

# International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies

ISSN: 2308-5460



## The Role of Self-Assessment and Peer-Assessment in Improving Writing Performance of Iranian EFL Students

[PP: 01-10]

**Jalil Fathi**

(Corresponding Author)

University of Kurdistan

Iran

**Mohammad Reza Khodabakhsh**

University of Kurdistan

Iran

### ABSTRACT

As an attempt to shed more light on the effectiveness of alternative assessment in second language (L2) learning, this study sought to evaluate the effect of self-assessment and peer-assessment on writing performance of Iranian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students. To achieve this objective, a number of forty-six English major learners who were the students from two intact classes at an Islamic Azad University were employed as the participants of this study. The two classes were randomly assigned to a self-assessment group (N=22) who were trained to self-assess their writing tasks and a peer-assessment group (N=24) who were taught to assess the writings of their peers. The study intervention during which self- and peer-assessment practices were carried out for each group lasted for a period of one university semester. The required data were collected through two timed-writing essays administered as the pre-test and post-test of the study. The findings revealed that both self-assessment and peer-assessment were effective in improving the writing abilities of the participants. However, it was found that the students in the peer-assessment group outperformed those in the self-assessment group in terms of writing performance, suggesting that peer-assessment was more effective than self-assessment. The discussions of the results as well as the pedagogical implications of the study were finally presented.

**Keywords:** *Alternative Assessment, Self-Assessment, Peer-Assessment, Writing Performance, EFL*

ARTICLE	The paper received on	Reviewed on	Accepted after revisions on
INFO	06/04/2019	12/05/2019	23/08/2019

#### Suggested citation:

Fathi, J. & Khodabakhsh, M. R. (2019). The Role of Self-Assessment and Peer-Assessment in Improving Writing Performance of Iranian EFL Students. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 7(3), 01-10.

### 1. Introduction

Over the last three decades, language testing has witnessed a paradigm shift from a behaviorist and positivist psychometric approach to a more learning-oriented, constructivist edumetric approach or from a testing paradigm to an assessment paradigm (Gipps, 1994). Within this relatively appealing assessment paradigm, alternative assessment types such as self-assessment, peer-assessment, portfolio assessment and journal keeping have received particular attention in second language assessment (Brown & Hudson, 1998) and have been considered as an effective metacognitive tool to foster learning outcomes of the students (Liu, & Brantmeier, 2019).

From a broader perspective, alternative assessment is considered as a sub-category of *assessment for learning*, or what is known as formative assessment,

which deals with gleaning information about learning and using such information to ameliorate instruction and the process of learning (Black, Harrison, & Lee, 2003). Although gathering and employing information about learners' amount of understanding and learning are customarily assigned to teachers and are among the teachers' duties, peer-assessment and self-assessment have received increasing attention as the effective elements of assessment for learning (Black & Wiliam, 2009). These two types of assessments are claimed to enhance learning and help learners to gain a clear understanding of the assessment criteria which can also foster their own learning (Dochy, Segers, & Sluijsmans, 1999; Stefani, 1994, 1998).

Peer-assessment is conceptualized as a series of actions by which learners evaluate and make judgements about the



work of their peers (Liu, & Brantmeier, 2019). It provides the learners with the opportunities to think about their own learning process, activate and employ their previous knowledge, make inductions, incorporate ideas, compensate for inadequate understandings, and impart information and clarify their understandings (Roscoe & Chi, 2007). Such activities can offer some advantages for learners including enhanced learning and understanding, improved assessment skills, and raised self-confidence (Boud & Falchikov, 2005; Reinholz, 2016). By the same token, self-assessment, as another category of alternative assessment, is defined as a means by which learners themselves assess and make judgements about their own language skills and competencies (Bailey, 1998). Concerning its purported benefits, self-assessment is argued to improve learners' confidence and performance, raise learning self-consciousness and autonomy, lower anxiety and increase self-regulated learning as well as learner-focused instruction (e.g., Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Butler, 2018; Little, 2009; Oscarson, 1989).

As far as L2 writing is concerned, the practitioners should be able to train their learners with good writings habits so that they can produce high-quality written drafts (Baker, 2016). One of such good habits is the fact that longer pieces of writings should be divided into smaller pieces for each of which the learners receive continuous feedback (Bean, 2011). Although such regular feedback provision can be very helpful for students' planned writings and thoughtful revisions, providing continuous feedback is demanding and time-consuming for teachers as they should devote much time to reading the learners' drafts carefully and expressing their opinions on various mechanical, rhetorical, and linguistic dimensions of the writing tasks (Baker, 2016; Herrington & Cadman, 1991). In the meantime, learners are less likely to consistently answer to all feedbacks they receive and may feel uncomfortable or frustrated to be given continuous teacher feedback (Jonsson, 2013). Also, given the limited class hours dedicated to L2 writing classes, teachers may be unable to provide feedback on various drafts of learners in relatively bigger classes. As a result of these seemingly warranted hurdles for L2 writing practitioners, numerous writing researchers have turned to peer-assessment and self-assessment as a viable and alluring

alternative for the traditional teacher-fronted writing assessment classes (Jensen & Fischer, 2005; Topping, 1998).

Moreover, a substantial body of literature in L2 learning acknowledges constructivist perspective as the dominant paradigm governing the main theories and principles in language learning and teaching (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Ellis, 2003). From this perspective, knowledge is not acquired but constructed by learners in a sense that different learners may have their own different construction of knowledge and meanings (von Glasersfeld, 1996). This view also recognizes and validates the active involvement of the learners in the whole process of learning so that a more successful and meaningful learning can be achieved and guaranteed (von Glasersfeld, 2013). Within this line of enquiry, much attention is directed to learners' engagement and participation in the assessment process (Suzuki, 2009). As a result, this heightened interest in the learner involvement as advocated by the constructivist, learner-centered approach lends much credit to self-assessment and peer-assessment as a means by which L2 learners could gain a kind of self-consciousness and metacognitive ability to identify their own strengths and weaknesses and to set more feasible objectives for themselves (Rea-Dickins, 2008).

As far as Iranian EFL context is concerned, a number of empirical studies have investigated the effects of self-assessment and peer-assessment practices on L2 writing (Birjandi & Hadidi Tamjid, 2012; Birjandi & Siyyari, 2011; Iraj, Enayat, & Momeni, 2016; Mazloomi & Khabiri, 2018; among others). Nevertheless, these studies were predominantly quantitative in terms of the employed research methodology designs. The findings obtained from such quantitative studies require further replication in order to gain the basic scientific generalizability of the results (Porte, & Richards, 2012, p.284). According to Porte and Richards (2012), L2 writing is claimed to "present an increasingly diverse nature of scope and topics, which can easily result in conflicting, fragmented, and consequently confusing research outcomes. Replication can help bring some order to this situation by focusing on the "why" of previous findings." Additionally, in the world of practice in Iranian EFL classrooms, L2 writing practitioners still pursue traditional instructional procedures in their own

classrooms and “incorporating formative assessment tools, collaborative tasks, portfolio writing, and other process-and genre-based strategies were among activities absent from the majority of writing classes” (Naghdipour, 2016, p. 85).

Therefore, in order to partially fill these raised gaps and to shed more light on the effectiveness of self-assessment and peer-assessment in enhancing L2 writing performance, the purpose of this study was set to investigate the effect of self-assessment and peer-assessment on writing performance of Iranian EFL students. Moreover, this study sought to compare the effectiveness of the two types of alternative assessment (i.e., self- and peer-assessment) in improving the writing performance of the participants of the study.

## 2. Literature Review

During the late 1990s, language assessment witnessed a kind of paradigm shift by which the positivist norm-referenced paper-and-pencil tests were replaced by more contextualized learner-focused assessments whose primary purpose was to enhance learning rather than to objectively measure what has been learned (Gipps, 1994). In this line of research, much attention was directed towards alternative assessment and its sub-categories as appropriate and viable alternatives to traditional tests (Hamp-Lyons, 2009). As two major types of alternative assessment, self-assessment and peer-assessment have received much attention by L2 scholars and practitioners (Sambell, McDowell, & Montgomery, 2012).

Use of self- and peer-assessment in L2 writing classes have enjoyed substantial research attention in L2 literature and numerous empirical studies have been carried out to evaluate the effectiveness of these two categories of alternative assessment in enhancing writing performance of language learners (Liu & Brantmeier, 2019; Zhao, 2018a, 2018b). Although it is beyond the scope and aim of this study to review all the studies investigating the effects of employing self- and peer-assessment activities in L2 writing classes, to ground the purpose of this study, some of the more illuminative studies are reviewed in this section. For example, Birjandi and Siyyari (2011) probed the impact of self- and peer-assessment practices on writing performance and rating accuracy of Iranian EFL students. The participants of this research were 198 Iranian students of English majors from

different universities. For the purpose of the study intervention, 11 paragraphs during a university semester were written and self-rated or peer-rated by the participants of the two groups. The results revealed that although both self- and peer-assessment activities contributed to enhancing writing performance and the rating accuracy of the learners, the peer-assessment group outperformed the self-assessment group in terms of writing performance.

In another study, Birjandi and Hadidi Tamjid (2012) examined the impact of self-assessment, and peer-assessment on writing performance of EFL learners. In so doing, a number of 157 intermediate English major students were divided into five groups, four of which received particular treatments and one group served as the control group. Group one carried out journal writing as a self-assessment technique. Group two were engaged in self-assessment of their writings, group three used peer-assessment activities, and group four conducted both self-assessment and peer-assessment for their writings. Furthermore, all the groups received teacher assessment except for group four (self-assessment and peer-assessment group). The control group was provided with just teacher assessment. Additionally, there was teacher assessment in all experimental groups, except the fourth group, i.e., the self- and peer assessment group. The findings of the study indicated that group two (self-assessment) and group three (peer-assessment) had the highest positive influence on writing enhancement of the study participants.

In another study, Khonbi and Sadeghi (2012) probed the impact of self-assessment, peer-assessment, and teacher assessment on achievement of Iranian EFL learners. In so doing, four intact groups from three universities were randomly assigned into one of the three types of assessments (i.e., self-, peer-, teacher-assessments) and one control group. The results of this research revealed significant differences among the groups. Overall, it was found that peer-assessment group outperformed the other three groups. The second highest performance was that of self-assessment group, followed by the teacher-assessment group. Similarly, Iraj, Enayat, and Momeni (2016) probed the impact of self-assessment and peer-assessment practices on the writing ability of Iranian EFL students in argumentative writings. To this end, thirty-six intermediate EFL learners were chosen and became homogeneous according to the



results of an administered Oxford Quick Placement Test and an argumentative essay serving as the pretest of the research. The participants were then randomly assigned to groups of control and experimental conditions. The written essays of the students in the control group were rated employing traditional teacher-based assessments, whereas self-assessment and peer-assessment activities were practiced in rating the compositions of the experimental group. The findings of this study revealed that the use of self-assessment and peer-assessment activities contributed to enhancing the argumentative writing competence of the participants.

In another study, Ratminingsih, Marhaeni, and Vigayanti (2018) investigated the impact of self-assessment on learners' independence and writing ability. To this end, the effect of self-assessment activities on writing performance of two groups of Indonesian learners were examined in terms of three genre texts. The study involved an experimental group engaged in self-assessment activities while the control groups were exposed to only teacher assessment. A valid questionnaire for learners' independence and writing competence tests were administered to measure the required data. The results of the study revealed that self-assessment was conducive in improving learner autonomy and writing ability. Conducting a similar study in Iranian context, Mazloomi and Khabiri (2018) explored the effect of self-assessment practices used in writing instruction on L2 learners' writing skills and traced the changes in their language achievement. The participants were sixty Iranian university students from two homogeneous groups which were assigned to an experimental group and a control group. Although both groups were provided the same writing tasks and activities, the control group were just required to revise their own written drafts and did not receive any training and practice of self-assessment activities. The results of the study showed that self-assessment significantly improved the learners' writing performance and their global language abilities.

In a recent study, Liu and Brantmeier (2019) investigated self-assessment of reading and writing skills and the correlation between self-assessment and scores on objective tests of reading and writing abilities. The participants of this study were one hundred and six young Chinese EFL

learners. A reading comprehension test, a writing task, and a self-assessment questionnaire were given to the participants. The results obtained from correlational analyses revealed that scores of self-assessment were highly correlated with reading comprehension and writing production scores. Taking a socio-cultural perspective, Zhao (2018a) proposed and verified a process-oriented approach to unveil the peer review process in EFL writing. In so doing, 13 pairs of Chinese university learners were instructed how to peer review writings and then they carried out peer review of numerous writing genres. The interactions between pairs were analyzed with regard to patterns of interaction, mediation strategies, and learning chances revealed by focusing on oral peer interactions. Overall, the qualitative and quantitative findings of this study emphasized the significance of peer interactions and oral feedbacks in creating a proper learning setting for successful peer review in L2 writing.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Participants**

A number of 46 Iranian English major students took part in this research. The participants of this study were students from two intact classes who were studying English literature at an Islamic Azad University in Iran. The participants consisted of both male and female learners with their ages ranging from 20 to 25 and the mean age of 21.26. At the time of the conduction of the study, the students were passing an English writing course, as an obligatory two-credit course for the undergraduate students of English majors. The intervention lasted for 12 weeks during which a two-hour session class was held every week. The two intact classes were randomly assigned to a self-assessment group (N= 22) and a peer-assessment group (N= 24). Owing to the potential influence of general language proficiency on the writing performance, a standard test of English proficiency was administered to the students of both groups before the conduction of the intervention of the study. The purpose of administering the language proficiency test was to investigate the homogeneity of the participants with regard to general language ability.

#### **3.2 Instruments**

##### **Language Proficiency Test**

In order to homogenize the participants in terms of general English



proficiency, Oxford Placement Test (OPT) (Allen, 2004) was administered to the students of both groups (self- and peer-assessment). OPT is considered as a reliable and valid standard English proficiency test which can be administered to different number of learners with various proficiency levels (Allen, 2004). The version of OPT used in this study contained multiple-choice items measuring vocabulary, grammar, and reading. There was also an optional writing section. The internal consistency of this test as estimated by Cronbach's alpha in the present study was reported to be 0.81.

#### **Timed-writing Essays**

To measure the writing performance of the participants before (i.e., as the pre-test) and after the treatment (i.e., as the post-test), two 45-minute writing essays were administered to the participants of both groups. To this end, two general topics which did not require any particular technical background knowledge were assigned for each administration.

**Topic 1:** Some people argue that it might be better that children are raised in the countryside than in big cities. What is your opinion?

**Topic 2:** Some people argue that success is the result of hard work and luck has no effect on someone's success. What is your opinion?

#### **3.3 The Writing Scoring Scale**

In order to score the participants' essays, Jacobs et al.'s (1981) writing scale was used which is mainly based on an analytical scoring procedure. The effectiveness of this writing scoring rubric has been verified by Brown and Baily (1984). According to this scale, a written text or an essay should be evaluated against a set of five criteria or subcategories such as content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. This rubric consists of a 100-point scheme based on which 30 points are devoted to the content, 25 points to language use (mainly syntax), 20 points to organization, 20 points to vocabulary use, and 5 points to mechanics. To ensure the inter-rater reliability of the given scores to the essays, about 30 percent of the written essays for both topics in the pre-test and the post-test were rated by two independent researchers who were familiar with the scoring rubric. The given scores of the two raters as well as those of the researchers were evaluated by Cohen's Kappa's inter-rater reliability test. The measured reliability index turned out to be 0.80.

#### **3.4 Procedure**

As discussed above, before the start of experiment, the language proficiency test (i.e., OPT) was administered to the participants of the two intact classes so as to get sure about the homogeneity of them. Then a timed-writing essay (Topic 1) was given to the participants of both the self-assessment group and the peer-assessment group as the pre-test of the study in order to measure their writing performance prior to starting the interventions. According to this pre-test, all the participants were required to write an English essay on the assigned topic (Topic 1) in a 45-minute allocated time.

Afterwards, the writing course, in which one two-hour session was held each week, the basics of paragraph writing were instructed. For the objectives of the present study, self-assessment and peer-assessment practices were conducted in the two experimental groups. The same materials and coursebook were employed by the same instructors in both classes. The main employed coursebook was *Paragraph Development* (Arnaudet & Barrett, 1990).

During the early sessions of the treatment, the basic instructions on writing a paragraph were provided to the students. These basic instructions included detailed explanations on how to brainstorm on a topic, to write a topic sentence, to support main idea by using supporting sentences, to write concluding sentences to restate the main idea, to relate sentences with each other through transition expressions, and to write more cohesive and coherent paragraphs. Moreover, the students were taught on how to develop a better introductory, body, and concluding paragraphs. In addition, the students of both self- and peer-assessment groups were trained on how to use the writing scoring rubric to assess the written tasks and essays. To accomplish the particular objectives of the study, the students of the peer-assessment group were required to assess the written tasks and the paragraphs of their peers on a regular basis, whereas the students in the self-assessment group were required to assess their own written paragraphs and tasks. When the treatment sessions were completed, another timed writing essay (Topic 2) was administered to the both groups to measure their writing ability as the post- test of the study.

#### **4. Results**

As previously discussed, first OPT was first given to the participants to ensure that they are not of heterogeneous language proficiency backgrounds. The reason for



administering OPT was the fact that writing performance can be influenced by the global language proficiency. Then in order to compare the OPT mean scores of the two groups, an independent-samples t-test was performed. The results of the independent-samples t-test (see Table 1) indicated that there was not any statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the peer-assessment group ( $M = 41.92$ ,  $SD = 11.26$ ) and the self-assessment ( $M = 44.42$ ,  $SD = 11.31$ );  $t(44) = -.796$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), suggesting that the both groups were not heterogeneous with regard to global English competence before beginning the intervention.

*Table 1: Results of the OPT for each group*

Groups	M (SD)	T	Sig.
Peer-assessment	41.92 (11.26)	-.796	.430
Self-assessment	44.42 (11.31)		

Then for the purpose of examining the effects of peer- and self-assessment activities on the writing performance of the participants, two paired-samples t-test were performed to evaluate the change in the mean scores of both groups from the pretest to posttest. As seen in Table 2, there was a statistically significant increase from the pretest to posttest of writing performance for both the peer-assessment group ( $t(23) = -9.67$ ,  $p < 0.00$ ) and the self-assessment group ( $t(21) = -7.77$ ,  $p < 0.00$ ). As presented in Table 2, the writing performance mean score for the peer-assessment group increased from 11.35 on the pretest to 14.79 on the posttest. By the same token, the writing performance mean score of the self-assessment group was raised from 10.90 on the pretest to 12.72 on the posttest. These results showed that writing performance of both groups increased significantly after experiencing the two interventions.

*Table 2: Paired samples t-test for writing performance scores*

Groups	Pre-test		Post-test		T	Sig.
	M	SD	M	SD		
Peer-assessment	11.35	3.09	14.79	2.68	-9.67	0.00
Self-assessment	10.90	3.14	12.72	3.16	-7.77	0.00

Furthermore, a One-Way Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was performed on writing performance scores to evaluate the effects of the two types of alternative assessments employed in the present study on the L2 writing performance. The independent variable was the type of intervention (i.e. self-assessment versus

peer-assessment), and the dependent variable was the participants' scores on the post-test of timed-writing essay. The pre-test scores of writing performance were considered as the covariate in the ANCOVA analysis.

Assumption evaluations revealed that the assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance, linearity and homogeneity of regression slopes were all satisfactory. More particularly, the assumption of homogeneity of regression slope was investigated by testing the interaction effect of the independent variable and the covariate. The interaction effect of writing performance on the pre-test and the independent variable was not significant ( $p = 0.09$ ).

The results of the ANCOVA analysis (see Table 3) using the General Linear Modeling approach in SPSS showed that a statistically significant difference existed between the peer-assessment group and self-assessment group in the mean scores on the posttest of writing performance;  $F(1, 43) = 17.13$ ,  $p = 0.000$ , partial eta squared = 0.28). These results indicated that doing peer-assessment practices was more effective than doing self-assessment activities in improving writing performance of the participants.

*Table 3: ANCOVA results for writing performance scores*

Source	Type III Sum of Squares		Mean Square		F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
	Squares	df	Square	F			
Corrected Model	342.873 <sup>a</sup>	2	171.437	89.500	.000	.806	
Intercept	66.070	1	66.070	34.493	.000	.445	
Pre-writing	293.956	1	293.956	153.462	.000	.781	
Group	32.825	1	32.825	17.137	.000	.285	
Error	82.366	43	1.915				
Total	9191.000	46					
Corrected Total	425.239	45					

## 5. Discussion and Conclusions

In order to shed more light on the role of alternative assessment in fostering L2 learning and to replicate the previous similar studies in order to increase the generalizability of results, as recommended by researchers (e.g., Porte, & Richards, 2012), this study was set to investigate the effect of self-assessment and peer-assessment on writing performance of a sample of Iranian EFL students. The findings of this study revealed that both self- and peer-assessment contributed to improving the writing performance of the participants. This finding is in line with the findings of a significant bulk of previous studies (Birjandi & Hadidi Tamjid, 2012;

Birjandi & Siyyari, 2011; Iraj, Enayat, & Momeni, 2016; Liu & Brantmeier, 2019; Mazloomi & Khabiri, 2018; Ratminingsih et al., 2018; among others). Furthermore, this finding is consistent with a substantial body of research suggesting that learners' involvement in the assessment and feedback process enhances the quality of the written drafts (e.g., Jensen & Fischer, 2005; Reiber, 2006; Topping et al., 2000).

To justify such finding, it can be argued that self-assessment and peer-assessment have made the writers integrate the learned standards and criteria for better writing into their own revisions thereby increasing the quality of their final written drafts. Moreover, the participants' involvement in self-assessment and peer-assessment activities is likely to foster their sense of autonomy, agency, and self-regulation which helped them to critically analyze their own drafts and to try hard to refine their written essays.

Moreover, the results of the data analysis indicated that the peer-assessment group outperformed the self-assessment group in writing performance measured by timed-writing essays. This finding concurs with the findings of a significant number of previous studies which found peer-assessment to be more effective than self-assessment in enhance EFL writing performance (Birjandi & Hadidi Tamjid, 2012; Birjandi & Siyyari, 2011; Hughes & Large, 1993; among others).

The improved performance of the peer-assessment group can be attributed to the fact that writers are likely exert more effort and pay more attention to their writing tasks as they know their peers will see and make judgements about their writings. This justification has been put forward and verified by some researchers (e.g., Brindley & Scofield, 1998; Gao, Schunn, & Yu, 2019; Reinholz, 2016; Schriver, 1989). Additionally, it might be argued that peer-assessment practices encouraged the participants to become much involved in identifying the errors of their peers and to become more familiar with writing assessment checklists, a situation which raised the participants' awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses. This finding is also in line with that of Lundstrom and Baker (2009) who found that L2 writers can enhance their own quality of writing by transferring their acquired abilities through reviewing the writings of their peers. Furthermore, the findings of their study revealed that the learners who were trained

to give peer feedback enhanced their own writing competencies more than the learners who were taught to just use the feedbacks of peers. Similarly, Li, Liu, & Steckelberg (2010) found that the feedback quality provided by the student reviewers to their peers is correlated with the improved performance of the reviewers' final products.

From the theoretical point of view, the role of peer-assessment in improving the writing ability can be also justified through socio-cultural theory by underscoring the effectiveness of other-regulation (i.e., receiving feedback from peers) in improving learning outcomes (Lantolf & Aljaafreh, 1995). From socio-cultural perspective, language learning is facilitated and developed first through other regulation achieved via social interaction and then internalized through self-regulation (Vygotsky, 1978).

As far as pedagogical implications of the study are concerned, it is recommended that L2 policy makers, curriculum developers, syllabus designers, teacher educators, test developers, and practitioners take alternative assessment on the board more seriously. Given that fact that the vast majority of Iranian EFL writing classes are still teacher-centered and traditional with little students' participation in assessment (Naghdipour, 2016), alternative assessments such as peer- and self-assessment might be a promising platform not only to enhance the learners' quality of writing but also to raise their writing motivation and self-confidence. Implementing peer-assessment and self-assessment practices in their own classrooms, EFL teachers can assign a more responsible and autonomous role to their learners by means of which a more motivational and self-regulated learning is induced and sustained. However, such a change should be initiated from the top where the policy-makers, stake-holders, and curriculum developers should adopt a more learner-focused perspective by allowing more active involvement of the L2 learners in their own learning assessment. Fulfillment of such a goal requires that teacher education programs prepare the prospective and in-service teachers to be equipped with both competence and willingness to implement self-assessment and peer-assessment activities in their L2 classrooms in general and in writing instruction in particular. Moreover, syllabus designers and test developers should also design and develop test tasks and activities





which encourage learners' participation in their own assessment process.

Given the significance of alternative assessment in L2 learning as well as the given the fact that replication studies in L2 writing research are highly recommended (Porte, & Richards, 2012), carrying out further empirical research into the role of alternative assessment in enhancing writing abilities with bigger samples of participants in different contexts appears to be much warranted. In addition, future researchers may examine the impacts of self- and peer-assessment on different dimensions of writing skill such as complexity, fluency, and accuracy. Moreover, because the dynamics of peer-assessment especially dialogic and scaffolding techniques mediating the learners' understanding of peer-assessment and feedback may be less-discovered (Yu & Lee, 2016), conduction of future qualitative studies are pressingly needed to gain more insight on the dynamic of peer-assessment practices and their effect of writing skills.

### References

- Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 465-483.
- Allen, D. (2004). *Oxford placement test 1*. Oxford: OUP.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bailey, K. M. (1998). *Learning about language assessment: Dilemmas, decisions, and directions*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Baker, K. M. (2016). Peer review as a strategy for improving students' writing process. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17(3), 179-192.
- Barrett, M. E., & Arnaudet, M. C. (1990). *Paragraph Development: A Guide for Students of English*. Prentice Hall Regents.
- Bean, J. C. (2011). *Engaging ideas: The professor's guide to integrating writing, critical thinking, and active learning in the classroom*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Birjandi, P., & Hadidi Tamjid, N. (2012). The role of self-, peer and teacher assessment in promoting Iranian EFL learners' writing performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(5), 513-533.
- Birjandi, P. & Siyyari, M. (2011). Self-assessment and peer-assessment: A comparative study of their effect on writing performance and rating accuracy. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 23-45.
- Black, P., Harrison, C., & Lee, C. (2003). *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability (formerly: Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education)*, 21(1), 5.
- Boud, D., & Falchikov, N. (2005). Redesigning assessment for learning beyond higher education. *Research and development in higher education*, 28(special issue), 34-41.
- Brindley, C., & Scoffield, S. (1998). Peer assessment in undergraduate programmes. *Teaching in higher education*, 3(1), 79-90.
- Brown, J. D., & Hudson, T. (1998). The alternatives in language assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 653-675.
- Butler, Y. G. (2018). The role of context in young learners' processes for responding to self-assessment items. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102(1), 242-261.
- Dochy, F. J. R. C., Segers, M., & Sluijsmans, D. (1999). The use of self-, peer and co-assessment in higher education: A review. *Studies in Higher education*, 24(3), 331-350.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Gao, Y., Schunn, C. D. D., & Yu, Q. (2019). The alignment of written peer feedback with draft problems and its impact on revision in peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(2), 294-308.
- Gipps, C. V. (1994). *Beyond testing: Towards a theory of educational assessment*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (2009). Principles for large-scale classroom-based teacher assessment of English learners' language: An initial framework from school-based assessment in Hong Kong. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(3), 524-529.
- Herrington, A. J., & Cadman, D. (1991). Peer review and revising in an anthropology course: Lessons for learning. *College*



- Composition and Communication*, 42(2), 184-199.
- Hughes, I. E., & Large, B. J. (1993). Staff and peer-group assessment of oral communication skills. *Studies in Higher Education*, 18(3), 379-385.
- Iraji, H. R., Enayat, M. J., & Momeni, M. (2016). The effects of self-and peer-assessment on Iranian EFL learners' argumentative writing performance. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(4), 716-722.
- Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Jensen, W., & Fischer, B. (2005). Teaching technical writing through student peer-evaluation. *Journal of technical writing and communication*, 35(1), 95-100.
- Jonsson, A. (2013). Facilitating productive use of feedback in higher education. *Active learning in higher education*, 14(1), 63-76.
- Khonbi, Z. A., & Sadeghi, K. (2012). The Effect of Assessment Type (self vs. peer vs. teacher) on Iranian University EFL Students' Course Achievement. *Language Testing in Asia*, 2(4), 47.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Aljaafreh, A. (1995). Second language learning in the zone of proximal development: A revolutionary experience. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 23(7), 619-632.
- Li, L., Liu, X., & Steckelberg, A. L. (2010). Assessor or assessee: How student learning improves by giving and receiving peer feedback. *British journal of educational technology*, 41(3), 525-536.
- Little, D. (2009). Language learner autonomy and the European language portfolio: Two L2 English examples. *Language Teaching: Surveys and Studies*, 42(2), 222-233.
- Liu, H., & Brantmeier, C. (2019). "I know English": Self-assessment of foreign language reading and writing abilities among young Chinese learners of English. *System*, 80, 60-72.
- Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of second language writing*, 18(1), 30-43.
- Mazloomi, S., & Khabiri, M. (2018). The impact of self-assessment on language learners' writing skill. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55(1), 91-100.
- Naghdi-pour, B. (2016). English writing instruction in Iran: Implications for second language writing curriculum and pedagogy. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 32, 81-87.
- Oscarson, M. (1989). Self-assessment of language proficiency: rationale and implications. *Language Testing*, 6 (1), 1-13.
- Porte, G., & Richards, K. (2012). Focus article: Replication in second language writing research. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(3), 284-293.
- Rea-Dickins, P. (2008). Classroom-based language assessment. *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 2391-2405.
- Ratminingsih, N. M., Marhaeni, A. A. I. N., & Vigayanti, L. P. D. (2018). Self-Assessment: The Effect on Students' Independence and Writing Competence. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(3), 277-290.
- Reinholz, D. (2016). The assessment cycle: a model for learning through peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(2), 301-315.
- Rieber, L. J. (2006). Using peer review to improve student writing in business courses. *Journal of Education for Business*, 81(6), 322-326.
- Roscoe, R. D., & Chi, M. T. (2007). Understanding tutor learning: Knowledge-building and knowledge-telling in peer tutors' explanations and questions. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(4), 534-574.
- Sambell, K., McDowell, L., & Montgomery, C. (2012). *Assessment for learning in higher education*. Routledge.
- Schrifer, K. A. (1989). Evaluating text quality: The continuum from text-focused to reader-focused methods. *IEEE Transactions on professional communication*, 32(4), 238-255.
- Stefani, L. A. (1994). Peer, self and tutor assessment: Relative reliabilities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 22(3), 289-306.
- Stefani, L. A. (1998). Assessment in partnership with learners. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 23(4), 339-350.
- Suzuki, M. (2009). The compatibility of L2 learners' assessment of self-and peer revisions of writing with teachers' assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(1), 137-148.
- Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276.



- Topping, K., Smith, E., Swanson., I. & Elliot, A. (2000). Formative peer assessment of academic writing. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 25(2), 149-169.
- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Exploring Chinese students' strategy use in a cooperative peer feedback writing group. *System*, 58, 1-11.
- Von Glasersfeld, E. (1996). Footnotes to 'the many faces of constructivism'. *Educational researcher*, 25(6), 19.
- Von Glasersfeld, E. (2013). *Radical constructivism*. Routledge.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Readings on the development of children*, 23(3), 34-41.
- Zhao, H. (2018a). New insights into the process of peer review for EFL writing: A process-oriented socio-cultural perspective. *Learning and Instruction*, 58, 263-273.
- Zhao, H. (2018b). Exploring tertiary English as a Foreign Language writing tutors' perceptions of the appropriateness of peer assessment for writing. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(7), 1133-1145.