Implementation of Peer-Assessment to Improve Writing

Fanny Lissette Abad Villafuerte

Coordinator: María Rossana Ramirez 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: fanny.abad@casagrande.edu.ec. Guayaquil, October 19th, 2022.

0

Implementation of Peer-Assessment to Improve Writing

English is considered the essential tool in many countries to interact with each other in different contexts. Learning English allows the users to contact in diverse areas where communication is crucial to different skills, such as speaking, listening, reading, or writing, which are widely applied in global information exchanging. However, in the transactional and business field, writing skills are vastly used, but in many cases, it is a significant challenge for learners (Buragohain & Wahdan, 2018).

In the Ecuadorian context, learners need to improve their writing skills. It is noticeable that, in many cases, the daily context is not the most adequate to create a learning environment, and a second language beyond a classroom does not always work (Fabre et al., 2015). To reinforce the English area, education authorities mentioned that English would become mandatory in schools by adopting the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) at the different levels of education (Ministerio de Educación, 2016). However, despite the effort, done in the national land, findings demonstrated that proficiency in the last year collocated it in place in 90 of 112 countries previously tested (Education First, 2021).

Some learners are not interested in learning a second language effectively. In many cases, using technological resources does not help to learn in an authentic context. Participants of this study were adapted to use their mobile devices as translators and dictionaries as they used at home, where their tasks were a copy and paste from different websites. Most of them wanted to learn, but their writing skills were not developed in the correct form. Learners could not identify verbs in present from past, they were not able not recognize and apply auxiliary verbs as did, can or have in the

different lessons. So, it was required to develop some learning strategies. The chosen one was peer assessment.

Peer assessment describes various activities where learners evaluate and provide comments on the peers' work. It is used as a strategy for learners to assess their partners' contributions to group work, which is particularly valuable in team-based learning. In this study, peer assessment focused on how writing could allow learners to interact in a non-traditional form; instead of being the neglected skill to develop, it could establish a set of rules that needed interaction among partners through assessment and providing comments. This action research aimed to implement the peer assessment strategy to improve writing skills in a group of high school students.

Peer assessment has been a topic of various studies (Escobedo, 2022; Gennip et al., 2010; Tapia, 2020), where researchers found a change in the teaching and learning process from teacher-centered to student-centered. Thus, peer assessment may be considered a collaborative learning strategy to enhance students' writing skills, as was written by Wesiak et al. (2013). The authors mentioned that formative peer assessment involves input on drafts of work before the final product can be uploaded. Moreover, the summative peer assessment includes evaluating other students' outcomes, participation, and contributions that can be part of a final grade contrasted with an instrument that can be a rubric or a checklist.

Due to easier technology access (translators on mobile phones), participants of this study found it easy to write sentences or paragraphs in English. However, in real classes, students were not able to structure a sentence correctly. Their paragraphs were not correct at all, and verbs forms were not adequate in most of the sentences. This aspect hindered fundamental knowledge. Students felt frustrated and did not pay much

attention to their teachers' feedback to improve their writing. For these reasons, implementing peer assessment to review and provide feedback was helpful for students and the facilitator during the process of acquiring writing skills. It also promoted a better understanding of the assessment criteria and student interaction.

Literature Review

This study focused on implementing peer assessment to provide feedback between peers and improve writing skills. Therefore, it is required to research the definition of peer assessment as a strategy to be implemented to improve their writing skills. Readers will find information from primary authors that illustrate this work in this section.

Some strategies focus on specific skills, such as writing, considered one of the most complex skills to learn because learners have a limited vocabulary and a lack of grammar structure knowledge (Cole & Feng, 2015). Topping (2017) expressed that peer assessment is a peer-assisted, collaborative learning arrangement that includes students assessing their fellow students' performance by providing feedback. This feedback could be quantitative (i.e., grades or ratings across assessment criteria) and/or qualitative (written or oral comments). It provides an organized learning process for students to review and give feedback to each other. Peer assessment also helps students to develop judgment skills in evaluating and providing feedback to others in any field of their lives to improve their tasks (Ibarra-Saiz et al., 2020).

Peer assessment is a way to ensure all students' engagement in providing feedback to their peers and assuming the role of assessors during the process (Topping, 2009). Feedback is not anonymous, and learners who receive it will surely know who

assessed his/her work. Assessing, evaluating and commenting on the strengths and weaknesses of peers' work can help familiarize the assessor with the evaluation criteria and help develop knowledge on what constitutes good work and what needs to be avoided (Yu & Sung, 2016). Thus, peer assessment allows students to learn when considering others' successes and weaknesses to improve their tasks.

Topping (2017) expressed that students discuss their decisions and scores with a peer when the outcome is done. These products are the result of a conscious work, and depending on the learning objectives or context, it can be taken as a formative or summative approach. Formative assessment helps students' learning evolve and is often used as an alternative to the formative traditional assessment modes in which students may overestimate or underestimate their assessment (Babaii et al., 2015). Students give formative feedback on their peers' tasks before delivering the improved final assignment, but the teacher provides the final score.

Furthermore, Panadero and Jonsson (As cited in Panadero, 2013) indicated that rubrics have specific components to check learners' descriptors. They have the potential to influence students learning positively; also, there are several ways to use rubrics to mediate improved performance and self-regulation. A rubric is a set of scoring indicators for evaluating partners' work in student assessment (Ravela, 2008). It is provided by a scale of possible scores collocating punctuation on specific components or descriptors of quality. A well-developed rubric provides descriptors for each level of performance to enable more reliable and unbiased scoring.

Brown and Hudson (1998, as cited in Espinoza, 2019) mentioned that some advantages of peer assessment are the direct participation of learners, the stimulation of autonomy, and increased motivation. On the other hand, peer assessment has a degree of

risk with the reliability of the scores, which carries out some disadvantages when assessing each other's contribution, even if they use an assessment tool such as a checklist or a rubric (Gunawardena, 2010). Rotsaert et al. (2017) mentioned that peer assessment is often described as a complex collaborative learning task that requires high-level cognitive processing. Therefore, it cannot be successful when students have no experience in assessing each other or if they feel their peer's pressure, which may influence the assessment's final results (Kollar & Fischer, 2010).

In order to use peer assessment effectively, teachers should provide clear and direct guidelines to students. When teachers apply peer assessment to their students, instructions and criteria must be clearly defined (Jung, 2016). The author mentioned that in some cases, learners tend to score low grades to their peers and can be stricter than the teacher. Standardized checklists or rubrics with the criterion to be assessed can be effective in this process. In addition, teachers should provide constructive feedback and suggestions for improvement. Wiggins (2012) stated that students need information that tells them if they are headed in the correct direction.

Undoubtedly, the ability to use peer assessment as a convenient, informative, and interactive learning resource and as a teaching tool is a valuable asset for EFL English educators. Finch (2004) noted that peer assessment could be integral to student-centered learning. The author mentioned that students exchanged formative feedback on each other's sites via notice boards and submitted their final assessment to the teacher. A practical peer assessment is implemented through guided interactions that include organized writing instruction (Nagori & Cooper, 2014).

The previous authors mentioned that students favor using explicit strategies when peer assessment is adequate. For researchers, it is necessary to collect data in

different forms and analyze it to get results. Interviews are an essential source of preliminary data (Clements, 2021). The author expressed that interviews can capture all details of these interactions, which is crucial to derive the necessary data for research.

Innovation

This innovation focused on developing writing skills by applying peer assessment. It was implemented in a private school in Guayaquil. The group of students selected was from a ninth-grade class with a CEFR -A2 level. The unit title was "Business". It was carried out in twelve hours of in-person modality for four weeks. The 4-week-lesson plan was presented to the students during class hours (See Appendix A).

In the first part of the innovation, students are introduced the peer assessment by seeing some images and examples that the facilitator showed them. In this part, images have simple sentences, where learners checked their meanings, forms, and uses. Learners saw, understood, and began to write the examples as a drilling activity, then learners did their own examples that gradually were improved until obtaining the final task of the unit.

During classes, students are paired to work with their peers to read another model text and review the writing checklist (See Appendix B) to assess its content. The checklist was helpful to check if the task fulfill all the required standards. Students checked with a "Yes" or "No" according to the five questions in the checklist, including all of what was expected from the paragraph: Topic sentence, supporting sentences, concluding sentence, transition words, comparatives, and superlatives, vocabulary learned through the unit and organization, punctuation, spelling, and grammar.

Every week was focused on a specific aspect assessed in the final task. In the first week, students were introduced to the topic through the unit question and discussing it. Students checked vocabulary words and their corresponding definitions. They also posted their opinions about the advantages and disadvantages of running up a new business in a forum. After that, they peer-assessed each other paragraphs using the checklist.

In the second week, students focused on the grammar tense required for the final task. They watched a video and predicted what would happen using the simple future tense. Students developed a worksheet using the correct structure of the grammar tense. They developed a proposal for a new school business using the simple future tense as homework. In the third week, students learned superlatives and comparatives. They compared pictures of different businesses by structuring sentences. Students improved their drafts and works by using comparatives and superlatives in their paragraphs.

In the final week, students learned to use transition words to connect their ideas. In every week, students implemented the writing rubric (See Appendix C) to contrast their works with the required components written in the descriptor. This instrument was implemented to support teacher and students verify assumptions about the task standard. The rubric was also used by the teacher to grade students' works.

Research Methodology

The type of investigation implemented in this study was action research. Action research is widely used in education, especially by teachers who use it to improve their teaching practices. Action Research is defined as a formative study of training or investigation progress practiced by facilitators in schools. Action research is a spiral

process that includes investigating a problem, taking action and fact-finding about the results obtained. It allows a facilitator to adopt the most appropriate strategy within the teaching environment (Lesha, 2014). This action research collected quantitative and qualitative data to explore the main research question:

"Does peer assessment improve the writing skill among 9th-grade students?" from this main research questions, three research questions emerged:

1. - Could peer assessment strategy through some paragraphs in contexts improve learners' English writing skills?

2. - How could a rubric implementation facilitate the peer assessment in learners?

3. - What were students' perspectives observed in writing skills and peer assessment?

To answer these questions, the action research implemented quantitative and qualitative research methods. Hoover (2021) stated that quantitative research requires data collection methods, including compiling numerical data to test different relationships among variables. The data collection for this study tries experiments, questionnaires, or surveys. This collection method manages further numerical analysis to look for reliable answers. Questionnaires, in this case, have a multiple-choice format to generate countable responses, like yes or no, which can be turned into quantifiable data.

McLeod (2019) defined qualitative research as non-numerical data, text, video, pictures, or audio recordings that collect, analyze, and interpret non-numerical data, such as language. The author stated that it could be implemented to understand how a

person perceives and gives meaning to their social reality. This data type can be collected using daily observations or interviews to analyze specific phenomena. Additionally, there are mixed methods that are very helpful in working with this type of research as well.

Working with mixed methods have become more popular over time because implementing quantitative and qualitative data in the same study gave better reliability to these studies' results. Mixed methods research combines elements of quantitative research and qualitative research in order to answer the research questions. Mixed methods can help the investigator gain a more complete picture than a standalone quantitative or qualitative study, as it integrates benefits of both methods (Tegan, 2022).

On their part, Shorten and Smith (2017) stated that combined methods focus on developing strengths of qualitative and quantitative methods, letting investigators explore different points of view and uncover relationships between the intricate layers of our multifaceted research questions. In the study, there were quantitative and qualitative research questions that the facilitator answered implementing different instruments adapted to collect all the necessary information.

Participants

Participants were a group of students from a 9th-grade class at a private school in Guayaquil, Ecuador. The high school is located in an urban area near the city center. Students were between 13 and 14 years old. Their English proficiency is in the majority A2 level. However, some of them have poor English knowledge. They expressed that their classes were minimum in the two prior years. Their class schedule was reduced to three or four periods of classes per day. They had English classes once a week.

The class had about 30 students who were asked to participate in the innovation project, but just twenty parents gave their consent. Ten of the 30 students were excluded from the project and could not be part of the analysis. Finally, just 20 out of 30 students completed both pre-test and post-test and participated in the peer-assessment innovation. Eight students were male, and twelve were female. Participants' socioeconomic situation is higher middle class. They all have an internet connection at home and understand everything concerning using technical resources to work at home.

Instruments

The instruments were designed to collect information for the research questions: "Does peer assessment improve the writing skill among 9th-grade students compared to students' writing grades before peer assessment?" This was the global question research that englobes the research questions previously mentioned. A pre and post-test was applied to measure their possible improvement in their writing skills. Additionally, there was the writing rubric to contrast every task with the components written on it. The rubric was structured with the following criteria: content, organization, and language, with four bands of performance, 0 being the lowest band and five the highest. Every component of the rubric is detailed in the appendix section.

The writing grading rubric was built with similar aspects to the students' checklist to evaluate the pre-test assigned prior to the intervention and the post-test assigned after the intervention. Furthermore, the rubric was used to grade every weekly project where students graded their partners' work, and the teacher also scored those works. Finally, to answer the last research question, a semi-structured interview (See Appendix D) with five questions was prepared to know students´ perspectives and different points of view about the innovation. It was necessary to understand students'

perspectives and points of view concerning the innovation in detail. So, it was required to randomly select to a group of students (seven of them) to talk tom them and understand their perspectives concerning this study.

Data Analysis

  Quantitative. To determine progress in peer assessment in writing, the teacher compared the first week results against the final results of the innovation. The students' data were tabulated on Excel, the online spreadsheet. After that, these results were double-checked in the IBM SPSS Statistics 24 to generate descriptive statistics, the mean, and the standard deviation to calculate Cohen's *d* Effect Size (ES). Cohen expressed that 0.20 is known as a small effect size, 0.50 as a medium, and 0.80 or more is considered a large effect size (Thalheimer & Cook, 2002). Furthermore, students' peer assessment in writing improved if learners and teacher averages of their tasks became closer at the final part of the innovation answering the second research question.

  Besides this, the second research question was answered with every rubric component. The researcher compared the learners' grades with the teacher's scores on the weekly products. In this part, learners improved the peer assessment by seeing how the teacher contrasted the task with the rubric, and provided them feedback. The checklist was applied in every final weekly product to double-check if the task accomplished all the requirements asked in the checklist.

  Qualitative. The implementation of a semi structured interview helped clarifying some doubts that learners could have during all the process. Questions were related to their way to study and learn, the advantages of the innovation, the challenges faced during the innovation, and so on.

Ethical Consideration

It is required to implement some ethical considerations in research. The principles of ethical considerations are a set of resources that guide the plans, designs, and practices in an investigation or action research (Fleming & Zegwaard, 2018). The author expressed that investigations must always have a specific code of conduct when collecting data from participants. The facilitator communicated to the institution (See Appendix E) the intention to develop action research with a group of learners to work on the study. The institution authorities talked with the tutor of the course where the innovation was supposed to take place to let her/him know about the project. The tutor sent the information to parents. Then parents were informed about the training to sign their permission.

The researcher prepared the tutor some letters to obtain the students' consents. (See Appendix F). The letters described the process and its aim. After a few days, twenty parents from a group of thirty people agreed to participate voluntarily in the innovation. Participants were informed about the benefits and implications of the study for their academic and professional growth, especially in their writing skills competencies.

Results

The outcomes found throughout the innovation was necessary to answer every research question developed to improve writing skills in students. **To answer the first question:** *Could peer assessment strategy through some paragraphs in contexts improve learners' English writing skills?* The pre-test and post-test instruments were implemented to collect and analyze the possible improvement in students. Table number

one shows that the effect size for the whole writing skill improvement was 2.03, which means that it is a significant and positive effect size (ES) obtained. Additionally, the *p-value* with an alpha of 5% was less than 0.005, which means there is a piece of definitive evidence that showed the innovation caused the improvement. The results show a large and positive improvement in the writing skills. The findings mentioned are detailed in Table number 1 that follows.

Table one

Descriptive statistic of writing skills pre-test and post-test

	N Sample	M Mean	SD Std. Deviation.	*p* value < 0. 005	Effect Size *d*
Pre-test	20	22.20	4.69	0. 00	
Post-test	20	30.75	3.67	0. 00	2.03

To answer the second question: *Ho*w *could a rubric implementation facilitate the peer assessment in learners?* It was required to collect all the results obtained by students. Learners worked on the products for four weeks to improve their writing skills and facilitate the use of peer assessment. Students progressively improved their results, which the teacher checked since their first product. Tables 2 and 3 demonstrate how learners closed the educative gap, and step-by-step results came closer to the teacher ones.

Table 2 reflects outcomes obtained in peer assessment, plus the teacher results in Week One. This table shows the results mean obtained by leaners in the first week. It was 5.75, and the mean for the teacher grades was 4.80.

Table two

Descriptive statistic of writing skills in Week One.

Product Week One.	N. Sample	Min. Minimum	Max. Maximum	M. Mean
Students	20	3.00	8.00	5.75
Teacher	20	4.00	6.00	4.80

Additionally, table 3 shows the last students' task mean was 8.20, and the facilitator's grade was 9.10, closer to the students' scores. The difference is almost the same. Learners overestimated results at the beginning, but underestimated them at the final part. Fortunately, learners improved their peer assessment from receiving comment from the facilitator.

Table three

Descriptive statistic of writing skills in Week Four.

Product Week Four.	N. Sample	Min. Minimum	Max. Maximum	M. Mean
Students	20	7.00	9.00	8.20
Teacher	20	8.00	10.00	9.10

To answer the third question: *What were students' perspectives observed in writing skills?* A group of seven students was considered to have an interview with the teacher facilitator. In this stage, students answered the questions in an accessible form. Learners talked about their different points of view concerning the study. The interview

was done in Spanish to clarify all the doubts and details from students' answers. The group of learners answered five open-ended questions that are summarized here:

1. - What did you learn from this innovation? This study was a change for their learning. In a global form, all students mentioned that their writing skills increased during this training time. Some learners expressed that during these weeks, they learned more English than in all the two years of the pandemic. Student # 3 *"writing is a long process, but it is necessary begin by doing."* She noticed that her knowledge improved when she began to use comparatives and superlatives and practicing without the necessity to do a homework, but do it by herself to improve. Student # 1 *"I am writing my dairy in English, I write many things in it. How I feel, what I have experienced in different moments. I think it is a great resource to improve."* In this way, the learner improved without looking at any note written in her book, but she remembered how to do it.

2. - What did you do to learn? This question was straightforward for students. They mentioned that the first thing was to be optimistic about their learning to have the possibility to learn something new. They understood that their English level needed improvement, so they created a study routine to develop their knowledge. Student # 2 said "*I revised my book in specific parts of the grammar, then I contrasted some points that previously were unclear for me. It helped a lot to increase my knowledge."* Student # 4 said *"I improved my vocabulary knowledge by writing new words from texts that I read."* Students # 6 and 7 said that *"At the beginning, the tasks looked more complex than they really were, but thanks to the training, we could understand some rules and structures better."*

3. - What were the most positive aspects of the innovation? The innovation was a new form of acquiring the language and increasing the participants' knowledge. Students understood that the English language is accessible for them to learn and implement the new inputs in different life situations. Student # 3 said *"For me, the most positive part of the study was learning the grammar structures in a better form than before the innovation."* Additionally, they could better understand the instructions written in documents and apply the rules without looking at their notes. Student # 2 expressed *"For me, reading the instructions or understanding the learning requirements is easier in different contexts of the subjects."*

4. - What were the hardest challenges faced during the innovation? Students did their best every week of the work; unfortunately, some complex situations appeared in the learning path. Some students had poor vocabulary knowledge at the beginning of the work. Student # 6 said *"I remember when I began the innovation, it was frustrating sensation because my knowledge was very poor."* There was a part of the students who refused to work on the project, and some were pessimistic at the beginning. Additionally, student # 1 said *"the innovation was too short to learn all I would like to have in my mind."* However, it was not bad at all. One learner (student # 3) said *"the learning was complex because it was combined with the other subjects in the regular school schedule than the innovation, but the learning was worth it."*

5. - Would you like to work with a project like this in subsequent innovations? Students expressed that this work was handy in improving their learning. Some of them said that it is essential to adapt the teaching and learning process to current methodologies that center the learning in the students, but it is not

easy when there is not enough time to develop a good product. Student # 4 said *"I loved working with this methodology, please considering do it again."*

Some learners mentioned that if this work could be part of their regular classes, they would accept the work. On the other hand, student # 3 said *"If I were supposed to do more work in this innovation, I am sure that I would fail the work."* So, a small part of the interviewed participants would refuse to do the innovation, or they consider to take this course as extra classes in holidays.

Discussion

The present study tried to involve students to improve their writing skills through the use of peer assessment. The findings in this action research ratified the benefits of using the peer assessment strategy for the writing skills training and improvement in the English language. The paired-sample *t*-test provided evidence that peer-assessment significantly improved writing grades.

Question #1. *Could peer assessment strategy through some paragraphs in contexts improve learners' English writing skills?* The results of the pre and post-test scores show that peer assessment improved the learners writing skills. The effect size was 2.03 which means a significant impact of this study on the participants' learning. These findings are in agreement with Ibarra-Saiz et al. (2015). They said that peer assessment helps students develop judgment skills in evaluating and providing feedback to others in any field of their lives to improve their tasks. At the beginning of the study, students were nervous because their lack of knowledge could become a limitation in the improvement.

Learners were afraid to demonstrate their competencies. Writing skills are considered one of the most challenging skills; as mentioned by Cole and Feng (2015), writing is considered one of the most complex skills to learn because learners have a limited vocabulary and a lack of grammar structure knowledge. In the process, learners felt more confident about peer assessing their partner tasks and collaborating, providing effective feedback, as stated by Topping (2017). Students gradually learned to revise their partner's task. They implemented the writing rubric with the specific components to develop their work and evaluate it according to the requirement. Panadero (2013) indicated that rubrics have specific components to check learners' descriptors.

The use of peer assessment helped students of this innovation improve their writing skills, working in students' attitude and confidence to create a more comfortable environment. Espinoza (2019) similarly stated that some advantages of peer assessment are the direct participation of learners, the stimulation of autonomy, and increased motivation. This action research implemented the peer assessment strategy to improve writing skills allowing learners to interact in a non-traditional form (Escobedo, 2022; Gennip et al., 2010; Tapia, 2020; Wesiak et al., 2013). In their studies, the authors found a change in the teaching and learning process, centering student activities with effective collaboration through providing feedback.

Question #2. *How could a rubric implementation facilitate the peer assessment in learners?* In the first part of the innovation, learners' peer assessments were over-graded to the point that students did not understand how to evaluate their partners. In this stage, when the teacher graded those same works, they got a different score than the students collocated. Jung (2016) stated that when teachers apply peer assessment to their students, instructions and criteria must be clear and precise. As mentioned by Yu

and Sung (2016), assessing, evaluating, and commenting on the strengths and weaknesses of peers' work can help with the evaluation criteria to do a better job.

During the training, students calibrated the scores with the teacher's ones. After every product, learners received feedback to correct and improve on mistakes. In the same form, Topping (2017) expressed that students learn by receiving and providing feedback and discussing their scores with peers to achieve a negotiated agreed outcome. The big issue in this innovation was the short time to develop the work. At the beginning of the project, some learners over-graded their partner's work, but at the final part, some under-graded those tasks. Babaii et al. (2015) mentioned that in some cases, students might overestimate or underestimate their assessment.

The teacher facilitator thought that stimulation, confidence, and motivation could be a fact of reliability to work with peer assessment. However, according to Gunawardena (2010), it has a degree of risk with the reliability of the scores because it carries out some disadvantages when assessing each other's contributions, even if they use a checklist or a rubric. So, the project length was short but meaningful. Kollar and Fischer (2010) stated that in some cases, peer assessment could not be successful when students have no experience in assessing each other or if they feel their peer's pressure, which may influence the final results. So, it is essential to keep calm and do their best.

Question #3. *What were students' perspectives observed in writing skills?* Students' perspectives about peer assessment of writing skills were positive. The seven participants' interviews allowed the researcher to understand the learning points of view collected in the results. Students spent different emotions while the innovation took place. Clements (2021) mentioned that interviews can capture all details of these interactions, which is crucial to derive the necessary data for research. The interview

reflected how learners in first hand modified their English knowledge throughout four weeks of work. On some days, learners felt comfortable with the work, but in other cases, they felt frustrated and anxious because they could not manage their job as they initially liked to.

Despite these complications, the innovation was helpful for learners. They recognized that even troubles and mistakes were valuable to acquire meaningful learning experiences. Learners mentioned that the innovation was an excellent opportunity to learn in a different and a practical form. They adapted their new knowledge to their necessities. However, it was all the time beneficial to provide them with valuable comments and adequate feedback to address learners in the correct learning path, as Wiggins stated (2012).

Participants' perspectives towards peer assessment motivated learners to improve, but in the innovation, it was demonstrated that learners began improve their writing skills in the teaching and learning process by doing, by working by themselves collaborating with each other, and above all reading and considering all teacher´s feedback to improve their peer assessment and writing skills.

Conclusions

This project has shown the effectiveness of peer assessment in improving students' writing skills. At the same time, it has provided the teacher with a valuable tool to enhance their students' writing process by giving each other effective feedback. The project was observed during all the processes and obtained results before and after applying the innovation to prove that it can be positively used as a pedagogical strategy to engage learners in their learning path. In this case, their writing skills.

In conclusion, learners changed their attitude at the beginning of the innovation. They did not feel so comfortable at first, but gradually, after some days of training and practicing their writing skills, learners were involved in the project with a better predisposition for learning. Additionally, learners began to grade their partners following the rubric, but learners were not adapted to do it, and progressively, they were improving. The teacher facilitator noticed that learners over-graded their partners, and after her first feedback, learners were more controlled to peer assessing their peer work. Finally, it is concluded that working on projects such as this innovation is always suitable for learners to improve their learning competencies and teachers to become updated in their strategies for teaching better.

Limitations

An explicit limitation when the study began was the lack of vocabulary that many students had. Fortunately, the innovation applied the pre-writing test to collect all the elements necessary to be improved the study. Another limitation found in the study was some students' attitudes. It is unclear if studying at home for two years changed students' behaviors and perspectives about learning by doing. Their attitude was not the best at the beginning. After some days, they changed their mind, and their work improved.

There was a limitation concerning the study. It was too short for learners. Students mentioned that they would like more time for being learning with the training, but using a different schedule than the one applied for classes. When learners finished the innovation, they wanted to continue with the innovation in their regular classes. There was a little unconformity with those learners who did not participate in the innovation. They felt as they were stolen in their classes' time. Finally, having a control

group to compare results could be a limitation for the teacher facilitator to contrast helpful information.

Recommendations

The teacher facilitator has written some recommendations that are considered essential for valuable writing skills development. The first one talks about implementing a conscious plan in the English area. Here, the institution's English teachers can work with the same guidelines and create a plan where the learning could be centered on students and how to make them acquire practical strategies that allow them to apply the English language in different situations. The second recommendation is for learners. They need to take advantage of all the resources and materials designed by the teachers and facilitators. These materials will be a support to make them the English language learning more didactic and less frustrating for them. Finally, the third recommendation is for researchers and investigators who can use this study as a control group to check valuable information and, in the same form, share helpful information in the English learning and teaching community.

References

Babaii, E., Taghaddomi, S., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2015). Speaking self-assessment: Mismatches between learners' and teachers' criteria. *Language Testing*, *32*(3), 1 – 27. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.902.9241&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Buragohain, D., & Wahdan, N. (2018). Investigating the effects of writing process on students' writing performance at foundation program-Hai'l University. *Journal of Linguistics, 10*(3), 14-20. doi:10.5296/ijl.v10i3.13299

Cole, J. & Feng, J. (2015). Effective Strategies for Improving Writing Skills of Elementary English Language Learners. *Chinese American Educational Research and Development Association Annual Conference April 15-16, 1*(1), 1 – 25. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED556123.pdf

Clements, J. (2021). *What are the benefits of using interviews in research?* https://www.legaltranscriptionservice.com/blog/what-the-benefits-of-using-interviews-in-research/

Education First. (2021). *EF English Proficiency Index – Comparing English skills between countries – EF EPI.* https://www.ef.com.ec/epi/

Escobedo, V. (2022). *Peer Assessment of Audio Recordings to Improve Oral Skills using WhatsApp.* (Master´s thesis, Casa Grande University, Guayaquil, Ecuador). http://dspace.casagrande.edu.ec:8080/bitstream/ucasagrande/3363/1/Tesis3528ESCp.pdf

Fabre, P., Boroto, J., & Soto, S. (2015). *Approaches to EFL teaching: Curriculum, instruction, assessment, and technology*. Machala, Ecuador: Universidad Técnica de Machala.

Finch, A. (2004). Online peer-assessment of a multimedia project. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning, 7*(2), 65 – 80. http://www.finchpark.com/arts/Web-based_Peer_Assessment.pdf

Fleming, J. & Zegwaard, K. (2018). Methodologies, methods and ethical considerations for conducting research in work-integrated learning. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning, Special Issue, 19*(3), 205 – 213. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1196755.pdf

Gennip, N., Segers, M. & Tillema, H. (2010). Peer assessment as a collaborative learning activity: The role of interpersonal variables and conceptions. *Learning and Instruction, 20*(1), 280 – 290. doi: 10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.010.

Gunawardena, E. (2010). A rubric to self - assess and peer- assess mathematical problem solving tasks of college students. *Acta Didactica Napocensia, 3*(1). 75 – 88. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1056109.pdf

Hoover, L. (2021). *What Is Qualitative vs. Quantitative Study?* https://www.gcu.edu/blog/doctoral-journey/what-qualitative-vs-quantitative-study

Ibarra-Sáiz, M., Rodríguez-Gómez, G. & Boud, D. (2020). Developing student competence through peer assessment: The role of feedback, self-regulation and evaluative judgement. *High Educ., 80*(1), 137 – 156. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00469-2

Jung, M. (2016). Peer/teacher-assessment using criteria in the EFL classroom for

developing students' L2 writing. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied

Linguistics, 20*(1), 1 – 20. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1110730.pdf

Kollar, I., & Fischer, F. (2010). Peer assessment as collaborative learning: A cognitive

perspective. *Learning and Instruction, 20*(4), 344–348.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.005

Lesha, J. (2014). Action research in education. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*,

10(13), https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2014.v10n13p%p

McLeod, S. (2019). *What's the difference between qualitative and quantitative

research?* https://www.simplypsychology.org/qualitative-quantitative.html

Ministerio de Educación. (2016). *English as a foreign language.*

https//educacion.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2016/03/EFL1.pdf

Nagori, R., Cooper, M. (2014). Key principles of peer assessments: A feedback strategy

to engage the postgraduate international learner. *The IAFOR Journal of

Education, 2*(2), 211 – 237. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1080371.pdf

Panadero, E. (2013). The use of scoring rubrics for formative assessment purposes

revisited: A review. *Educational Research Review, 9*(1), 129 – 144.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2013.01.002.

Ravela, P. (2008). Educative assessment. Designing assessments to inform and improve

student performance by Grant Wiggins. *Páginas de Educación*, *1*(1), 144 – 147.

https://doi.org/10.22235/pe.v1i1.718

Rotsaert, T., Panadero, E., Schellens, T., & Raes, A. (2017). Synchronous peer

assessment in secondary education. *European Journal of Psychology of

Education,* 3(2), 255-275. doi: 10.1007/s10212-017-0329-x

Shorten, A. & Smith, J. (2017). Mixed methods research: Expanding the evidence base, *BMJ Journals, 20*(3), (pp. 74- 75), doi: 10.1136/eb-2017-102699

Tapia, J. (2020). *Improving Writing Skills through Peer Assessment* (Master´s thesis, Casa Grande University, Guayaquil, Ecuador). http://dspace.casagrande.edu.ec:8080/bitstream/ucasagrande/2263/1/Tesis2438T APil.pdf

Tegan, G. (2022). *Mixed Methods Research | Definition, Guide & Examples.* https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/mixed-methods-research/

Thalheimer, W., & Cook, S. (2002). How to calculate effect sizes from published research: A simplified methodology. *A Work-Learning Research Publication.* http://www.bwgriffin.com/gsu/courses/edur9131/content/Effect_Sizes_pdf5.pdf

Topping, K. (2009). *Peer Assessment. Theory into Practice, 48*(1), doi: 10.1080/00405840802577569.

Topping, K. (2017). Peer assessment: Learning by judging and discussing the work of other learners. *Interdisciplinary Education and Psychology, 1*(1), doi: https://doi.org/10.31532/InterdiscipEducPsychol.1.1.007

Wesiak, G., AL-Smadi, M., & Guetl, C. (2013). Self- and peer-assessment in collaborative writing: Findings on motivational-emotional aspects, usability and usage patterns. *International Journal of e-Assessment (IJEA), 3*(1), https://ijea.org.uk/index.php/journal/article/view/53

Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven keys to effective feedback. *Educational Leadership, 70*(1), 10-16. https://pdo.ascd.org/lmscourses/PD13OC005/media/FormativeAssessmentandC CSwithELALiteracyMod_3-Reading2.pdf

Yu, F., & Sung, S. (2016) A mixed methods approach to the assessor's targeting

behavior during online peer assessment: effects of anonymity and underlying

reasons. *Interactive Learning Environments, 24*(7), 1674 – 1691. doi:

10.1080/10494820.2015.1041405

Appendix A

Lesson plan.

Available upon request.

Appendix B

Checklist

Available upon request.

Appendix C

Writing Rubric

Available upon request.

Appendix D

Interview Protocol

Available upon request.

Appendix E

Letter to the School authority.

Available upon request.

Appendix F

Consent Letter for Parents.// Carta de Consentimiento de los Padres.

Available upon request.

Appendix G
E-portfolio

Available upon request.