

Enhancing Second Language Writing Self-regulation Through Self-assessment and Peer-assessment: A Case of Iranian EFL Learners

Jalil Fathi^{1*}, Sara Mohebinia², Saeed Nourzadeh³

¹University of Kurdistan, Iran

²Islamic Azad University Central Tehran Branch, Iran

³Damghan University, Iran

Corresponding Author: Jalil Fathi, E-mail: jfathi13@yahoo.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: February 17, 2019

Accepted: March 19, 2019

Published: May 31, 2019

Volume: 8 Issue: 3

Advance access: April 2019

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the effect of self-assessment and peer-assessment activities on second language (L2) writing self-regulation of Iranian English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners. For this purpose, a sample of forty-six English major students from two intact classes at an Iranian Islamic Azad University were recruited as the participants of the present study. Then, the two classes were randomly assigned to a self-assessment group (N=22) and a peer-assessment group (N=24). The self-assessment group was instructed on the writing assessment criteria in order to self-assess their writing tasks and the peer-assessment group was trained on how to assess the writings of their peers. The treatment carried out for the self-assessment and peer-assessment groups lasted for a period of one university semester. The data was collected through Second Language Writing Self-regulation (SLWS) administered as the pre-test and post-test of the study. The results obtained from the data analysis indicated that both self-assessment and peer-assessment were conducive in enhancing L2 writing self-regulation of the participants. Nevertheless, further analysis of the data indicated that the participants in the peer-assessment group were better than those in the self-assessment group with regard to writing self-regulation, suggesting that peer-assessment activities were more effective than the self-assessment activities in contributing to enhancing writing self-regulation of the EFL learners. The justification of the findings and their implications for L2 writing pedagogy are also discussed.

Key words: Alternative Assessment, Self-Assessment, Peer-Assessment, Writing Self-Regulation, Efl

INTRODUCTION

In reaction to the traditional notions of psychometrics and test-oriented language evaluation, the concept of edumetrics (also known as educational assessment) gained considerable popularity among those second language (L2) researchers and testing scholars who favored learner-centered language assessment (Hamayan, 1995; Lambert & Lines, 2013; Reeves & Okey, 1996). This kind of paradigm shift favors a constructivist and more learner-focused approach the primary concern of which is to enhance learning and induce positive cognitive functioning among language learners (Gipps, 1994). In line with this shift of orientation, *alternative assessment* was widely acknowledged as the chance which would make learners continuously construct language and perform in more real-life language contexts (Brown & Hudson, 1998). Self-assessment and peer-assessment in L2 learning are considered as a sub-category of alternative assessment (Alderson & Banerjee, 2001). Overall, alternative assessment types are viewed as beneficial because of some of their qualities such as fast administration, learners'

engagement in the process of assessment, and increasing L2 learners' motivation and sense of autonomy (Brown & Hudson, 1998). As sub-categories of alternative assessment, self-assessment and peer-assessment are also referred to as assessment for learning in the literature, a conceptualization which prioritizes students' learning and their motivation for assessment rather than addressing ranking, accountability, and certification purposes (Black et al., 2006). It is argued that assessment types are designed to enhance students' learning and their intrinsic motivation (e.g., Birjandi & Siyyari, 2011; Brown, 2005). Moreover, self-assessment and peer-assessment are argued to have the potential to foster independent and autonomous learning (Black & Wiliam 1998; Sambell, McDowell, & Montgomery, 2012).

Alternative assessment has been widely applied in both L2 writing research and practice. Originally, alternative assessment was a response to the emerging concerns in practice to engage learners more in the process of assessment so that the challenge of dissociation between assessment and instruction in L2 writing could be tackled. Later, research-

ers showed interest in alternative assessment and undertook theoretical and empirical studies to examine its different aspects. The theoretical camp provided arguments as to why alternative assessment should be tried in language classrooms, and most of these arguments were based on the constructivist school of education which is discussed in the next section. In the empirical camp, the conducted studies traced positive effects for different forms of alternative L2 writing assessment on such aspects as L2 writing performance (Birjandi & Hadidi Tamjid, 2012; Birjandi & Siyyari, 2011) and rating accuracy (Liu & Brantmeier, 2019).

However, the vast majority of these studies have explored the effects of assessment practices (i.e., self-assessment and peer-assessment) on the production dimensions of L2 writing ability as the main dependent variable, ignoring the psychological writing-related factors. This line of inquiry disregards the fact that L2 writing is a complex process which requires synchronization of multiple linguistic and affective variables (Kellogg, 1996). Therefore, the investigation of non-cognitive variables related to L2 writing is highly underscored by L2 writing researchers (Han & Hiver, 2018; Piniel & Csizér, 2015). In addition, since L2 learning and teaching is currently considered to be dynamic (Hiver & Al-Hoorie, 2016), the intricate interplay between L2 learners' individual differences and their context-dependent idiosyncrasies becomes more significant (Larsen-Freeman, 2016). On the bright side, some researchers have gone to focus their attention on the psychological processes emerging from self-assessment and peer-assessment as they are related to L2 writing, including L2 writing autonomy and reflection (e.g., Khodadady & Khodabakhshzade, 2012; Sullivan & Lindgren, 2002); yet, there are some other processes that remain untouched by this latter line of inquiry. For example, self-regulation in L2 writing comprises an area which has been generally overlooked by researchers working on self-assessment and peer-assessment of L2 learning and performance. This is the case even though self-regulation has crept into investigations of other aspects of L2 learning and use (e.g., Hashamdar & Maleki, 2018; Lam, 2014; McDonough, 2001; Moyer, 2014). Therefore, in order to shed more light on the effect of self-assessment and peer-assessment on psychological L2 writing variables, this research was set to examine the effects of these assessment types on the L2 writing self-regulation of English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners.

Literature Review

This section presents a selective literature review of self-assessment and peer-assessment, with a focus on their theoretical background, definitions, and implications for L2 writing research. The concept of alternative assessment, particularly self-assessment and peer-assessment, is strongly rooted in the constructivist school of thinking in the realm of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research. An accumulated body of literature has recognized constructivism as the dominant paradigm currently feeding the key methods and principles in language learning and teaching (Ellis, 2003; Lantolf, Thorne, & Poehner, 2015). According to this constructivist

view, knowledge is co-constructed by students differently in that various learners are likely to have their own method of co-construction of knowledge in their own learning context (Lantolf & Aljaafreh, 1995; von Glasersfeld, 1996). This SLA paradigm also lends much support to the active engagement of learners in their own learning process (von Glasersfeld, 2013). Subscribing to this view of knowledge construction, numerous L2 researchers and testing experts have exerted much attention to learners' involvement in the assessment and testing activities (Lee, 2017). Therefore, this newly directed attention to learner involvement and learner-centered approaches legitimizes self-assessment and peer-assessment activities as effective means by which L2 learners could acquire self-awareness and metacognitive competencies to understand their own strengths and weaknesses, and to be able to set more achievable learning objectives for themselves (Rea-Dickins, 2008).

Self-assessment is conceptualized as a process through which learners evaluate and judge their own underlying language abilities and skills (Bailey, 1998). With regard to its usually mentioned advantages, self-assessment is claimed to enhance learners' confidence and self-efficacy, increase learning autonomy, reduce learning anxiety, and foster self-regulated learning (e.g., Butler, 2018; Little, 2009). In addition, this assessment strategy would provide teachers, materials designers, and curriculum developers with useful information about learners' language and learning needs (Blanche and Merino, 1989), without pressuring them to undertake tedious needs analysis projects (Oscarson, 1989). Likewise, peer-assessment, as another subcategory of alternative assessment, can be defined as a set of operations by which learners can assess and judge the learning activities and performance of their peers (Liu and Brantmeier, 2019). This type of assessment encourages learners to reconsider their learning activities, actuate and use their background knowledge, make inferences, organize concepts, clarify ambiguities, and communicate information with one another (Roscoe and Chi, 2007). Peer-assessment activities can provide learners with some advantages such as improved learning as well as understanding, fostered assessment skills, and bolstered self-confidence. It is believed that these advantages of peer-assessment are influential in the ultimate attainment of the L2 knowledge and skills (Reinholz, 2016).

As the purposes of the present study are concerned, these positive effects of self-assessment and peer-assessment on L2 writing have been empirically supported. A large variety of studies have provided evidence that self-assessment and peer-assessment would lead to improving different aspects of L2 writing in language learners (e.g., Birjandi and Hadidi Tamjid, 2012; Birjandi & Siyyari, 2011; Brown, 2005; Khodadady & Khodabakhshzade, 2012; Sally, 2005). Fortunately, a number of these studies have been conducted to examine the effects of self-assessment and peer-assessment activities on L2 writing within the Iranian EFL context, the same context in which the present study was undertaken. Due to space limitations, this literature review would mostly focus on the empirical studies done in the Iranian EFL context, but the study would also narrowly review studies

from other EFL contexts in order to help the readership have a deeper understanding about the current status of self-assessment and peer-assessment with respect L2 writing in the EFL context.

To begin with, Birjandi and Siyyari (2011) addressed the very immediate question of whether self-assessment and peer-assessment would have influential effects on EFL learners' L2 writing performance. The researchers also aimed to determine whether their participants' writing evaluations via self-assessment and peer-assessment were reliable and dependable. To serve these purposes, the researchers sampled and grouped 198 Iranian EFL learners. The groups of the participants included a control group, a self-assessment group, and a peer-assessment group. During a semester, the participants wrote eleven separate paragraphs on different topics. Once each paragraph was written, the participants in the self-assessment group were asked to rate their own writing while those in the peer-assessment group were asked to evaluate the writings of their peers in the classroom. Finally, the writing performance of the participants in the control group was evaluated by their language teacher (i.e., teacher assessment). The results of the study demonstrated that, though the L2 writing performance of all the three treatment groups improved over the treatment sessions, the improvement was more limited for the control group than for the self-assessment and peer-assessment groups. In fact, the largest improvement was obtained by the participants in the self-assessment group. The researchers also found that the accuracy of the L2 rating done by the participants in the self-assessment and peer-assessment group improved after the nine sessions of treatment, and that there was no significant difference between the two groups in the degree of improvement in the rating accuracy. In fact, during the last sessions of assessment, a high convergence was observed between the ratings done by the participants in these two groups and the ratings based on the criterion measures, meaning that the participants could evaluate their own writings, and the writings of their peers in the classroom, in a reliable fashion.

In another study, Birjandi and Hadidi Tamjid (2012) examined the role of self-assessment and peer-assessment in promoting the L2 writing performance of EFL learners in Iran. The researchers randomly assigned 157 Iranian EFL learners at the intermediate level to five different treatment groups; i.e., 1) the first group accomplished journal writing as a self-assessment technique (JW group), 2) the second group were asked to self-assess their own writing performance (SA group), 3) the participants in the third group assessed the writing performance of their peers (PA group), 4) the participants in the fourth group assessed their own writing and those of their peers (i.e., both self-assessment and peer-assessment) (SA+PA group), and 5) a control group in which the teacher assessed the participants' writings (TA group). It is also necessary to mention that the three first groups also received teacher assessment on their writing performance in addition to their respective treatment (i.e. journal writing, self-assessment, or peer-assessment). The results of the study indicated that there were no significant differ-

ences between the performance of the participants in the JW group and the other four treatment groups on the criterion writing test. On the other hand, the results showed that the all the three groups in which alternative assessment was employed (i.e., SA, PA, and SA+PA groups) outperformed the control group in the criterion L2 writing test. In addition, the group receiving both types of alternative assessment (SA+PA group) gained the highest mean score on the criterion L2 writing test. Based on these results, the researchers went to claim that both self-assessment and peer-assessment are effective in improving L2 writing performance, and that a mixture of both assessment types would yield the best outcomes.

In a more recent study conducted outside the Iranian EFL context, Liu and Brantmeier (2019) examined the effects of self-assessment on L2 writing performance within the EFL context in China. The researchers were specifically interested in the questions of whether Chinese EFL could assess their own writing performance as reliably as possible. For this research purpose, they had 106 Chinese learners of English to rate their own abilities for self-assessment of L2 writing. The participants were also required to accomplish a writing task as a measure of their L2 writing performance. The purpose was to examine whether there was an association between the participants' perceptions of their own rating abilities and their actual L2 writing ability. The results of the study indicated that the participants in Liu and Brantmeier's investigation had a high level of ability to assess their own English writing performance. In fact, it was found that the participants' self-assessment abilities for L2 writing were more reliable than their self-assessment abilities for L2 reading comprehension, which constituted another assessment variable in the study. Moreover, Liu and Brantmeier obtained a positive correlation between the participants' perceptions of their rating skills for L2 writing and L2 writing performance. To conclude, Liu and Brantmeier (2019) found that language teachers can rely on their students' abilities to rate their own L2 writing and that, learners' perceptions of their rating abilities are related to their L2 writing abilities.

As self-regulation is the target variable in the present study, it is now felt necessary to give an overview of this concept so that the readership can understand the purposes of the study more clearly. As an affective variable, L2 writing self-regulation builds upon the main assumptions of the broader concept of self-regulated learning (Han & Hiver, 2018). Self-regulated learning is concerned with goal-directed, self-initiated, and monitored emotions and activities which lead to accomplishing learning objectives (Zimmerman, 2001). These emotions and activities determine the learner's level of engagement in regulating, planning, and monitoring his own learning process as well as the extent to which the learner is able to take charge of his own learning (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2012). L2 learners with high levels of self-regulation are actively involved in their learning process and are competent in planning, setting objectives, and regulating their strategic knowledge while doing language tasks (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). As far as L2 writing is concerned, self-regulation can be very influential in directing, planning, and regulating attention as well as efforts

of L2 learners in understanding and appreciating writing tasks more effectively (Teng & Zhang, 2016). From Han and Hiver's (2018) perspective, L2 writing self-regulation can be defined as writers' strategic endeavor in organizing and managing writing-related objectives and tasks.

The literature review demonstrated that self-assessment and peer-assessment can lead to improving L2 writing skills in language learners through providing them with a platform for internalization of L2 writing skills (self-assessment) or co-construction of L2 writing skills. It was also shown that evaluations based on self-assessment and peer-assessment can be considered as reliable and dependable as the literature has shown that there is convergence between the results of these assessment types and the results obtained from established methods (e.g., teacher assessment). Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, researchers have also shown interests in examining the effects of these types of assessment on psychological processes involved in L2 writing. With respect to this last issue, however, L2 writing self-regulation remains a topic unexamined in the area of alternative assessment of L2 writing knowledge and skills. Research on self-regulation in L2 writing is very rich at the present time (see Csizér and Tankó (2015) and Rose et al. (2018) for reviews on the issue); yet, the concept of self-regulation in L2 writing have been less examined with respect to self-assessment and peer-assessment, particularly within the Iranian EFL context. To fill this research gap, this study was set to investigate the effects that self-assessment and peer-assessment in L2 writing sessions would exert on the development of L2 writing self-regulation among Iranian EFL learners.

METHOD

Participants

A sample of forty six Iranian English major students served as the participants of this research. The participants were college students from two intact classes who were studying English literature at the Islamic Azad University in Iran. The students included both male and female students whose ages varied from 20 to 25 ($M = 21.26$). In fact, the participants of this study were taking an English writing course as an obligatory two-credit course for the undergraduate students of English majors. The experiment lasted for a semester equal to 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 ($N = 24$). Because of the potential effect of overall language proficiency on the L2 writing self-regulation, a standard test of English proficiency was given to the participants of both groups prior to the initiation of the study experiment. The reason for administering the language proficiency test was to ensure the homogeneity of the students regarding general language ability.

Instruments

Language proficiency test

For the purpose of homogenizing the participants in terms of general English proficiency, Oxford Placement Test (OPT)

(Allen, 2004) was administered to the participants from 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 assessing 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.

Second language writing self-regulation (SLWS)

This L2 writing self-regulation scale (SLWS) developed by Han and Hiver (2018) was given to self- and peer-assessment groups in order to measure their level of writing self-regulation before and after the experiment. SLWS consisted of items adapted from Tseng, Dörnyei and Schmitt (2006, as cited in Han & Hiver, 2018) (see Appendix 1) which intend to measure the strategic effort of language learners to organize and manage their L2 writing-specific goals and learning processes. It is a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The internal consistency of the questionnaire, as estimated by Cronbach's Alpha formula, turned out to be 0.79 in the present study.

Procedure

As discussed above, before beginning the experiment, the language proficiency test (i.e., OPT) was administered to the participants of both self- and peer-assessment groups in order to ensure the homogeneity of the two classes. Then L2 writing self-regulation scale was administered to the students of both the self-assessment group and the peer-assessment group as the pre-test of the study in order to identify their writing self-regulation prior to beginning of the intervention.

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

During the initial 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, L2 writing self-regulation scale (SLWS) was re-administered to the participants of both groups in order to measure their writing self-regulation as the post-test of the study.

RESULTS

As pointed out above, OPT was first administered to the students of both groups to ensure that they are not of heterogeneous language proficiency backgrounds. The rationale behind administering OPT was the fact that writing self-regulation is very likely to be affected by general language proficiency. Then in order to compare the OPT mean scores of the self-assessment and peer-assessment groups, an independent-samples *t*-test was carried out. The results of the independent-samples *t*-test (see Table 1) revealed 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 both groups were homogeneous in terms of overall English proficiency prior to the initiation of the experiment.

Next, in order to examine the effects of peer- and self-assessment activities on the writing self-regulation of the participants, two paired-samples *t*-tests were conducted to trace the change in the mean scores of both groups from the pretest to posttest. As presented in Table 2, there was a statistically significant increase from the pretest to posttest of writing self-regulation for both the peer-assessment group ($t(23) = -10.79$, $p < 0.00$) and the self-assessment group ($t(21) = -6.77$, $p < 0.00$). As seen in Table 2, writing self-regulation mean score for the peer-assessment group increased from 11.75 on the pretest to 15.29 on the posttest. Similarly, the writing self-regulation mean score of the self-assessment group was raised from 11.31 on the pretest to 13.13 on the posttest. These results demonstrated that the writing self-regulation of both groups increased significantly after practicing self-assessment and peer-assessment activities.

Moreover, a One-Way Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was performed on writing self-regulation scores to assess the effectiveness of use of self- and peer-assessment activities on the L2 writing self-regulation. The independent

variable was the type of treatment (i.e., self-assessment versus peer-assessment), and the dependent variable was the participants' scores on the post-test of writing self-regulation. The pre-test scores of writing self-regulation were considered as the covariate in the ANCOVA analysis.

Assumption evaluations indicated 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 self-regulation on the pre-test and the independent variable was not significant ($p = 0.12$).

The results of the ANCOVA analysis (see Table 3) using the General Linear Modeling approach in SPSS demonstrated that there was a statistically significant difference between the peer-assessment group and self-assessment group with regard to the mean scores on the posttest of writing self-regulation; $F(1, 43) = 16.82$, $p = 0.000$, partial eta squared = 0.29). These results revealed that practicing peer-assessment activities was more effective than doing self-assessment activities in enhancing writing self-regulation of the students.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The present study was carried out to investigate the effect of practicing self- and peer-assessment activities on the L2 writing self-regulation of Iranian EFL students. The findings of the study revealed that both self- and peer-assessment activities significantly contributed to improving L2 writing self-regulation of the participants. The most likely justification for the students' improved level of self-regulated writing ability is the fact that the participants were provided with further opportunity to get involved in their own writing performance through self- and peer-assessment activities, a situation which led to students' enhanced sense of agency and autonomy. In other words, the participants of the study became more self-regulated learners as they were equipped with knowledge and enough control on how to self-assess and peer-assess their writings. This finding is in line with the empirically supported claim that assigning agency and monitoring functions to the learners are likely to enhance their self-regulatory learning skills (Williams, 1996). Additionally, self- and peer-assessment activities are considered as individualized teaching which is claimed to be superior to public instruction as it has more potential to enhance learners' engagement, motivation, and autonomy (Pintrich, 2004).

However, the results of the study revealed that peer-assessment group outperformed the self-assessment group in writing self-regulation. This finding might be justified in the light of the fact that feedback and evaluations provided by peers have led the participants with scaffolding and a kind of mediated regulation which is likely to have enhanced students' self-regulation. Such other-regulated learning provided by peers may have made the participants become more conscious of their own learning process so that they exerted much effort to develop effective strategies to self-regulate their own writing process (Csizér & Tankó, 2015). It may

Table 1. Results of the OPT for each group

Groups	M (SD)	T	Sig.
Peer-assessment	41.92 (11.26)	-0.796	0.430
Self-assessment	44.42 (11.31)		

Table 2. Paired samples *t*-test for writing self-regulation scores

Groups	Pre-test		Post-test		T	Sig.
	M	SD	M	SD		
Peer-assessment	11.75	3.24	15.29	3.30	-10.79	0.00
Self-assessment	11.31	3.52	13.13	3.58	-6.77	0.00

Table 3. ANCOVA results for writing self-regulation scores

Source	Type III Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta squared
Corrected model	484.858 ^a	2	242.429	115.812	0.000	0.843
Intercept	43.467	1	43.467	20.765	0.000	0.326
Pre-regulation	431.538	1	431.538	206.153	0.000	0.827
Group	35.213	1	35.213	16.822	0.000	0.292
Error	90.012	43	2.093			
Total	9930.000	46				
Corrected Total	574.870	45				

be also argued that peer-assessment has been more effective than self-assessment in helping the participants to get familiar with assessment criteria, which fostered students' motivation in paying more attention to their writing tasks and in carrying out further planning and monitoring while doing their written tasks (Han & Hiver, 2018).

Overall, the findings of this study revealed that self- and peer-assessment activities reinforced the L2 learners' self-regulated writing by encouraging them to gain further consciousness of and familiarity with assessment criteria for successful L2 writing. The participants of the study also paid more attention to the demands of written tasks and learned how to deploy their writing competencies and all of their linguistic resources to take more control of their writing performance. Taken together, the findings of the present study are consistent with a bulk of previous studies (e.g., Andrade & Heritage, 2017; Boekaerts & Corno, 2005; Brookhart & Durkin, 2003; Kostons, van Gog & Paas, 2012) which emphasized the role of assessment for learning or educational assessment in fostering self-regulated learning. Brookhart and Durkin (2003) considered assessment to be more effective than traditional tests in providing the learners with further strategic and goal-directed learning which can be equally beneficial for both various learners with different levels of self-efficacy. The findings of the study may be also justified in the light of the fact that students' engagement in their own assessment and their familiarity with assessment criteria can play a key role in increasing learners' self-regulation (Kostons, Van Gog, & Paas, 2012). Furthermore, since both self- and peer-assessment groups were first trained to assess writing tasks by receiving teacher's modeling in assessing writings, their improved writing self-regulation might be attributed to teacher's modeling which is argued to be an integral variable in enhancing particular self-regulated competencies (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2002).

Given the findings of this study as well as much empirical support associated with use of self- and peer-assessment in L2 classrooms, it might be recommended that EFL teachers and methodologists take self- and peer-assessment activities into account more seriously and try to encourage their learners to use these assessment practices. By the same token, teacher educators should prepare pre-service teachers to be ready to employ alternative assessment in their own instructions. Furthermore, stake-holders, textbook designers, and material developers should be encouraged and supported to incorporate self- and peer-assessment activities in their L2 textbooks and materials. On the other hand, a number of sug-

gestions can be made so that future studies delve more into the effects of alternative assessment on different aspects of L2 writing. For example, it is recommended that researchers target more writer-related variables beyond self-regulation (e.g., L2 writing motivation, anxiety, and self-efficacy, among others) to see if these variables can be intervened via alternative assessment techniques. Moreover, it is suggested that samples from other language learning contexts (e.g., schools, language institutes, etc.) be also investigated to determine whether the findings obtained in this study can be generalized to other learning contexts as well. Finally, it is suggested that the moderating effects of such learner variables as age, gender, L2 proficiency, and learning experience be taken into account in future studies.

REFERENCES

- Alderson, J. C., & Banerjee, J. (2001). Language testing and assessment (Part I). *Language Teaching*, 34(4), 213-236.
- Allen, D. (2004). *Oxford placement test 1*. Oxford: OUP.
- Andrade, H. L., & Heritage, M. (2017). *Using formative assessment to enhance learning, achievement, and academic self-regulation*. London: Routledge.
- Arnaudet, M. L., & Barrett, M. E. (1990). *Paragraph development: A guide for students of English*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Bailey, K. M. (1998). *Learning about language assessment: Dilemmas, decisions, and directions*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- 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. J., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5-31.
- Black, P. J., McCormick, R., James, M., & Pedder, D. (2006). Learning how to learn and assessment for learning: A theoretical inquiry. *Research Papers in Education*, 21(2), 119-132.
- Blanche, P., & Merino, B. J. (1989). Self-assessment of foreign-language skills: Implications for teachers and researchers. *Language Learning*, 39(3), 313-338.

- Boekaerts, M., & Corno, L. (2005). Self-regulation in the classroom: A perspective on assessment and intervention. *Applied Psychology, 54*(2), 199-231.
- Brookhart, S. M., & Durkin, D. T. (2003). Classroom assessment, student motivation, and achievement in high school social studies classes. *Applied Measurement in Education, 16*(1), 27-54.
- Brown, A. (2005). Self-assessment of writing in independent language learning programs: The value of annotated samples. *Assessing Writing, 10*, 174-191.
- 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. *Modern Language Journal, 102*(1), 242-261.
- Csizér, K., & Tankó, G. (2017). English majors' self-regulatory control strategy use in academic writing and its relation to L2 motivation. *Applied Linguistics, 38*(3), 386-404.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. London: Routledge.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gipps, C. V. (1994). *Beyond testing: Towards a theory of educational assessment*. London: Routledge.
- Hamayan, E. V. (1995). Approaches to alternative assessment. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 15*, 212-226.
- Han, J., & Hiver, P. (2018). Genre-based L2 writing instruction and writing-specific psychological factors: The dynamics of change. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 40*, 44-59.
- Hashamdar, M., & Maleki, M. (2018). The effects of the instruction of self-regulation strategies and critical thinking strategies on the second language vocabulary achievement among Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 7*(7), 148-157.
- Hiver, P., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2016). A dynamic ensemble for second language research: Putting complexity theory into practice. *Modern Language Journal, 100*(4), 741-756.
- Kellogg, R. T. (1996). A model of working memory in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences and applications* (pp. 57-71). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Khodadady, E., & Khodabakhshzade, H. (2012). The effect of portfolio and self assessment on writing ability and autonomy. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3*(3), 518.
- Kostons, D., Van Gog, T., & Paas, F. (2012). Training self-assessment and task-selection skills: A cognitive approach to improving self-regulated learning. *Learning and Instruction, 22*(2), 121-132.
- Lam, R. (2014). Promoting self-regulated learning through portfolio assessment: Testimony and recommendations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 39*(6), 699-714.
- Lambert, D., & Lines, D. (2013). *Understanding assessment: Purposes, perceptions, practice*. London: Routledge.
- 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.
- Lantolf, J. P., Thorne, S. L., & Poehner, M. E. (2015). Sociocultural theory and second language development. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 207-226). London: Routledge.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2016). Classroom-oriented research from a complex systems perspective. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 6*(3), 377-393.
- Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. New York: Springer.
- Little, D. (2009). Language learner autonomy and the European language portfolio: Two L2 English examples. *Language Teaching, 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.
- McDonough, S. K. (2001). Promoting self-regulation in foreign language learners. *The Clearing House, 74*(6), 323-326.
- Moyer, A. (2014). Exceptional outcomes in L2 phonology: The critical factors of learner engagement and self-regulation. *Applied Linguistics, 35*(4), 418-440.
- Oscarson, M. (1989). Self-assessment of language proficiency: Rationale and applications. *Language Testing, 6*(1), 1-13.
- Piniel, K., & Csizér, K. (2015). Changes in motivation, anxiety and self-efficacy during the course of an academic writing seminar. In Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, & A. Henry (Eds.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (pp. 164-189). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. *Educational Psychology Review, 16*, 385-407.
- Rea-Dickins, P. (2008). Classroom-based language assessment. In E. Shohamy & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Volume 7 (2nd ed.)* (pp. 257-271). New York: Springer.
- Reeves, T. C., & Okey, J. R. (1996). Alternative assessment for constructivist learning environments. In B. G. Wilson (Ed.), *Constructivist learning environments: Case studies in instructional design* (pp. 191-202). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Reinholz, D. (2016). The assessment cycle: a model for learning through peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 41*(2), 301-315.
- 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.
- Rose, H., Briggs, J. G., Boggs, J. A., Sergio, L., & Ivanova-Slavianskaia, N. (2018). A systematic review of language learner strategy research in the face of self regulation. *System, 72*, 151-163.
- Sally, A. (2005). How Effective Is Self-Assessment in Writing? In P. Davidson, C. Coombe, & W. Jones (Eds.), *As-*

- assessment in the Arab World (pp. 307-321). United Arab Emirates: TESOL Arabia.
- Sambell, K., McDowell, L., & Montgomery, C. (2012). *Assessment for learning in higher education*. London: Routledge.
- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2012). *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. London: Routledge.
- Sullivan, K., & Lindgren, E. (2002). Self-assessment in autonomous computer-aided second language writing. *ELT Journal*, 56(3), 258-266.
- Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2016). Fostering strategic learning: The development and validation of the Writing Strategies for Motivational Regulation Questionnaire (WSMRQ). *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 25(1), 123-134.
- Von Glasersfeld, E. (1996). Footnotes to 'the many faces of constructivism'. *Educational Researcher*, 25(6), 19.
- Von Glasersfeld, E. (2013). *Radical constructivism*. London: Routledge.
- Williams, M. (1996). Learner control and instructional technologies. In D. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 957-983). New York: Scholastic.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2001). Theories of self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview and analysis. In B. J. Zimmerman, & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 1-36). (2nd ed.). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (2002). Acquiring writing revision and self-regulatory skill through observation and emulation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 660-668.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1. Second Language Writing Self-regulation (SLWS)

I know how to reduce my stress from learning writing in English.

I have special techniques to achieve my learning goals when learning writing in English.

I feel satisfied with my own special methods for reducing the stress of writing in English.

I have special techniques to keep my concentration focused when learning writing in English.

I persist until I reach the goals that I make for myself when learning writing in English.

I believe I can achieve my goals more quickly than expected when learning writing in English.

I can cope with the stress from learning writing in English immediately.

When it comes to learning writing in English, I think my methods of controlling procrastination are effective.

I know how to arrange the environment to make learning more efficient when learning writing in English.