



Peer-Assessment Impact on EFL Writing Skills

Andrea Abigail Robayo Nugra

Guide: María Rossana Ramírez Ávila

Modality: Research Report

Presented as Partial Fulfillment for the Degree of Magíster en Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros con Mención en la Enseñanza de Inglés. CES: RPC-SE-19-N°.140-2020. Cohort 2021 - 2022. Author's email: andrea.robayo@casagrande.edu.ec Guayaquil, October 14th, 2022.

Peer-assessment Impact on Writing Skills

Adult students are constantly looking for opportunities to improve their English language due to different purposes which might include professional, personal or leisure reasons. A group of eight students from a private binational language center in the city of Cuenca participated in a study where they were regularly attending an intensive language course. These students were coursing the fifth of the tenth levels offered by the institution, which placed them with a consolidated A2 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR; Council of Europe, 2018).

In EFL classes, one of the biggest challenges in students is to promote the production of the foreign language. Hence, teachers could tend to focus on providing activities and practice through the enhancement of production skills. During this study, in particular, students were not having enough exposure to writing skills. Partially, this was because the course textbook emphasized its content on spoken production of the language leaving written skills not entirely approached.

Students were not entirely familiar with the writing process; thus, when asked to do a written composition, they would submit it on their first try or without applying any sort of brainstorming or proofreading techniques. This later issue was evident in students' low grades when submitting written work. Even though some students performed fairly, their compositions would lack a clear topic sentence or supporting details. Because students were half way to reaching a graduation process from the language center, it was perceived as an appropriate approach trying to improve their writing skills.

Additionally, teachers are constantly looking for ways to promote social interactions while achieving academic performance. Certainly, the strike of the pandemic limited even more social interaction within virtual academic settings.

Students interacted differently and rather passively due to the nature of the virtual environment. Notwithstanding the use of breakout rooms, for independent and semi-controlled practice, the chances for discussion or interaction among students decreased. Out of the many possible ways to provoke both collaboration while aiming production is through peer-assessment. So, the implementation of peer-assessment to enhance writing was designed.

Literature Review

Peer-assessment tends to be associated with peer feedback, peer evaluation, or peer grading because of its relation with formative assessment (Double et al., 2019). As Topping (1998) expressed, to avoid confusion, peer-assessment could be seen as an umbrella term in which students, who share similar status, provide information of the success of activities carried out in a class. In this process, students or peers-assess a work and are being assessed about the same work simultaneously (Double et al., 2019). Within this technique, students might be requested to provide feedback, which is perceived as an essential part of peer-assessment. Wiggins (2012) defined feedback as “information about how we are doing in our efforts to reach a goal” (p. 11). It is fundamental to understand feedback as part of peer-assessment since students tend to inform their classmates of the progress they are making in a given task for an assignment.

Reinholz (2015) mentioned a potential advantage of peer-assessment because when students play the role of the assessor and are at the same time assessed, they can benefit from it more than by only being assessed. Research also shows that the involvement of the student in the process of assessment inevitably impacts his performance and potentially encourages autonomy and motivation (Brown and Hudson, 1998).

In addition, it is evident that research validates how the use of peer-assessment enhances not only academic development but metacognitive and social skills throughout the process (Dang, 2016; Espinoza, 2019; Loretto et al., 2016; Ndoye, 2017). For instance, some of the benefits of peer-assessment stated by students include collaboration, sense of responsibility, awareness of expectations, evaluative skills and positive learning environments (Ndoye, 2017). Regarding this latter benefit, Ndoye (2017) reported having students who highlighted the fact that closer relationships among classmates are forged; thus, promoting better collaboration because of the friendly environment that has been created.

When peer-assessment is applied to a production process of language learning, such as writing, the impact it produces tends to be positive as well. Dewi et al. (2019), found out that when peer assessment is used in academic writing, students develop a higher level of understanding as they deepen their knowledge of the content and structure of the composition. Also, the authors concluded that peer-assessment happens to be more detailed because the students' aim is to help the classmate. A literature review on web-enhanced peer feedback in ESL writing classrooms prepared by Elboshi (2021) concluded that peer-assessment impacts a student's motivation to interact both academically and socially with peers. This motivation might eventually lead students to enhance their writing skills with the potential outcome of publishing online without the fear of using their second language.

Among the limitations that peer-assessment might encompass, students' perceptions on their assessment performance seem to have a wide audience for research. Azarnoosh (2013) investigated students' prior and post perception on peer-assessment as well as how in lined teachers' and learners' assessments could be. On one hand, Azarnoosh's study found that students' perceptions tend to progressively change

towards a positive learning experience. Their initial attitude perceived this strategy as difficult and boring whilst, after having training, their perception moved towards a motivating and interesting strategy. This claim overcame the negative perception that students might not be able to play a “teacher’s role” when applying peer-assessment techniques. On the other hand, she found out that with the right training there is no significant difference among learners’ and teachers’ assessments. The results of peer-assessment and teacher evaluation showed coherence in the scoring system applied.

Elboshi (2021) suggested that teachers’ role is the key as students might argue they do not possess the necessary writing skills as they, too, are learning and struggling with writing production. Literature collected by the same author suggested that teachers ought to set realistic expectations about students’ writing at the moment of applying peer-assessment. It is the positive contribution to a classmate’s composition what should be considered and reinforced as a successful practice.

Another factor to consider when applying peer-assessment is students’ predisposition. In an Action Research study done by Vélez (2022), students’ feelings and attitudes were analyzed through field notes. The results concluded that students could experience anxiety while carrying out peer-assessment at first due to factors such as lack of vocabulary, organization or ideas. Nonetheless, it was found that with better instructions, guidance, and modeling students could lower their frustration and get more familiar with peer-assessment techniques.

Innovation

Throughout the course of nine sixty-minute hours divided in four weeks, students were exposed to an innovation to improve writing through peer-assessment strategies. These were aimed to be enhanced with the use of Google Docs in Google Classroom. The participants of the study belonged to the fifth of ten levels of an

intensive course which in total has fifty hours of English instruction during, approximately, six weeks per level. This innovation occurred while students were practicing all four skills in English with four different units of their textbook's content in a virtual environment. Since students attended classes from Monday to Thursday, usually the last day of classes was devoted to learning peer-assessment techniques as well as writing strategies.

During the first week, a mentor text was designed in order to model for students what was expected from their compositions. The text was analyzed as an aim for content discussion. Then, a guided activity took place in which students and the teacher together designed a composition while practicing a five-step writing process; this was later extended in a lecture. A checklist was introduced to first explain its objective and it was applied as a class for the mentor text. Later, students used it in pairs for the class composition. Students had the chance to share their thoughts about the checklist and its use. They were assigned their first composition and applied peer-assessment for the first time as well as received feedback and tips from the teacher.

Over the next two weeks, a four-step graphic organizer was designed based on Wiggins' (2012) seven keys to effective feedback paper. The class covered this material several times, at first explained by the teacher to later be exemplified or recalled by students from time to time. Also, time was devoted to providing effective and ineffective examples of comments a student can post when giving written feedback to a classmate; some anonymous examples were pulled from the students' comments on previous assignments. Students developed their second and third compositions throughout these weeks practicing the use of the checklist and leaving comments with written feedback. These practices were made in pairs through breakout rooms and then comments and thoughts were shared among them as a whole. The teacher would draw

students' attention when the checklist and comments did not match or had extra examples or general comments. In addition, essential questions were provided for students to reflect on their self and peer practice of assessment for writing, providing feedback and using the checklist. The use of Google Docs features was practiced and reinforced throughout the weeks, especially with suggesting mode and inserting comments.

Finally, in week four, students went over the previous written assignments and use of checklists. They reflected on their work with the use of essential questions; pair work took place to analyze the writing process and effective feedback graphic organizers. For a detailed description of the innovation process, see Appendix A. To see the checklist, see Appendix B.

Research Methodology

The research methodology applied for this study was Action Research. This is a methodology highly used in educational contexts with the purpose of providing teachers an opportunity to become an academic researcher to conduct a series of steps to provoke a change in their classrooms (Burns, 2009). Because the teacher started by identifying a problem to later act, observe and reflect, this study is seen with proactive lenses for action research (Rossi & Sein, 2021).

The intent of this study is that the implementation of peer-assessment techniques will enhance the ability of writing descriptive compositions of A2-level adult learners. Due to the social and academic advantages peer-assessment holds, and aiming to achieve and promote more written production, this research aims to explore the following questions:

“What is the impact of peer-assessment on writing skills among adult learners with an A2 level in an EFL class?”

“What are students’ perceptions about using peer-assessment after the innovation?”

To collect quantitative data, a pretest and a posttest were applied. Thus, to grade the tests, the teacher used an analytical rubric (see Appendix C), which was developed using the checklist students used throughout the innovation. Also, the posttest happened to be the participants’ final examination to finish their level at the language center. As Andrade (2000) defined, “rubrics make assessing student work quick and efficient and...are also teaching tools that support student learning” (p.13).

In addition, to collect qualitative data, a semi-structured interview (see Appendix D) was carried out. Creswell (2015) stated that in qualitative research, an interview is a tool a researcher could use for asking general open-ended questions, which could be recorded to be later analyzed and transcribed.

Participants

The participants involved in this action research belonged to a Binational Center, which is a private institution in the city of Cuenca that offers English language instruction to different audiences. There were eight adult participants in this study, three males and five females. Their ages ranged from eighteen to forty-two years old. They belonged to the fifth of ten levels of an intensive course as a total of fifty hours of English instruction during, approximately, six weeks per level. According to both placement tests carried out by the center, and previous levels approved by some participants, these students had achieved a consolidated A2 level as established by the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe, 2018).

Instruments

The instruments of this action research were designed according to the research questions. An analytic rubric was designed to assess the pre-posttest applied to students.

The pretest and posttest focused on elements for descriptive compositions in two different settings. While in the pretest, students described about a time when they could not do something, but eventually learned how to do it. The posttest requested students to provide a detailed description of their academic and professional experiences. The content design of this instrument was proof-read and approved by an expert on backward design in addition to the approval of the academic coordinator of the language center.

After having investigated over seventy-five studies on scoring rubrics, Jonsson and Svingby (2007) concluded that “the reliable scoring of performance assessments can be enhanced by the use of rubrics. In relation to reliability issues, rubrics should be analytic...” (p. 141). The use of the analytical rubric for this action research focused on four criteria or theoretical constructs as follows: content, organization, grammar and vocabulary. According to the aforementioned authors, “...in analytic scoring, the rater assigns a score to each of the dimensions being assessed in the task” (p.131). Hence, all four constructs were described with five different level and scoring scales from 0.5 to 2.5 portraying a range from below basic performance to advance. To assure construct validity, the criteria and its performance standards were revised by an expert assessment professor by Universidad Casa Grande.

Moreover, to answer question number 2) What are students’ perceptions about using peer-assessment after the innovation? A semi-structured interview was designed with the goal of asking students about their feelings and perceptions on peer-assessment and its application on writing. Six questions were designed that inquired about challenges and benefits of peer-assessment.

The reliability of both pre-posttest and semi-structured interview lies on the fact that both instruments are eligible for replication in a context where peer-assessment and writing are the variables of a study.

Data Analysis

To answer the first research question both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze data. The descriptive statistics of pretest and posttest grades include: minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation. In addition, the four constructs described in the rubric fall under the continuous variable. Content, organization, grammar and vocabulary are ratio data with five levels. Hence, to measure the impact of peer-assessment on writing grades a paired-sample *t*-test was run to obtain the inferential statistics. The paired-sample *t*-test allowed for a comparison of pretest and posttest scores of the eight participants. This analysis was done in a Google Sheets spreadsheet using a formula. Moreover, to explore students' perceptions on the innovation, their interview answers were transcribed and classified into three categories, which include challenges, benefits and improvements.

Ethical Considerations

As Govil (2013) expressed, educational research might tend to lose its credibility because of malpractice, issues such as plagiarism, or neglected areas subject to research. That is why, it is paramount to analyze ethics involved in research so that "every researcher may realize that he is involved not only in research activity rather in a process of modifying the system of education" (p.17). Similarly, Creswell (2015) encouraged researchers to anticipate ethical considerations and provide emphasis on sections of data collection and results disclosure. Additionally, ethical considerations are to be made with participants. Govil (2013) noted that participants are entitled four

rights: “(a) right to maintain privacy (b) guaranteed anonymity (c) guaranteed confidentiality and (d) avoiding harm, betrayal or deception” (p. 18).

This report anticipated ethical considerations by informing participants of the goals of the innovation both orally and in writing. The researcher sent a survey through Google forms (see Appendix E) to request their consent for participation as well as to collect virtual authorization for publishing results in anonymity.

Academic honesty is a matter of concern when it comes to carrying out research. Creswell (2015) stated that neither collected data should be altered with the purpose of matching a desirable outcome nor findings should remain unpublished, rather openly shared. This particular report finds it crucial to be transparent and honest; for this reason, all procedures are found in appendices.

Results

The results of the first research question: What is the impact of peer-assessment in writing among adult learners with an A2 level in an EFL class? are the following:

Table 1

Pretest and Posttests Descriptive and Inferential Statistics

	N	Min	Max	M	SD	<i>p</i> value
Pretest	8	6.5	9.5	8.1875	0.96	0.18
Posttest	8	6	10	8.5625	1.43	0.18

Note: N=sample Min=minimum Max=maximum M=mean SD=standard deviation

Table 1 shows the comparison between pretest and posttests with descriptive statistics where it is possible to observe that posttests benefited from an overall increase in terms of mean of 0.37 points. Additionally, inferential statistics through a paired-sample *t*-test identified a restricted statistical difference between pretest and posttest scores ($p = 0.18$). Even though mostly a p value < 0.05 is considered to be highly

statistically significant, this p value < 0.1 shows a weak or approaching significance; the small sample size plays a key part in light of this result. Hence, the test indicated support of the alternative hypothesis between dependent groups. The standard deviation indicates that pretest scores were closer to their mean in relation to the posttest scores.

Table 2

Descriptive and Inferential Statistics per construct

Construct	N	Pretest				Posttest				p value
		Min	Max	M	SD	Min	Max	M	SD	
Content	8	1	2.5	1.87	0.69	1.5	2.5	2.18	0.10	0.15
Organization	8	1.5	2.5	2	0.46	1	2.5	2.06	0.37	0.15
Grammar	8	2	2.5	2.43	0.18	1.5	2.5	2.12	0.56	0.41
Vocabulary	8	1	2.5	1.87	0.58	1.5	2.5	2.18	0.35	0.05

Note: N=sample Min=minimum Max=maximum M=mean SD=standard deviation

Table 2 explores results of each theoretical construct. On one hand, students' pretests scores on grammar were the highest criteria score; this resulted in a mean of 2.43 which means it is reaching the scale descriptor "advanced" in the rubric over 2.5 points. The lowest pretests scores were both content and vocabulary with a mean of 1.87, being the scale descriptor "proficient" the nearest over 2.5 points.

On the other hand, students' posttests scores on both content and vocabulary were the highest criterion score results; the mean for both criteria were 2.18 which is placed on the scale descriptor "proficient" in the rubric over 2.5 points. The lowest posttests scores were on organization with a mean of 2.06.

The standard deviation for the grammar criteria in both pretests and posttests was closer to its mean with a value of 0.18 and 0.35 respectively. Nonetheless, the posttest results show more dispersion. Furthermore, the theoretical construct of organization shows a significant statistical disagreement with p value < 0.05 .

Nonetheless, inferential statistics also suggest a p value < 0.05 for both constructs of grammar and vocabulary. Therefore, quantitative results suggest that there was a slight positive impact on the use of peer-assessment for writing skills; this improvement is highly present in constructs such as content and vocabulary.

In addition, the semi-structured interview used for collecting qualitative data explored the second research question of this study: What are students' perceptions of peer-assessment after the implementation?

Students' answers were classified into three categories: benefits and challenges of the peer-assessment variable and writing improvements perceived by students.

Participants listed several benefits of applying peer-assessment. For instance, among the most recurrent answers, students mentioned that there is a clear two-way benefit. Some reasons for this mutual benefit are that the writer receives another's useful perspective and they are able to realize their own mistakes when doing peer-assessment.

"There was a two-way benefit because we had to focus on correcting...when we read the text [of a classmate], we found new words and improve our vocabulary and ideas too...to implement in our text" (Participant #1).

"I felt good; it [peer-assessment] was useful for both. We discovered what to improve or what we can learn from the other person; so, it was useful or necessary because it came from the other's perspective, and not focus only on mine" (Participant #4).

"It [peer-assessment] was interesting; there are other perspectives that I could not see, but my classmates saw them. We don't pay attention to our own mistakes, but another person does...There is mutual learning" (Participant #6).

"When I told my classmates what was bad, that also helped me to recall my own mistakes" (Participant #8).

Also, the fact that classmates were able to be specific and honest when providing feedback in peer-assessment, was a benefit students highlighted. Some participants commented:

“The fact that they [comments] were sincere helped my classmate and myself...the checklist provided a guide to do so” (Participant #1).

“It was up to each person, but it was useful when I received comments that were very specific” (Participant #3).

“It was an objective observation [peer-assessment with checklist] when they told me specifically what was missing (Participant #8).

Furthermore, there are skills that are being promoted when applying peer-assessment. Students’ replies show investigation, reading practice and comparison skills among these advantages.

“This activity [peer-assessment] led me to investigate more about periods, commas, capital letters, etc. I felt I have improved. We always have this feeling of “Am I O.K.?” in comparison to my classmates, so when I read, I could compare and guide myself” (Participant 5).

“To leave comments to my classmate, I investigated a bit more and it helped me to learn...and remember more” (Participant #6).

Students also mentioned a social component when doing peer-assessment in a virtual class setting.

“I learned about my classmate like where he lived, things he liked, etc. Because of virtual classes, I haven’t met my classmates; with this writing activities I could learn about my classmates” (Participant #6).

“I learned from my classmates and their personalities when I read their papers. So, it was interesting” (Participant #5).

Nonetheless, students' answers reflected some challenges when using peer-assessment, too. Some students mentioned how their initial lack of preparedness or confidence influenced them at the moment of leaving comments for classmates.

“It was difficult for me to add a comment, an appropriate one...because I didn't feel confident” (Participant #3).

“I felt like some classmates struggle when writing a comment or suggestion” (Participant #5).

“We are not as prepared to leave comments as much as a professor who knows a lot about the topic. For example, I feared that I was giving incorrect feedback or help” (Participant #6).

“It was challenging for me to give feedback and to do peer-assessment because I lacked some structure in English, so it was complicated to help” (Participant #8).

Another challenge perceived by two students is related to time management. On one hand, a student refers to the length of time the innovation took place: “I felt I am missing something. It was too quick to write. I think to have feedback is very good...but it requires time and it is difficult” (Participant #3). On the other hand, another participant refers to time as that taken by classmates: “There were cases in which I had to wait for my classmate to grade it, and sometimes I didn't have the time and they [classmates] checked it [the composition] in the last minute; so, it was tight” (Participant #4).

Students also manifested challenges such as perceiving feedback resistance, and frustration to see their own mistakes.

“There is a feeling, maybe cultural, of judging and not receiving in a positive way the given comments. I perceived a classmate did not like my feedback” (Participant #6).

“I didn’t like when I was wrong in some words that I did not even know were incorrect. I had some frustration when I forgot those mistakes”. (Participant #6)

Throughout the interview, students mentioned their perceived improvement in writing skills, which is summarized in table 3 along with a summary of the peer-assessment benefits and challenges explained above. The writing improvements of this summary are ordered in the number of times mentioned by students; “vocabulary”, for instance, was mentioned by all interviewees while “confidence to write” mentioned by a couple of participants only.

Table 3

Summary of challenges, benefits and improvements

Peer-assessment		Writing
Benefits	Challenges	Improvements
Two-way benefit	Lack of confidence or preparedness	Vocabulary
Other’s perspectives	Time constraints	Ideas
Objectivity	Feedback resistance	Structure (e.g., intro, body, conclusion)
Help with specific details	Frustration to own mistakes	Punctuation
Own mistakes realization		Grammar
Reading practice		Connectors
Comparison skills		Confidence to write
Investigative skills		
Learning about classmates		
Critical thinking for feedback		

Discussion

Because of the small number of participants in this research, the results need to be carefully interpreted. Nonetheless, this discussion provides an analysis of students’

perceptions over peer-assessment as well as the impact this technique had over writing skills. The significantly approaching quantitative results as well as the qualitative ones of this study suggest that when peer-assessment is applied, positive outcomes are drawn. Similar studies have reached related positive results (Dang, 2016; Dewi et al., 2019; Loretto et al., 2016; Ndoye, 2017).

Participants claimed that when applying peer-assessment, a mutual benefit was provided. Similarly, Reinholz (2015) supported this finding when mentioning an advantage of this strategy as the role of the student goes in both directions: assessor and assessed. Moreover, there were two students who commented on their personal take away of peer-assessment related to investigating on their own; Brown and Hudson (1998) stated how having students involved in the assessment process, provokes autonomy and motivation.

Another worth-noting aspect mentioned by students' responses relies on a positive social component, which was perceived as restricted in remote learning. Through the use of peer-assessment, students claimed to have learned about their classmates through the writing activities. This finding is similar to a conclusion drawn by Ndoye (2017) where she stated that students felt a closer relationship with their classmates when doing peer-assessment.

Correspondingly, Dewi et al. (2019) mentioned how peer-assessment improves a deeper knowledge of content and structure of academic writing; participants' quantitative results in the posttests suggest that content and vocabulary were the most impacted criteria at the moment of grading. Furthermore, these authors also concluded that the level of detail tends to be higher when peer-assessment occurs as it is students' intent to help each other. In like manner, these findings resemble this study's

participants' replies to the interview in terms of useful specificity given by classmates through effective feedback in peer-assessment.

However, among the challenges students faced with peer assessment, participants in this research study, expressed their lack of confidence specifically when writing comments or suggestions to a partner rather than the whole process of the peer-assessment. Nonetheless, their lack of expertise and preparedness was also present in studies done by Azarnoosh (2013) and Elboshi (2021). In addition, a few participants experienced certain frustration when realizing about their own mistakes, which was similarly reported by Velez (2022) when she found out having students feeling negatively towards peer-assessment.

Conclusions

The implementation of peer-assessment techniques was designed for a group of adults with an A2 English level. This students' sample did not have enough written production in accordance with their current curriculum. Participants' initial grades prior the implementation were fair; however, the content of their compositions seemed to lack a clear organization, and writing process. In addition, virtual settings restricted some sort of interaction between students, which through this study it was meant to increase.

The first research question resulted in a slight positive impact of writing skills at the moment of applying peer-assessment, in this particular context despite a small sample size. It is worth noticing that even though the overall posttest results are not highly statistically significant, each of the four constructs were slightly even in comparison to the pretest results.

In addition, insightful perceptions by students support this result as they felt more time was needed to improve peer-assessment execution. Increasing the sample size could help better identify the impact of the practice. The analysis of the theoretical

constructs of the rubric of pretests and posttests, allowed the researcher to observe that the most impacted criteria of this study were the content and vocabulary. This was also confirmed by the qualitative data analysis of students' interviews' replies in which they perceived improvement in several aspects of writing, being vocabulary the most common one.

The perception students had after the implementation of peer-assessment is mostly positive and of benefit and improvement despite some perceived challenges. It was evident that students felt there was a mutual learning experience and the level of detail and specificity they provided, would help their classmates and themselves. Another relevant finding is that due to the virtual setting of this study, a restricted social interaction was initially anticipated to be improved through this application. Students felt that some sort of communication was possible when they read their classmates' papers; hence, leading to learn more from them even though they have not met each other in on site classes where chit chat and social interaction usually occurs.

Limitations

It is possible that this study could take a different direction if the population sample increases or was analyzed with a different research design approach, such as a single participant design. In addition, time constraints were also present in this study as the innovation took place throughout nine sixty-minute class hours in the course of four weeks. It is possible that a longer implementation could have impacted the quantitative results differently. Finally, students were aware that their final assignment, a posttest for this study, was the final summative assessment; in other words, their final exam. It could have been possible that the knowledge of this assessment could have interfered with their writing abilities or create an extra unnecessary pressure.

Furthermore, through the implementation of the innovation it was observed that students struggled with providing effective comments and an accurate usage of the checklist, which was reflected on their perspectives after having applied this strategy. This led the researcher to constantly provide extra opportunities for training, practice and feedback within the already limited time for the innovation.

Recommendations

It might be suitable to either increase the sample size or analyze students' responses with and without the intervention to analyze the impact of the intervention in single participants. Action research is also useful for small classes; however, it is recommended that strategies such as peer-assessment are constantly trained, monitored and practiced as many times as possible in a larger time frame. Provided a replication of this study takes place, it is fundamental to extend the time of the exposure and practice. Hence, for short-term class frames, such as this study context, it could have been useful to have applied this strategy throughout two levels at least. It is also possible that the quantitative data shows a higher statistical significance in relation to the alternative hypothesis.

Additionally, unnecessary pressure could be avoided when students are requested to present a final work. It is important to acknowledge students' feelings during final examinations so that these do not influence the results of the study.

References

- Andrade, H. (2000). Using rubrics to promote thinking and learning. *Educational Leadership*, 57(5), 13-18.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285750862_Using_rubrics_to_promote_thinking_and_learning
- Azarnoosh, M. (2013). Peer assessment in an EFL context: Attitudes and friendship bias. *Language Testing in Asia*, 3(11), 1-10. doi:10.1186/2229-0443-3-11
- Brown, J., & Hudson, T. (1998). The alternatives in language assessment. *Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL)*, 32(4), 653-675.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3587999>
- Burns, A. (2009). Action research in second language teacher education. In A. Burns & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 289-297). Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)*. https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/home/-/asset_publisher/FfMails48Xwv/content/recommendation-and-resolution?inheritRedirect=false
- Creswell, J. (2015). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. (5th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Dang T. (2016). Vietnamese EFL students' perceptions of noticing-based collaborative feedback on their writing performance. *English Language Teaching*, 9(5), 141-153. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n5p141>

- Dewi, E.W., Nurkamto, J., & Drajadi, N.A. (2019). Exploring peer-assessment practice in graduate students' academic writing. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 22(1), 58-65.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332401290>
- Double, K.S., McGrane, J.A., & Hopfenbeck, T.N. (2019). The impact of peer assessment on academic performance: A meta-analysis of control group studies. *Educational Psychology Review*, 32, 481-509. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09510-3>
- Elboshi, A. (2021). Web-enhanced peer feedback in ESL writing classrooms: A literature review. *English Language Teaching*, 14(4), 66-76.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n4p66>
- Espinoza, M. (2019). *Peer feedback and its effect on speaking skills using bubbly*. [Master's thesis, Universidad Casa Grande].
<http://dspace.casagrande.edu.ec:8080/handle/ucasagrande/1811>
- Govil, P. (2013). Ethical considerations in educational research. *International Journal of Advancement in Education and Social Sciences* (1)2, 17-22.
- Jonsson, A. & Svingby, G. (2007). The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences. *Educational Research Review* 2, 130-144.
doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2007.05.002
- Loretto A., DeMartino, S., & Godley, A. (2016). Secondary students' perceptions of peer review of writing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 51(2), 134-161.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311679895_Secondary_Students'_Perceptions_of_Peer_Review_of_Writing

Ndoye, A. (2017). Peer / self assessment and student learning. *International Journal of Teaching and Language in Higher Education*, 29(2), 255-269.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309464014_Peer_self-assessment_and_student_learning

Reinholz, D. (2015). The assessment cycle: a model for learning through peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 41(2), 301-315.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1008982>

Rossi, M., & Sein, M. (2021). *Proactive research approaches: Design and action research*. [PowerPoint slides]. SlideToDoc. <https://slidetodoc.com/proactive-research-approaches-design-and-action-research-professor/>

Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/1170598>

Vélez, A. (2022). *Implementing peer feedback to improve writing process facilitated by Google Docs: An action research study* [Master's thesis, Universidad Casa Grande]. <http://dspace.casagrande.edu.ec:8080/handle/ucasagrande/3277>

Wiggins, G. (2012, September 1). *Seven keys to effective feedback*. ASCD.

<https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/seven-keys-to-effective-feedback>

Appendix A

Lesson Plan on Backward Design

Available upon request.

Appendix B

Peer-assessment Checklist

Available upon request.

Appendix C

Peer-assessment Rubric

Available upon request.

Appendix D

Semi-structured Interview Protocol

Available upon request.

Appendix E

Survey on Google Forms

Available upon request.

Appendix F

E-Portfolio

Available upon request.