

The Effect of Peer Assessment and Collaborative Assessment on Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners' Writing Ability

Dr. Ghasem Aghajanzadeh Kiasi¹ ✉ and Sona Rezaie²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of English Language, College of Humanities, Rasht Branch, Islamic Azad University, Rasht Iran

²MA in TEFL, Department of English Language, College of Humanities, Rasht Branch, Islamic Azad University, Rasht Iran

✉ **Corresponding Author:** Dr. Ghasem Aghajanzadeh Kiasi, **E-mail:** aghajanzadeh@iaurasht.ac.ir

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received: 16 October 2021

Accepted: 22 November 2021

Published: 20 December 2021

DOI: 10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.13.2

KEYWORDS

Collaborative assessment, L2 writing ability, peer assessment, teacher assessment

ABSTRACT

As an attempt to shed more light on the effectiveness of alternative assessment in second language learning, the current study sought to explore the effects of peer assessment (PA) and collaborative assessment (CA) on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability. To fulfil the purpose of this study, 36 Iranian EFL learners studying English at Kadous English Language Institute in Rasht, Iran, were homogenized as intermediate learners based on their performance on Oxford Solutions Placement Test (OSPT). The final pool of qualified candidates was assigned to one control and two experimental groups comprising 12 learners. All the participants sat for a pretest of L2 writing so that their initial level of writing could be appraised and their homogeneity in writing could be determined. The experimental groups received treatment on English writing through utilizing PA and CA strategies. On the other hand, the control group was taught through the conventional method (i.e. teacher assessment, TA). At the end of a twelve-session experiment, a post-test measuring the effectiveness of the treatments and the participants' writing ability was administered. The results of descriptive and inferential analyses revealed a statistically significant difference among CA, PA, and TA strategies. The results also demonstrated that the CA and PA groups outperformed the control group. However, the CA group performed significantly better than the PA group. Based on the findings of this study, language teachers, materials developers, and education authorities can concentrate on employing CA as the main strategy to foster the writing ability of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. However, PA may also be utilized to teach writing where possible.

1. Introduction

Writing is considered one of the essential skills that learners of English as a second or foreign language need to master. The ability to write has become a basic requirement for participation and interaction with the global community in which English is the prevalent language. Therefore, writing effectively in English is highly valued because of the possibilities it offers the learners to extend their intellectual production to international communities. Trotman (2010) asserts that learners are required to express their thoughts and disseminate information through writing in different fields. Accordingly, due to the indispensable and undeniable role that writing as a language skill plays in second language learning and teaching, the way it is taught or assessed is of utmost importance.

Second language classroom teachers have long been interested in improving learners' writing skills. One of the primary ways teachers help their learners improve is by assessing and giving feedback on their written work. Assessment, a natural part of the teaching and learning processes, is administered to support learning (Berry, 2008); therefore, it greatly influences teaching and learning (Baird, Andrich, Hopfenbeck, & Stobart, 2017; Wiliam, 2017). In the same vein, White (2009) believes that assessment remains a ubiquitous element of any writing classroom and is vitally important to the academic growth of learners.

Second language writing has been unanimously considered a highly complex and frustrating skill, since language learners should orchestrate a wide range of skills such as grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, and content simultaneously to produce a coherent piece of writing. Thus, among the four skills related to communication, learning how to write in a second language is more challenging than the other three skills. Along the same line of thought, Salma (2015) believes that since English is considered a foreign language in EFL context, writing skill becomes the most challenging activity for the learners. This can be attributed to the fact that second language writing has largely been neglected in EFL classrooms, and insufficient efforts are made to empower L2 learners' writing ability.

Language assessment can play a monumental role in fostering language learning and its primary role, i.e. measuring learning outcomes. However, in most writing courses, a traditional instructor-centred examination has remained the primary means for assessing learners' performance, and alternative assessment forms are still undervalued. Some researchers are right of the opinion that assessment has not grabbed worthy attention as a learning and developmental tool; rather, it has been primarily deployed as an evaluative instrument (e.g., Chau, 2005; Gareis & Grant, 2015).

Another point is that long traditional paper-and-pencil tests have always been very stressful to learners. Any kind of test which lacks further feedback and is viewed only as a tool by which teachers can gather scores can be demanding even if teachers have primarily designed the test to facilitate learning and teaching. This 'teacher-only' approach is time-consuming and discouraging. It may not come to any fruition. It is not an easy task for teachers to keep up with assessing large classes with 50 to 60 learners. For another, learners might not even read teachers' comments or revisions carefully since what they care about most is the score on the paper. As Sun and Wen (2018) assert, the effectiveness is compromised even for those who read the teacher-written feedback since learners might not comprehend why it should be corrected this way, and it cannot be guaranteed that they will not make the same mistakes again.

Therefore, to partially fill these raised gaps and shed more light on the effectiveness of alternative forms of assessment in enhancing L2 writing performance, this study was conducted to investigate the effects of PA and CA on the writing ability of Iranian EFL learners. More precisely, the study strived to answer the following questions:

RQ1: Does PA strategy have any statistically significant effect on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability?

RQ2: Does CA strategy have any statistically significant effect on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability?

RQ3: Does TA strategy have any statistically significant effect on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability?

RQ4: Are there any statistically significant differences among the effects of TA, CA, and PA strategies on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability?

2. Literature Review

Over the past five decades, writing assessment has witnessed a paradigm shift from psychometric to teacher-based and later to individualized paradigms (Lam, 2018a). The psychometric paradigm stresses scoring reliability and indirect measurement of writing skills to guarantee fairness. The teacher-based paradigm highlights contextualized writing assessment using direct writing tests holistically graded by test-takers teachers. Concerning the individualized assessment paradigm, learners are at the heart of the assessment process and actively involved in goal-setting, monitoring, evaluating, and revising (Lee, 2016). This kind of paradigm shift favours a constructivist and more learner-centred approach, and its main concern is to develop learning and induce positive cognitive functioning among language learners (Gipps, 1994). According to the constructivist view, knowledge is not acquired but constructed by learners differently in the sense that different learners may have their construction of knowledge and meanings (von Glasersfeld, 1996). This view also highlights and validates the active engagement of the learners in the whole process of learning so that more effective and meaningful learning can be attained and warranted (von Glasersfeld, 2013). Within this line of enquiry, much attention was directed to alternative assessment and its sub-categories as proper and viable alternatives to traditional tests (Hamp-Lyons, 2009).

2.1 Assessment

Assessment has been defined variously in the literature. Amongst many, Linn and Miller (2005) describe assessment as a systematic process of gathering information about learners' progression towards educational goals. Likewise, Dhindsa, Omar, and Waldrip (2007) characterize assessment as a core element in teaching and learning processes, "a systematic process of collecting data" about learners' progression (p.1261). According to Mihai (2010), assessment combines all types of formal and informal judgments and examinations occurring inside and outside a classroom. According to Mousavi (2012), assessment is "appraising or estimating the level or magnitude of some attribute of a person" (p.435).

2.2 Traditional assessment

The traditional writing assessment deals with the summative information regarding the learners' attainment based on predetermined standards. It is generally in the form of testing to evaluate the learners' achievements, represented by grades (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010). Therefore, writing assessment in the ESL/ EFL context is limited to the learners' final product grades. According to Lee (2017), writing assessment has been influenced by the conventional notions of tests, with assessment being used to provide scores and serve as accountability measures.

2.3 Alternative assessment

Examining different methods of assessing writing is limited to alternative assessment methods, and they have been the focus of attention among EFL researchers in recent years. According to Al-Mahrooqi and Denman (2018), alternative assessment is a blanket term used to cover a set of various alternatives to the traditional form of assessment.

In alternative assessment, a learner's performance is measured against specific learning objectives or performance standards, not against the performance of other learners on the national or local level (Dung & Ha, 2019). While in traditional assessment, teachers have to develop, analyze and administer the assessment (questions and techniques) themselves and then compare the assessment results to their teaching (Jabbarifar, 2009). An alternative assessment gives teachers some feedback on the efficacy of instruction and learners' measurement of their development.

Alternative assessment can include authentic and performance-based tasks that are carried out in realistic contexts while also allowing assessment and instruction to constantly interact and thereby assisting teachers in gaining a clearer picture of their learners' abilities. According to Al Ruqeshi (2015), Alternative assessment includes forms of assessment that involve authentic and performance-based tasks whereby learners are required to use higher-level thinking skills in real-life or authentic contexts. In this way, alternative assessment places assessment at the center of instruction.

Many empirical studies have reported the positive influence of alternative assessment strategies on improving learners' writing skills ranging from simple writing to argumentative writing skills (Iraji, Enayat, & Momeni, 2016; Jafarigohar, 2020; Javaherbakhsh, 2010; Mazloomi & Khabiri, 2018; Moradan & Hedayati, 2011; Mosmery & Barzegar, 2015).

2.3.1 Peer assessment

PA can be interpreted as a series of actions by which learners can appraise and judge their peers' learning activities and attainment (Liu & Brantmeier, 2019). PA activities can provide learners with some advantages such as improved learning and understanding, fostered assessment skills, and boosted self-confidence. It is deemed that these merits of PA are effective in the ultimate achievement of the L2 knowledge and skills (Reinholz, 2016).

Fathi and Khodabakhsh (2020) conducted a study to investigate the effect of self-assessment (SA) and PA activities on the writing anxiety of Iranian EFL learners. Their study demonstrated that both SA and PA activities significantly contributed to reducing the writing anxiety of the participants. Further analyses, however, indicated that the learners' writing anxiety in the PA group was significantly lower than the SA group on the post-test.

Moreover, Fathi, Mohebiniya, and Nourzadeh (2019) showed a significant SA and PA activities contribution in improving Iranian learners' second language writing self-regulation. The findings of their study indicated that both SA and PA were conducive to enhancing the L2 writing self-regulation of the participants.

2.3.2 Collaborative assessment

CA, as another sub-category of alternative assessment, is conceptualized as an "experiential journey" and a "process of development" for learners without marring the evaluative nature of assessment (Chau, 2005, p. 15). According to Sun and Wen (2018), CA consists of three phases: a) learners practice SA strategy and receive feedback from the tutor; b) learners gauge each other's work (through PA) and receive peer feedback; c) CA is, Miri, and Alamdar (2021) investigated the possible effects of CA on improving the writing proficiency of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. The findings suggested that the learners took advantage of being engaged in collaborative dialogue while assessing their writing tasks. In a similar study, but a different culture, Sun and Wen (2018) explored the effectiveness of teacher-student collaborative assessment (TSCA) in an EFL integrated course designed for second-year English majors in a university in mainland China. They found that TSCA was a good way to identify the learners' weaknesses and help them learn how to revise their essays better.

The findings of Fahim, Miri, and Najafi's (2014) investigation of the role of teacher-student CA and student-student CA in fostering critical thinking and second language writing indicated that both CA types could foster critical thinking and writing proficiency. Additionally, the study results revealed that student-student CA was more effective than teacher-student CA in developing critical thinking and writing proficiency.

In another study, Moradian, Miri, and Alamdar (2015) studied improving writing skills using CA strategy on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners. To this aim, two intact groups of the Iranian intermediate EFL learners were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. The experimental group received treatment via CA, and the control group received traditional TA. The results demonstrated that exposure to CA instruction could significantly enhance the learners' writing ability.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The sample population of the current study consisted of 36 males and female EFL learners, selected from a total population of 65 English language learners at the intermediate level of language proficiency, with the age range of 18 to 25. They were assigned to three groups involving 12 learners; two experimental groups and one control group. All the participants were native speakers of Persian who were studying EFL at Kadous English Language Institute in Rasht, Iran.

3.2 Research design

Regarding the nature of the study, a quasi-experimental design, built on a quantitative approach to answering the research questions, characterized by the administration of a pretest, non-random assignment of the participants to study groups, application of the treatment, and a post-test, was employed to test whether PA and CA had any statistically significant effect on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability.

3.3 Instrumentation

To lead to better and more comprehensive findings regarding the impact of PA and CA on writing ability, the instruments used for the purpose of the present study were: an OSPT, a pretest, and a post-test of writing.

3.3.1 The language proficiency test

To homogenize the participants in terms of general English proficiency, OSPT was administered to the prospective participants. OSPT is considered a reliable and valid standard English proficiency test that can be administered to different numbers of learners with various proficiency levels (Allen, 2004).

3.3.2 The pretest and post-test of L2 writing ability

The writing tests were taken from TOEFL Writing Topics (TWT) and Model Essays by Okul (2012) for both pretests and post-tests. Since improvement from the pretest to the post-test indicated how much was gained by the participants as a result of applying PA and CA, the writing topics were chosen at the same level for both tests.

3.3.3 Writing scoring rubric

Due to the subjective nature of the dependent variable of the current study, a scoring rubric was used based on which the learners' writing ability could be reliably scored. In so doing, a scoring rubric developed by Brown (2007) was used to score the learners' writing in the pretest and post-test. The rubric consists of five parts: focusing criteria, elaboration, organization/support, conventions (spelling, grammar and punctuation), and vocabulary. Each criterion includes five descriptors by which the learners are judged and measured by the scores given to each descriptor.

3.4 Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis

First, a copy of OSPT was administered to the participants to ensure that all the participants were at the same level of proficiency. Then, they were randomly assigned to three groups of one control (TA) and two experimental (PA, CA) groups. Next, the researcher conducted a pretest of writing to measure the learners' initial writing performance and check the groups' homogeneity at the beginning of the treatment. Subsequently, the experimental groups received treatment types specific to PA and CA, and in the control group, traditional TA was applied. The courses lasted for 12 sessions and 45 minutes per session.

CA class was asked to write twelve pieces of writing which were initially graded by the teacher in accordance with the analytical scale. Afterwards, the learners were required to grade their writing on the same scale and identify where they disagreed with the teacher's grades. Later on, each learner was given three minutes to debate the points of difference and support their positions on the teacher's grades. They worked in collaboration to resolve differences and reach reciprocal inter-subjectivity and consensus on the final grades.

The learners were required to write essays on the same topics for the PA group. Then each learner was asked to grade his/her peer's writing according to the scale provided to them. In the control group of TA, the learners were also asked to write on the same topics for each session, but they received no feedback on their essays from the teacher or their peers, and their writings were only assessed by the teacher based on the same assessment scale. After carrying out the treatments, a post-test was administered

to examine the results and measure the progress from pretest to post-test and the efficacy of the treatments on the groups' performance in writing.

The students' papers in the pretest and post-test were scored by the same two raters based on the same performance profile Brown (2007) proposed. To estimate the inter-rater reliability of writing scores, Spearman's Rank Order Correlation (ρ) was used to provide the agreement of the two raters. The scores were first analyzed descriptively, and the standard deviations and the means scores of both pretest and post-test writing were calculated to find the difference among the results of the three groups. Then, the participants' pretest and post-test scores were analyzed using two one-way ANOVAs to find a statistically significant difference at the generally accepted alpha level (p -value) of 0.05. A post-hoc Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) test was also employed to indicate where the group differences occurred.

4. Results and Discussion

The inter-rater reliability for the pretest scores of writing in the three groups of TA, PA, and CA was estimated via Spearman's Rank Order Correlation (ρ). As shown in Table 1, the reliability of pretest scores for the CA, PA, and TA groups (.841), (.822), and (.914) were acceptable for the researcher to run the analyses of the findings.

Table 1 Inter-rater Correlations for the Pretest Scores of the Three Groups

Correlations		Collab. G.	Peer G.	Teach. G.
Pretest writing	Spearman Rank Order Correlation	.841	.822	.914
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	12	12	12

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the pretest writing scores obtained by the three groups before the onset of treatment sessions.

Table 2. Results of Descriptive Statistics on the Pretest of Writing Scores for the Three Groups

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min.	Max.
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Collab.	12	14.1285	2.65982	.83598	7.5987	11.2589	9.00	16.00
Peer	12	13.9852	2.47593	.82547	8.8524	10.4259	11.00	16.00
Teach.	12	14.2134	2.65841	.83587	6.1598	11.4698	10.00	16.00
Total	36	14.1090	2.59805	.83244	7.5369	11.0515	10.00	16.00

As displayed in Table 2, the three groups were homogeneous regarding their initial writing ability. The mean scores obtained from the groups' pretest writing approximately demonstrate a similar level of writing ability.

Another Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient ρ (p) was run to measure the inter-rater reliability for the post-test scores of the CA, PA, and TA groups. According to Table 3, the reliability of post-test scores for all three groups was high, which revealed the tests were acceptably reliable for the purpose of the analyses.

Table 3. Inter-rater Correlations for the Post-test Scores of the Three Groups

Correlations		Collab. G.	Peer G.	Teach. G.
Post-test writing	Spearman Rank Order Correlation	.867	.815	.882
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	12	12	12

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Having received the treatments in twelve sessions, the groups sat for the post-test of writing to measure the groups' achievements throughout treatment. Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics of the groups' performance on the post-test.

Table 4. Results of Descriptive Statistics on the Posttest of Writing Scores for the Three Groups

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min.	Max.
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Collab.	12	22,963	4,551	,375	14,523	21,417	17,00	24,00
Peer	12	18,369	4,147	,335	13,925	20,458	15,00	21,00
Teach.	12	15,132	4,485	,386	14,745	19,523	13,00	17,00
Total	36	18,821	4,429	,365	14,397	20,463	15,00	21,00

Table 4 shows that providing groups with different treatment types affected their performance on the L2 writing test. As seen, a sizable degree of variations of improvement appeared among the three groups of the study from the pretest to the post-test. However, their improvements were not equal across the pretest and post-test of writing ability. The mean scores were 22.96, 18.36, and 15.13 for CA, PA, and TA groups.

In order to find a statistically significant difference at the generally accepted alpha level (p-value) of 0.05 in the performance of three groups, the participants' pretest and post-test scores of writing were analyzed via one-way ANOVA. Before running ANOVA, Levene's test for homogeneity of variances was estimated for the pretest scores to test whether the variance in scores was the same for each of the three groups.

Table 5. Results of Levene's Test for the Pretest of L2 Writing Scores

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.736	2	33	.422

According to the result, the significance value (Sig.) for Levene's test is greater than .05. It means that the Sig. Value of .422 is greater than .05. So, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not violated for the pretest writing. As shown in Table 6, the results of one-way ANOVA indicate that the three groups were not statistically different in terms of writing ability at the beginning of the study before the immense of the treatment sessions.

Table 6. Results of One-Way ANOVA for the Writing Pretest Scores of Groups

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.078	2	2.039	.275	.745
Within Groups	244.367	33	7.405		
Total	248.445	35			

According to Table 6, the F (2, 33) statistic equals 0.275, and the probability value is 0.745. The F statistic is smaller than the probability value. So, it can be concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in the performance of the three different groups at the beginning of the study.

Before running one-way ANOVA to the post-test scores of the groups, Levene's test for homogeneity of variances was run for the post-test scores of writing. Table 7 shows the report for Levene's test on the post-test of writing scores.

Table 7. Results of Levene's Test for the Posttest of L2 Writing Scores

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.731	2	33	.421

Based on the significance value for Levene's test (.421) that is greater than .05, the assumption of homogeneity of variance is not violated in the post-test scores of the groups.

Table 8. Results of One-Way ANOVA for the Writing Posttest Scores of Groups

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	98.433	2	49.216	5.341	.000
Within Groups	304.067	33	9.214		
Total	402.500	35			

The results revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in writing performance amongst CA group (M = 22.96, SD = 4.551), PA group (M = 18.36, SD = 4.147), and TA group (M = 15.13, SD = 4.485). It means that the F statistics (2, 33= 5.341) used to assess the equality of means is greater than the probability value of 0.000. Thus, it can be concluded that the three treatment conditions led to varying degrees of learning success. Due to the different intervention programs, the three groups improve differently across the pretest and post-test.

Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) post hoc test was run to compare the means of three groups. The ANOVA test reported that there was an overall difference among the groups, but it did not report where the differences occurred. Therefore, the detailed structure of the differences was analyzed by making multiple comparisons. Table 9 represents the results of the comparisons.

Table 9. Results of Post Hoc Tukey Test for the Post-test Scores of L2 Writing

(I) Study Groups	(J) Study Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Collab.	Peer	4.594*	1.24030	.041	-2.58962	-.3598
	Teach.	7.831*	1.62050	.004	-1.2147	-1.8529
Peer	Collab.	-4.594*	1.24030	.041	.3598	-2.58962
	Teach.	3.237*	1.32040	.024	-1.3254	-.1329
Teach.	Collab.	-7.831*	1.62050	.004	1.8529	1.2147
	Peer	-3.237*	1.32040	.024	.1329	1.3254

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 levels.

Based on Table 9, the PA and TA groups' mean difference came to (mean difference = 3.237). The significance level was lower than ($\alpha = .05$), which showed that the difference between the two groups was not simply due to chance variation. It can be concluded that PA strategy has a statistically significant effect on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability. Due to the highest mean difference that was found between the CA group and control group (7.831), it was elucidated that CA strategy has a statistically significant effect on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability as well. Regarding the effect of TA strategy on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability, it was found that the TA group did not experience a perceptible improvement in writing ability from the pretest to the post-test. Moreover, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the CA group and TA group ($P < .05$). It is worth pointing out that the three groups were homogeneous regarding their initial writing ability, as revealed by the statistical analysis results for the pretest scores.

The result of one-way ANOVA for the post-test scores demonstrated that there was an overall difference amongst the three groups. Accordingly, the post-hoc (HSD) test was used to confirm where the differences occurred between the groups. As it was displayed in Table 9, the mean difference between the CA group and PA group came to (4.594), and a statistically significant difference between the effects of PA and CA was reported ($P < .05$). Thus, it was clarified that there is a statistically significant difference between the effects of CA and PA strategies on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability. The result of both descriptive and inferential analyses showed that CA and PA benefited more from the treatment types than the TA group. Nevertheless, the difference between the TA and PA groups was not as significant as the difference between the CA and both groups.

This study was set to investigate whether teaching writing through PA and CA would foster the L2 writing of the Iranian intermediate EFL learners any better than the conventional method. The findings based on the statistical analyses demonstrated that the participants' writing scores were significantly higher in the experimental groups, where the learners received PA and CA as treatment, compared to their counterparts in the control group, where the learners received traditional TA strategies. The findings also revealed that the participants of the experimental group who received CA outperformed the participants of the PA group.

The findings of this study are congruent with the one conducted by Fathi and Khodabakhsh (2020), who found both SA and PA activities helped reduce the writing anxiety of the participants. Similarly, Fathi, Mohebiniya, and Nourzadeh (2019) analyzed the effect of practising SA and PA activities on the L2 writing self-regulation of Iranian EFL learners. They argued that PA and SA activities made learners concentrate more on the demands of written tasks and found out how to develop their writing competencies and all of their linguistic resources to take more charge of their writing performance.

The findings of this study are also compatible with the study done by Moradian, Miri, and Alamdar (2021), who displayed the advantages of CA in fostering the writing proficiency of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. Their research followed Vygotsky's SCT

and directly took languaging as the treatment or part of the treatment. Their studies demonstrated how knowledge is co-constructed through collaborative dialogue in which the teacher and learners collaboratively provided opportunities to solve the existing problems by using language. TSCA increases learners' consciousness of their problems to keep them in mind when completing the next writing task (Sun & Wen, 2018).

The results are not compatible with the findings of the study conducted by Fahim, Miri, and Najafi (2014), who found that although the results indicated that both types of CA led to the students' progress, the student-student CA method was more effective than teacher-student CA. The results of this study are consistent with Moradian, Miri, and Alamdar's (2015) study, which found that CA was more conducive to L2 writing than the teacher-centred assessment. They also argued that CA could assist the learners in gaining a better insight into their strengths and weakness; further, it led to their metacognitive awareness about components of a good piece of writing.

5. Conclusion

The present study aimed to examine the effects of PA and CA on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability. The results demonstrated that there was a statistically significant difference between the effects of PA and CA on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability. It can be concluded that alternative assessment largely emerged in response to the inadequacies of more traditional or conventional forms of assessment, especially to their shortcomings when applied to learners with special needs. More importantly, these types of assessments are thought to have a vital role in enhancing the positive learning atmosphere and learners' motivation toward learning.

Undoubtedly, CA and PA as two types of alternative assessment can be effective tools for inspiring the learners' internal motivation and confidence and encouraging them to be in charge of their learning and become more autonomous. Based on data analysis, CA as the more effective strategy affords the learners the chance to benefit from the SA as one of the unique characteristics of the CA and the mediatory roles of the collaborative dialogue and the checklist. In essence, through engaging in collaborative dialogue, the learners present, discuss and test their ideas with a more capable teacher, enhance their metacognitive knowledge, and consequently attain mastery over the learning and assessment process. Most simply put, the learners grow beyond their current capabilities due to learning through the social medium.

To elaborate on the pedagogical implications of this study, it can be argued that because the findings of the current study demonstrated that applying CA strategies can have positive influences on the learners' writing ability, some language teaching and learning activities can be designed. Indeed, it is recommended that L2 policy-makers, curriculum developers, syllabus designers, teacher educators, test developers take an alternative assessment on the board more seriously. Integration of CA methods in writing instruction can assist EFL teachers in assigning a more responsible and autonomous role to their learners through providing more motivational and self-regulated learning in induced and sustained.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Allen, D. (2004). *Oxford placement test 1*. Oxford: OUP.
- [2] Al-Mahrooqi, R., & Denman, C. (2018). Alternative assessment. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1-6.
- [3] Al Ruqeishi, M. (2015). An evaluation of alternative assessment tools used in grades 5–8 of Omani Basic Education schools as perceived by EFL teachers. In R. Al-Mahrooqi & C. J. Denman (Eds.), *Issues in English education in the Arab world* (pp. 192–215). Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars.
- [4] Baird, J., Andrich, D., Hopfenbeck, T., & Stobart, G. (2017). Assessment and learning: Fields apart? *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy, and Practice*, 24, 317-350. Doi: 10.1080/0969594X.2017.1319337
- [5] Berry, R. (2008). *Assessment for learning*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- [6] Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices* (Vol. 10). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- [7] Brown, J. D. (2007). Multiple views of L1 writing score reliability. *University of Hawai'i Second Language Studies Paper 25* (2).
- [8] Chau, J. (2005). Effects of collaborative assessment on language development and learning. *Language Learning Journal*, 32(1), 27-37.
- [9] Dhindsa, H. S., Omar, K., & Waldrip, B. (2007). Upper secondary Bruneian science students' perceptions of assessment. *International Journal of Science Education*, 29(10), 1261-1280.
- [10] Dung, L.Q., & Ha, N.T.D. (2019). Portfolio - An alternative form of assessment in EFL context. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 9(1), 439-445.
- [11] Fahim, M., Miri, M., & Najafi, Y. (2014). The contributory role of collaborative assessment in improving critical thinking and writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(1), 1-11.

- [12] Fathi, J., & Khodabakhsh, M. R. (2020). Self-Assessment and peer-assessment in writing course of Iranian EFL students: An investigation of writing anxiety. *International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies*, 8(1), 88-96.
- [13] Fathi, J., Mohebiniya, S., & Nourzadeh, S. (2019). Enhancing second language writing self-regulation through self-assessment and peer-assessment: A case of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 8(3), 110-117.
- [14] Gareis, C. R., & Grant, L. W. (2015). *Teacher-made assessments: How to connect curriculum, instruction, and student learning*. Routledge.
- [15] Gipps, C. V. (1994). *Beyond testing: Towards a theory of educational assessment*. London: Routledge.
- [16] 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), 524-530.
- [17] Iraj, 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.
- [18] Jabbarifar, T. (2009, November). *The importance of classroom assessment and evaluation in the educational system*. In Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of Teaching and Learning, INTI University College, Malaysia.
- [19] Jafarigohar, M. (2020). The effect of assessment technique on EFL learners' writing motivation and self-regulation. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(4), 141-162.
- [20] Javaherbakhsh, M. R. (2010). The impact of self-assessment on Iranian EFL learners' writing skills. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 213-218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n2p213>
- [21] Lam, R. (2018a). *Portfolio assessment for the teaching and learning of writing*. Singapore: Springer.
- [22] Lee, I. (2016). Putting students at the center of classroom L2 writing assessment. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 72(2), 258-280.
- [23] Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9
- [24] Linn, R. L., & Miller, M. D. (2005). *Measurement and assessment in teaching* (9thed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [25] 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.
- [26] Mazloomi, S., & Khabiri, M. (2018). The impact of self-assessment on language learners' writing skills. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55(1), 91-100.
- [27] Mihai, F. M. (2010). *Assessing English language learners in the content areas: A research-into-practice guide for educators*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- [28] Moradian, M. R., Miri, M., & Alamdar, P. (2015, January 29). *The effects of collaborative assessment on fostering EFL writing proficiency: A sociocultural perspective* [Conference presentation]. The 2nd National Applied Research Conference on English Language Studies, Tehran, Iran.
- [29] Moradan, A., & Hedayati, N. (2011). The impact of portfolios and conferencing on Iranian EFL writing skill. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 8, 115-141.
- [30] Moradian, M. R., Miri, M., & Alamdar, P. (2021). The role of dialogic interaction in EFL writing assessment: A sociocultural perspective. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3).
- [31] Mosmery, P., & Barzegar, R. (2015). The effects of using peer, self, and teacher assessment on Iranian EFL learners' writing ability at three levels of task complexity. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 4(4), 15-27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2015.928>
- [32] Mousavi, S. A. (2012). *An encyclopedic dictionary of language testing*. Tehran: Rahnama.
- [33] Okul, H. (2012). *TOEFL writing (TWE) topics and model essays*. Retrieved from <http://black-sea.travel/library/download/asin=B00UCN31GS&type=stream>
- [34] Reinholz, D. (2016). The assessment cycle: A model for learning through peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(2), 301-315.
- [35] Salma, U. (2015). Problems and practical needs of writing skill in EFL context: An analysis of Iranian students of Aligarh Muslim University. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 20(11), 74-76.
- [36] Sun, S. G., & Wen, Q. F. (2018). Teacher-student collaborative assessment (TSCA) in integrated language classrooms. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8, 369-379. Doi: 10.17509/ijal.v8i2.13301
- [37] Trotman, W. (2004). Portfolio assessment: Advantages, drawbacks, and implementation. Retrieved September 20, 2010, from the World Wide Web: articles/trotman.com
- [38] Von Glasersfeld, E. (1996). Footnotes to 'the many faces of constructivism'. *Educational researcher*, 25(6), 19.
- [39] Von Glasersfeld, E. (2013). *Radical constructivism*. Routledge.
- [40] White, E. (2009). Are you assessment literate? Some fundamental questions regarding effective classroom-based assessment. *OnCUE Journal*, 3(1), 3-25.
- [41] William, D. (2017). Assessment and learning: some reflections. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 24(3), 394-403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2017.1318108>