Individual findings of the meta-analysis at a glance

According to Double et al. (2020). The impact of peer assessment on academic performance: A meta-analysis of control group studies

Moderator variable	Moderator levels	Effect size g	Number of studies (k)
Publication type (n.s.)	Dissertation	0.21	8
	Journal	0.31*	43
	Conference/Report	0.82	2
Education level (n.s.)	Primary	0.41*	11
	Secondary	0.44*	13
	Tertiary	0.21*	29
Subject area (n.s.)	Writing	0.30*	22
	Other	0.31*	32
Comparison group (n.s.)	Teacher Assessment	0.27*	31
	No Assessment	0.31*	23
	Self-Assessment	0.23	10
Form of Assessment: Written (n.s.)	Yes	0.35*	36
	No	0.20*	20
Form of Assessment: Dialog (n.s.)	Yes	0.21*	19
	No	0.35*	36
Assessment with Grading (n.s.)	Yes	0.37*	37
	No	0.17	18
Freeform Assessment (n.s.)	Yes	0.42*	9
	No (pre-structured)	0.29*	45
Online (n.s.)	Yes	0.38*	22
	No	0.24*	33
Anonymous (n.s.)	Yes	0.27*	23
	No	0.25*	29
Frequency (n.s.)	Multiple	0.37*	34
	Single	0.20	21
Transfer from Peer Assessment Task to Academic Performance Measure (n.s.)	Far	0.20	18
	Near	0.42*	23
	None	0.29*	23
Allocation (n.s.)	Classroom	0.31*	41
	Individual	0.21	11

Notes:

sig = Overall, the moderator variable has a significant influence on the effect sizes found in the studies. How large or small the effect sizes are in the primary studies can therefore also be explained with the help of this moderator variable. (n.s.) = Overall, the moderator variable has no significant influence on the effect sizes found in the studies, even if the values of the moderator levels vary significantly in some cases. Based on the available data, this moderator variable cannot be used to explain whether primary studies show larger or smaller effect sizes.