

Citation

Jitka Vseteckova, Marianne Markowski, Denise Miller, Charlotte Stoner, Lorraine Smith, Nataliya Rumyantseva, John Miles, Agnes Leu, Fabian Berger, Kerry Jones, Chris Kubiak. The uses of peer learning with older adults in formal, non-formal and informal learning activities. PROSPERO 2022 CRD42022307145 Available from: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/display_record.php?ID=CRD42022307145

Review question

RQ: What are the reported forms of peer learning for older adults?

Sub_RQ 1: In what way do these forms of learning take place and how do older adults engage with it?

Sub_RQ 2: What are the benefits of these forms of learning for older adults and for the wider society?

Sub-RQ 3: What are the barriers and facilitators for peer learning in the context of older adults?

Searches

Search Strategy

The search will include quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods studies as well as literature reviews. There will be no restrictions on study design or date. Language will be limited to English, French, Czech, German, Russian and Ukrainian. The search strategy will be created by an expert in systematic review searching, in collaboration with the authors. It may include specific MESH terms. Once this strategy is finalised, it will be adapted to the syntax and subject headings of the other databases.

Databases

The following suggested electronic databases will be searched:

1. PsycINFO (via EBSCO)
2. CINAHL (via EBSCO)
3. MEDLINE (via EBSCO)
4. Education Research Complete
5. ERIC (Education Resources Information Center)
6. Education research complete
7. ASSIA: Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts
8. Web of Science
9. Scopus

Additionally, grey literature will be searched in OpenGrey, Google and Google Scholar. A search strategy will be developed to identify grey literature using the most relevant terms in exploratory and database searches. In addition, reference lists of all relevant studies, reviews and reports will be searched.

Types of study to be included [1 change]

Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods peer-reviewed studies. Grey literature including third sector and government reports and briefings, educational theses, and conference proceedings.

Inclusion criteria

- Relate to older adults in formal, informal or non-formal learning activities
- Describe a form of peer learning activity and explicitly labels it as such
- Relate to the experience of the learner and describe its outcomes
- Are published in English, French, Czech, German, Russian and Ukrainian
- From 1978 to present

Exclusion criteria

- Do not relate a majority of older learners
- Do not include the word “peer” in the activity
- Do not consider itself as a peer-learning activity (e.g. group meditation, church sermon)
- The learning activity was a single and situational event which does not allow transferability
- book chapters
- Are published languages other than English, French, Czech, German, Russian and Ukrainian
- Published before 1977

Condition or domain being studied

This review aims to systematically review the uses of peer learning activities in different settings and formats, which are accessed by older adults. It further aims to capture feedback on the learning experience as it is perceived by the older person.

Peer learning is a key approach in offering and promoting learning and engagement with older adults from diverse backgrounds and different socio-economical contexts. Peer learning can be defined as occurring among peers from similar social groupings, who are not professional teachers, helping each other to learn and in doing so, learning themselves (Topping & Ehly, 1998). The established benefits of peer learning include peer support and feedback, reducing stress and anxiety, increases in confidence and peers can be role models (Markowski et al., 2021; Secomb, 2008; Topping, 2005). There are however some challenges with peer learning. These are centred around peer learners’ personalities and potentially having different knowledge levels, which can cause misunderstandings or difficulties in collaborating (Secomb, 2008). In peer learning there is the possibility that interactions could be perceived as competitive or intimidating events (McPake, 2019; Secomb, 2008) and therefore contribute to self-segregating and socially-divisive ‘learning initiatives’.

Participants/population

Populations studied include:

- i) older adults who may have some form of health impairments (including co-morbidity), but not in a way that it would stop them from learning
- ii) older adults who take part in either formal, non-formal or informal learning activities which include an

element of labelled 'peer learning'

iii) Older adults defined as over the age of 65 years. Although literature found may vary with the age starting point, we will consider literature where it addresses older adults not in employment anymore.

iv) There are no restrictions as to the location of older learners.

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

The forms of peer learning orchestrated in formal, non-formal and informal learning activities and how these contribute to the learners' experience.

Comparator(s)/control

Not applicable

Context

Main outcome(s) [1 change]

The main outcomes of interest are in the forms of the orchestrated peer activities in formal, non-formal and informal learning activities and how these contribute to the learners' experience. It is expected that outcomes will be diverse and context-specific, therefore it is not possible to produce an exhaustive list at the outset. However, we do expect to find peer activities in formal, non-formal and informal learning activities to be centred around:

- Peer learning in form of peer teaching or peer tutoring (e.g. language learning)
- Peer learning in form of peer assisted learning, which may use some form of help such as checklists, or structured activities (e.g. health support when managing dementia or diabetes)
- Peer learning in form of peer coaching (e.g. physical activities)
- Learning through peer support and interaction (e.g. carers support)
- Learning through peer mentoring, championing (e.g. gaining IT skills)

We are also keen to assess throughout the self-reported health and well-being outcomes associated with peer learning - we would be looking for an indication on how participating in peer learning/mentoring/support contributes to their overall physical /mental health and well-being.

Additional outcome(s) [1 change]

'Informal learning is defined as learning resulting from daily life activities related to family, work or leisure as such it contributes to both physical and mental health and well-being'. We are therefore interested in what the literature reports in relation to: What are the reported forms of peer learning activities for older adults, how are these different activities received, delivered and whether we can find any self-reported health and well-being outcomes associated with peer learning'.

Secondary outcomes relate to the barriers to implementing the peer learning activities and the view and perceptions of the educators.

Data extraction (selection and coding) [1 change]

We plan to extract data on the sample, phenomenon of interest, design, evaluation, and research type. In addition, the extraction sheet will include authors, year of study/report, geographical location, aim/purpose of the study, type of paper (e.g. journal article, annual evaluation report, etc), type of learning activity (formal, non-formal, informal), type of peer activity, reported experiences by older adults, and key findings that relate to the systematic review question. Two reviewers will independently extract data using a structured data extraction form. Disagreements between review authors will be resolved by discussion or a third author.

Two reviewers will extract data from each included study and insert this into the Excel spreadsheet. Disagreements between the reviewers will be resolved by discussion, or by a third reviewer. Study authors will be contacted to resolve any uncertainties.

Risk of bias (quality) assessment

Two reviewers will independently assess the risk of bias using the Cochrane risk of bias tool (Higgins et al., 2011; The Cochrane Collaboration, 2021), which includes the following domains: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of outcome assessors, completeness of outcome data, and selective outcome reporting. Studies will be judged at high risk of bias if there was a high risk of bias for one or more key domains and at unclear risk of bias if they had an unclear risk of bias for at least 2 domains. Authors of papers will be contacted if information is missing.

Strategy for data synthesis

Findings from included studies will be synthesized narratively. The 'Guidance on the Conduct of Narrative Synthesis in Systematic Reviews' will be used to advise the narrative synthesis (Mays et al., 2005; Popay et al., 2006). First, a preliminary synthesis will be conducted to develop an initial description of the findings of included records and to organize them so that patterns across records can be identified. In a second step, thematic analysis will be used to analyse the findings. The following five steps of thematic analysis will be followed adopting a recursive process (Braun & Clarke, 2006):

- a) Familiarization with the extracted data
- b) Generation of initial codes
- c) Searching for themes
- d) Reviewing themes
- e) Defining and naming themes

Depending on the findings available, the reviewers will aim to provide a representation diagram or table mapping the types of learning activities matched with the type of peer learning activity and with an indication of the benefits (or disadvantages) of this approach to the learners' experience. The information presented in this review may be considered, in the future, by education providers, employers, Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and funding bodies when planning future learning activities involving older adults.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets

Not applicable

Contact details for further information

Jitka Vseteckova
jitka.vseteckova@open.ac.uk

Organisational affiliation of the review

The Open university

Review team members and their organisational affiliations

Dr Jitka Vseteckova. The Open university
Dr Marianne Markowski. University of Greenwich
Dr Denise Miller. University of Greenwich
Dr Charlotte Stoner. University of Greenwich
Dr Lorraine Smith. University of Greenwich
Dr Nataliya Rummyantseva. University of Greenwich
Dr John Miles.
Dr Agnes Leu. Careum Hochschule Gesundheit
Dr Fabian Berger. Careum Hochschule Gesundheit
Dr Kerry Jones. Open University
Dr Chris Kubiak. Open University

Type and method of review

Narrative synthesis, Systematic review

Anticipated or actual start date

01 February 2022

Anticipated completion date

01 April 2023

Funding sources/sponsors

None

Conflicts of interest

Language

English

Country

England

Stage of review

Review Ongoing

Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

Subject index terms

Aged; Anxiety; Education, Feedback; Humans; Personality

Date of registration in PROSPERO

28 January 2022

Date of first submission

26 January 2022

Stage of review at time of this submission

The review has not started

Stage	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	No	No
Piloting of the study selection process	No	No
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	No	No
Data extraction	No	No
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	No	No
Data analysis	No	No

The record owner confirms that the information they have supplied for this submission is accurate and complete and they understand that deliberate provision of inaccurate information or omission of data may be construed as scientific misconduct.

The record owner confirms that they will update the status of the review when it is completed and will add publication details in due course.

Versions
28 January 2022

