where poor delivery triggers negative emotions such as anxiety and embarrassment.

Learners offer a slightly more positive view on basic accuracy, stating that peer corrections are usually accurate. This suggests they trust their peers' competence on common, rule-based errors. However, they immediately qualify this with the recognition that some may provide inaccurate corrections. This creates an uncertainty burden for the receiver, who must mentally verify every piece of peer feedback, unlike the assumed reliability of teacher feedback. This is a crucial distinction made by learners: They may be able to correct the error, but are unable to provide clear explanations. A peer can often identify that something is wrong or even supply the right form, but typically cannot articulate the rule or reason behind it (e.g., explaining the subjunctive mood). This limits peer CF to surface-level error fixing rather than deep learning, which requires understanding to prevent recurrence.

Peer CF is not as qualified as teacher CF. They justify this by attributing meta-cognitive and pedagogical expertise to the teacher: Teachers know better where, when and how to correct. Teachers can choose the best technique (recasting, elicitation, explicit correction) and deliver it with the right tone

to facilitate learning without causing discouragement. The interesting finding concerning learners' views about teacher and peer CF was that school students reported more negative feelings as the result of correction by both teachers and learners. It seems that the corrective techniques used by school teachers are different from those in language institutes given the larger number of students especially teenagers in school contexts, which makes correction emotionally very sensitive.

4.3. Emotional reactions caused by peer CF

Teachers reported a predominantly negative emotional climate surrounding peer CF. They believe that most learners react negatively when corrected by a peer. The primary emotions mentioned by teachers are anxiety and embarrassment. This suggests that, according to the teachers, the social threat of being seen as 'wrong' in front of equals often outweighs the academic benefit of the correction. This leads learners to become reserved, withdrawing from participation to avoid potential public scrutiny. Learners may adopt a risk-averse strategy, speaking less or only when certain of being correct, which severely limits opportunities for authentic language practice. As noted by one of the teachers, "what is important is not, in fact, the feelings in themselves, but the consequence of those potential feelings; fear of embarrassment and anxiety leads learners to prefer the safety of silence over the threat of being judged by others." Teachers emphasized the mediating role of two key factors including the classroom atmosphere and class size and peer relationships. According to them, in a supportive, collaborative environment where mistakes are framed as learning opportunities, peer CF is better received. In a competitive or high-pressure atmosphere, it becomes a source of shame. In smaller classes where relationships are strong, peer correction feels more like help from a friend. In large classes or where rapport is weak, it can feel like exposure to strangers. This is in fact, supported by the results of the present study; the learner participants in schools had a higher rate of reporting negative emotions by correction not only from classmates but also from their teachers.

Learners validated teachers' concern about creation of embarrassment and anxiety by peer correction although it was mentioned by a small number of learners. The key insight is that this is often linked to face and social status within the peer group. For school students, whose social identities are intensely tied to their peer group, these adverse feelings are more pronounced. The point is that fear of social judgment from classmates can be more potent than that from a teacher, who is an authority figure expected to evaluate and judge.

Most learners, though, said they were comfortable with peer correction. The most critical finding from the learners' perspective, in fact, was that they said the way correction is provided is more important than who provides it. They stated that a correction delivered kindly, privately, and clearly by a peer is far more acceptable than a correction that is harsh, public, or ambiguous even if the latter comes from the teacher. The most frequently mentioned factor in relation to how correction is provided was related to the tone of correction, which they believed should be supportive, not mocking. In not provided in an emotionally appropriate way, the correction may prove counterproductive; some learners asserted that even if their classmates may be right about their mistake, they will tune it out if not provided with good intentions. Learners are also likely to develop negative emotions in an emotionally threatening atmosphere. Studies (e.g., Sheen, 2008; Rassaei, 2013; Luquin & Roothooft, 2019) attest to the role of learner anxiety as a key variable in the noticing of corrections. This effect is particularly salient in oral practice, a context in which language anxiety is often elevated (Bodnar et al., 2017).

Generally, the findings suggest that although peer correction can be more face-threatening than teacher CF if the conditions in which it is provided is not suitable, learners' concerns about the emotional consequences are not as serious as assumed by teachers. Although some learners were concerned and doubtful about their peers' good intentions in correction, their most predominant issue was related to the quality of the provided corrections. There are many factors to consider, according to the teachers, including learners' age, proficiency level, context (school versus institute) with teenagers, low-proficiency learners, and school students being more vulnerable to its social-emotional risks. The teacher-created atmosphere and the existing peer relationships form the crucial backdrop. Nevertheless, emotional concerns should not blind teachers to the cognitive advantages associated with peer error correction mentioned in the literature (see Sato & Lyster, 2012; Sipple & Jackson, 2015), some of which were also mentioned by the teachers. Peer interaction and correction can help learners to develop their fluency and linguistic abilities by providing the opportunity for them to practice and proceduralize their explicit linguistic knowledge (Lyster et al., 2013).

5. Conclusion

The present study illuminated the perceptions held by both teachers and learners regarding the implementation and effectiveness of peer CF in language classrooms. The findings revealed a tension

that needs to be resolved; while both teachers and learners acknowledged the potential benefits of peer CF including fostering collaboration, deepening the provider's own linguistic analysis, and increasing the learning opportunities, these advantages seemed to be overshadowed by significant concerns about its quality, legitimacy, and emotional impact.

A central finding is the pervasive limited trust in the efficacy of peer CF. Learners, while often finding peer corrections accurate, consistently privileged the teacher's authority, seeking validation and, crucially, the metalinguistic explanations that peers typically cannot provide. This skepticism is mirrored by teachers, who question the linguistic capability of learners, especially at lower proficiency levels, to deliver reliable feedback. The data further show that perceptions are heavily filtered through social and emotional lenses. The risk of embarrassment and anxiety, particularly among school-aged learners, is a major barrier, with the classroom social climate and the manner of correction being more critical than the corrector's identity. Importantly, while teachers often anticipated more severe emotional repercussions than learners reported, the potential for peer CF to be perceived as mockery remains a genuine threat that can undermine participation.

The findings suggest that peer CF is not a straightforward substitute for teacher feedback but a complementary pedagogical tool with specific conditions for success. Its effectiveness is contingent upon a supportive classroom atmosphere, adequate learner proficiency, and explicit training in how to deliver feedback constructively. Without training and preparation, peer CF risks damaging confidence, silencing students, and undermining the very communication it seeks to improve. Sippel (2021) discovered that training the learners in how to provide peer CF following form-focused instruction can effectively help learners to develop higher competence compared to the time when no peer CF training is provided. Future studies should empirically compare learning outcomes from peer and teacher CF and investigate training protocols to help learners become both more competent and more sensitive providers of correction, thereby bridging the gap between its theoretical promise and its practical acceptance. Future studies can also use in-depth interviews to obtain a quantitative measure of the degree of favorability of peer CF to the learners from different groups including gender, age and proficiency groups.

References

Adams, R. (2007). Do second language learners benefit from interacting with each other? In R. Mackey (Ed.), Conversational interaction in second language acquisition (pp. 29–51). Oxford University Press.

Atai, M. R. & Shafiee, Z. (2017). Pedagogical knowledge base underlying EFL teachers' provision of oral corrective feedback in grammar instruction. *Teacher Development*, 1 –17. DOI: 10.1080/13664530.2016.1277257

Sepehrinia, S. & Mahdizadeh, M. (2016). Oral corrective feedback: teachers' concerns and researchers' orientation. The Language Learning Journal, 1-18. DOI: 10.1080/09571736.2016.1172328

Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & Sepehrinia, S. (2015). Preferences for interactional feedback: Differences between learners and teachers. The Language Learning Journal, 43(1), 74-93. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2015.1012060

Bodnar, S., Cucchiarini, C., Penning de Vries, B., Strik, H., & van Hout, R. (2017). Learner affect in computerised L2 oral grammar practice with corrective feedback. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 30(3-4), 223-246.

Bruton, A., & Samuda, V. (1980). Learner and teacher roles in the treatment of oral error in group work. *RELC Journal, 11*, 49–63.

Cheng, X., & Zhang, L. J. (2024). Engaging secondary school students with peer feedback in L2 writing classrooms: A mixed-methods study. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 81, Article 101337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101337

Katayama, A. (2007). Japanese EFL students‟ preferences toward correction of classroom oral errors. Asian EFL journal, 9(4), 289-305.

Kitzinger, J. (1995). Qualitative research: Introducing focus groups. BMJ, 311(7000), 299–302. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.311.7000.299

Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Error correction: Students' versus teachers' perceptions. Language Awareness, 14(2 3), 112 127.

Lee, E. J. E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System, 41(2),* 217–230.

Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 18(1), 30–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.01.002

Luquin, M., & Roothooft, H. (2019). The effects of oral corrective feedback and language anxiety on pronunciation development. Elia, 19(19), 41-70.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., and Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. Language Teaching, 46(1), 1-40.

Martin, I. A., & Sippel, L. (2021). Providing vs. receiving peer feedback: Learners' beliefs and experiences. Language Teaching Research, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211024365

Philp, J., Adams, R., & Iwashita, N. (2013). Peer interaction and second language learning (1st ed.). Routledge.

Rassaei, E. (2013). Corrective feedback, learners' perceptions, and second language development. System, 41(2), 472-483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.05.002

Sadoughi, M., & Hejazi, S. Y. (2023). Teacher support, growth language mindset, and academic engagement: The mediating role of L2 grit. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 77, Article 101250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2023.101250

Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals, 29(3),* 343–364.

Sepehrinia, S. & Arab Mofrad, A. (2023). Peer Corrective Feedback: Research Implications and Teachers' Complications. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 26(2),* 1-27.

Sheen, Y. (2008). Recasts, language anxiety, modified output, and L2 learning. Language Learning, 58(4), 835-874. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00480.x

Shirkhani, S., & Tajeddin, Z. (2016). L2 teachers' explicit and implicit corrective feedback and its linguistic focus. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19(1),* 181-206.

Sippel, L. (2024). Maximizing the benefits of peer interaction: Form-focused instruction and peer feedback training. *Language Teaching Research* 1–27. Doi: 10.1177/13621688211004638

Sippel, L., & Jackson, C. N. (2015). Teacher vs. peer oral corrective feedback in the German language classroom. Foreign Language Annals, 48(4), 688–705. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12147

Soruç, A., Yüksel, D., McKinley, J., & Grimshaw, T. (2024). Factors influencing EFL teachers' provision of oral corrective feedback: The role of teaching experience. The Language Learning Journal. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2024.2338346

Toth, P. D. (2008). Teacher- and learner-led discourse in task-based grammar instruction: Providing procedural assistance for L2 morphosyntactic development. Language Learning, 58(2), 237-283. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00441.x

Wang, H., Patterson, M. M., & Peng, A. (2024). Predictors of second language willingness to communicate among US undergraduate students: Classroom social climate, emotions, and language mindset. Language Teaching Research, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688241237214

Xu, J., & Fan, Y. (2021). Task complexity, L2 proficiency, and EFL learners' L1 use in task-based peer interaction. Language Teaching Research, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211004633

Ye, X. & Hu, G. (2024). Student and teacher beliefs about oral corrective feedback in junior secondary English classrooms. IRAL, 63(2), 1477–1505.

Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Understanding the role of learners with low English language proficiency in peer feedback of second language writing. TESOL Quarterly, 50(2), 483–494. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.291

Yüksel, D., Soruç, A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in university EFL classes. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 21, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12336

Zaccaron, R., & Xhafaj, D. C. P. (2020). Knowing me, knowing you: A comparative study on the effects of anonymous and conference peer feedback on the writing of learners of English as an additional language. System, 95, Article 102367. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102367

Appendix A

Teachers' interview questions

1) Do you allow your students to correct each other's errors? Why?

2) Which one are they more comfortable with, teacher or peer feedback?

3) Does peer feedback produce effective learning?

4) Do you think learners' proficiency level is effective in the quality of feedback they provide to each other?

5) What other factors do you take into account in allowing for peer error correction?

6) Which one do you think is more effective, teacher or peer feedback?

7) Who do learners expect to provide the correction, teachers or peers?

8) Have you ever asked your learners whether they like to be corrected by their peers?

Appendix B

Learners' interview questions

Do you like your classmates to correct your errors in class? Why?

How do you feel when your classmates correct your errors? Have you ever felt bad about a classmate's correction? What happened?

Which one are you more comfortable with, teacher or peer feedback?

Do you believe your classmates' corrections are accurate? Are they capable of identifying errors correctly?

Do you notice your error when your classmates correct them?

Which one do you think is more effective, teacher or peer feedback?

Which form of correction do you prefer—correction by the teacher or by peers? Why? In what respects?