The Effects of Three Different Assessment Types on Text Revisions: A Study of Indonesian EFL Learners

Andri Suherman

Language Centre, University of Mataram,

Jl. Pendidikan No.37, Dasan Agung Baru, Kota Mataram, Nusa Tenggara Barat 83125 Indonesia

andrisuherman123@gmail.com

Abstract

This research article aimed at exploring the effects of three different assessments (self-, peer-, and teacher-) on students' text revision. Ten Indonesian tertiary-level EFL students participated in this study. It investigated the extent to which three types of assessment facilitate text revision, and analyzed students' perception of these assessments. The research methods used were students' text revision and semi-structure interview. The findings revealed two main points. First, the results showed that students made the total of 2,096 revision changes across 40 drafts, with lower percentage of self-feedback incorporated into their revision. Furthermore, the findings indicated that students had a tendency to engage in self-assessment practice more often when revising their drafts. Second, students mostly appreciated teacher-assessment, as opposed to under half of them favoured peer-assessment. In contrast, self-assessment showed a balanced response between positive and negative comments. The implications of this study were provide practical insight to EFL teachers into how three assessment types (teacher-, peer-, and self-) can be developed to help improve students' writing performance, and to inform EFL teachers with some suggestions to explore students' perceptions regarding the three assessments to help facilitate quality-enhancing text revisions.

Keywords: Three assessment types, text revision, EFL students

Introduction

Since the promotion of the process approach in 1970, teaching method in writing classroom has shifted, not only in L1 but also in L2. Unlike the product-based approach, Nation (2009) mentioned that the process approach considers writing activity which involves two major sub processes; (1) gathering and organizing ideas, and (2) editing, revising, and submitting the text. In line with this, Paulus (1999) argued that these processes are believed to help learners improve their writing skill since they engage learners in self-assessing, revising, editing, and giving/receiving feedback tasks. As one of the key components in the text revision process, teacher-feedback is believed to help develop students' writing skill. Thus, the term Classroom-Based Assessment (CBA) occurs in the context of EFL writing classroom.

146

CBA refers to the teacher-mediated assessment practice which aims at helping students to improve their writing skill by providing developmental feedback. Davision and Leung (2009) stated that CBA can be implemented as opposed to the large-scale achievement texts used for certification purposes. With this respect, Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) mentioned two main principles of CBA; (1) engaging students in the evaluation process through self- and peer-assessment, and (2) encouraging teachers to provide constructive feedback to facilitate learning. Thus, CBA approach attempts to involve three assessments (self-, peer-, and teacher-) to help students make use of informed feedback in revising their interim draft, and to enable students reflect upon their strengths and weaknesses in writing. In spite of the pedagogical value of CBA approach in the context of EFL writing, there had been little attention paid to how the use of three different assessments (self-, peer-, and teacher-) in the context of EFL writing can influence the quality of text revision. The present study examines the relationship between three different types of assessment and their impact on students' text revision.

Teacher-assessment is considered as one of crucial elements in the process of L2 writing (Paulus, 1999). Studies have examined and found that students generally appreciate feedback given by their teacher (Ferris, 1995; Tsui and Ng, 2000). Most recent studies have explored different areas of teacher-assessment and its impacts on student writing skill. For example, Ferris (2006) investigated the effectiveness of teacher- assessment on language errors. Similar finding was reported by Lee (2008b) where she found that students prefer teacher comments on language to help them improve their writing. However, she also reported that excessive error correction given by teacher appears to overwhelm low-proficiency students resulting in decreasing their motivation and interest in writing activity. This indicates that affective factors are essential in engaging students with feedback.

An alternative to teacher-assessment is peer-assessment. Its benefits in writing development have been reported by several studies. For example, Min (2005) found that students can learn from each other while giving, receiving, and discussing feedback. Meanwhile, Diab (2010) mentioned that peer-assessment enables students to notice linguistics error during interaction process, and leads students to make more revisions in the area of text organization. Furthermore, Rollinson (2005) highlighted that peer-assessment is useful for improving students critical reading and analysis skills. Despite these benefits, peer-assessment has been reported to have some drawbacks. Harmer (2004) and Park (2017) found that students trust more feedback given by their teacher rather than by their peer because of its accuracy. Meanwhile, Min (2005) revealed that ambiguous comments given by peer seem to be the main reason of unsuccessful peer-assessment practice. Furthermore, Choi (2013) found that students show less confident when giving feedback because of their lack of language ability.

Self-assessment is another alternative method of assessment. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) defined self-assessment as a number of skills which students can make use of to manage their own learning. Meanwhile, Cresswell (2000) argued that self-assessment practice can lead student's attention to focus on content errors and text organization. In addition, Sadler and Good (2006)

argued that self-assessment activity is beneficial for students since it not only engages them in the evaluation process, but also stimulates self-reflection and encourages responsibility. In spite of its benefits, self-assessment is reported to have some weaknesses. Harris (1997) questioned whether average-proficiency students are able to make use of feedback during self-assessment process to improve their text. In their study, Andrade and Du (2007) found that students' lack of understanding of text quality is the main factor which impedes students to engage with self-assessment.

Each type of assessment mentioned above has its strengths and weaknesses in the relation to students' writing skill improvement. When two or three types of assessment are incorporated, it is reported to have more benefits by several scholars. For example, Taras (2003) revealed that the implementation of self-assessment accompanied by teacher-assessment is found useful by students when they are identifying both their strengths and weaknesses in writing. In the context of Taiwanese students, Birjandi and Hadidi Tamjid (2012) found that the participants perceived maximum writing improvement when they incorporated self-, peer-, and teacher-assessment in their tasks. However, Chen (2008) argued that the practice of self-assessment independently may bring about writing improvement if students are fully trained prior to the revision process. Similarly, Sengupta (2000) mentioned that to help students revise their draft, revision strategy instruction is necessarily important to carry out before students assess their own work. Nevertheless, the validity and reliability of self-assessment will be problematic when compared with peer- or teacher-assessment (Matsuno, 2009). Thus, the literature above suggests that the relationship between three types of assessment (self-, peer-, and teacher-) and text revision is complex and underexplored particularly in the context of Indonesian tertiary-level students. To have a better understanding of this issue, the present study aims at answering the following two questions:

1. To what extent do three assessments facilitate students' text revision?
2. What are students' opinions of three different types of assessment?

Method
Research Setting
A group of 10 undergraduate English major students (4 males and 6 females) participated in the present study, labelled as S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9, and S10. They were second-year enrolling students in "Writing 2" course at English Education department, Hamzanwadi University (Indonesia). Their age range was between 18 and 21 years old. Their English language proficiency ranged from low-intermediate to upper-intermediate (average TOEFL-ITP score 500-550).

Instruments
Two instruments were employed in the present study. The first one was students' text revisions across 40 drafts (first-cycle: 10 drafts, second-cycle: 10 drafts, third-cycle: 10 drafts, and fourth-cycle: 10 drafts). These writing drafts were

examined to find the effects of three different assessments on the text revisions. The second instrument was interview. Semi-structured interviews were chosen to allow participants express their perceptions. The data gained from these interviews were analyzed to find the students' opinions of three types of assessment.

Research Procedure

At the beginning of the course, the teacher provided a three-hour training to equip students with assessment (self-, and peer-) skills. It included understanding the assessment criteria of writing tasks, and using the criteria checklists of writing tasks.

At week 1, students were required to write a 200-250 composition on a given topic. After that, students were given some times to revise his/her own text before submitted to the teacher. The teacher checked and analyzed the texts (first draft).

At week 2, the teacher returned the texts to students. Each student received his/her peer text to assess. After that, the text owner revised his/her own text based on peer-feedback before submitted to the teacher. The teacher checked and analyzed the texts (second draft).

At week 3, the teacher assessed the texts and returned them to the text owner. Each student revised his/her own work based on teacher-feedback before submitted to the teacher. The teacher checked and analyzed the texts (final draft).

This writing cycle was repeated four times in the course of 15 weeks. The writing topics were different in each cycle, including argumentative, discussion, report, and persuasive. After the writing task was completely done, each student was interviewed for about 20 to 30 minutes. They were asked their perception regarding the three types of assessment (teacher-, peer-, and self-). The interview was conducted face to face and audio taped. Native language (Bahasa Indonesia) was used during interview sessions so as to facilitate natural communication.

Data Analysis

The data gained from students' texts were analyzed by counting two items, (1) the number and the percentage of revision changes after incorporating three different feedbacks (self-, peer-, and teacher-) made on each drafts, and (2) the percentage of revision (type, size, and function) made on all drafts. Meanwhile, the data gained from interview were firstly transcribed. They were then coded and analyzed on four separate occasions to ensure the consistency of the identified codes.

Findings and discussion

1. To what extent do three assessments facilitate students' text revision?

To address this question, the authors analyzed students' text revisions (interim and final drafts) from two sources. First, instances of incorporating three different feedbacks (self-, peer-, and teacher-) into students' text revisions were counted. Second, revision changes made on interim and final draft (types, size, and function) was performed.

Table 1. Revision changes across 40 drafts (4 writing cycles)

Draft	Types of feedback	Revision changes
first draft	self-feedback	220 (10.5%)
second draft	peer-feedback	424 (20.5%)
	self-feedback	184 (8.8%)
third draft	teacher-feedback	900 (42.9%)
	self-feedback	364 (17.3%)
Total		**2,096 (100%)**

The data in table 1 above was gained from the students' text revisions across 40 drafts (10 drafts in each writing cycle). It was clear that the students made the total number of 2,096 revision changes. At the first draft, students made a small percentage of revisions (10.5%). Meanwhile, they incorporated more peer-feedback (20.5%) than self-feedback (8.8%) at the second draft. Furthermore, they incorporated more teacher-feedback (42.9%) than self-feedback (17.3%) at the third draft. Despite a small proportion of self-feedback incorporated into revisions, it seemed that students had a tendency to engage in self-assessment practice more frequently when revising their drafts. It was showed by the second draft and third draft where the percentage of self-feedback almost doubled (from 8.8% to 17.3%).

In terms of text analysis, table 2 below showed that the most common types of revision changes were addition and distribution with 43.7% and 30.4% respectively. In terms of size of revision, the highest proportion (over 40%) was made up by word revision, and the lowest proportion (under 5%) was made up by punctuation revision. With regards to function of revision, the vast majority was made up by the discourse-related level (cohesion and coherent) by over 35%, as opposed to under 15% was made up by the other two levels (grammatical and texture).

Table 2. Text analysis

Type of Revision	Percentage	Size of Revision	Percentage	Function of Revision	Percentage
Addition	43.7%	Punctuation	4.3%	Grammatical	14.8%
Substitution	17.6%	Word	43.1%	Cohesion	39.5%
Consolidation	6.2%	Phrase	9.1%	Texture	7.2%
Permutation	2.1%	Clause	13.4%	Coherent	38.5%
Distribution	30.4%	Sentence	10.5%		
		Paragraph	19.6%		
Total	**100%**	**Total**	**100%**	**Total**	**100%**

The above finding echoed what Lam (2013) examined. At the level of function of revision, he found that the participants mostly concerned with cohesion and coherent where 58.1% revisions were made at these two areas. Similar pattern was showed at the level of type of revision. He found that the majority of participants (78.4%) focused on revising two areas, addition and distribution. However, his

finding showed different trend at the level of size of revision. While his study found that sentence revision was the most revised area (37.5%), the present study found that students mostly made word revision (43.1%). This data indicated that students were more likely to make revision at the level of vocabulary by changing, omitting, and adding new words in their text, especially when feedback from peer and teacher were adopted concurrently.

In the context of Korean tertiary students, Park (2018) examined the effect of teacher and peer feedback on students' text revision. She found that the teacher mostly gave suggestive comments by asking students to add more additional information or offer direct alternatives. Students appreciated teacher suggestions by adding some relevant information when revising their text. This finding was similar to that of present study. As indicated in table 2, addition was the first area which students mostly revised (43.7%), especially when teacher-feedback was adopted. In addition, Park (2018) also found that the students gave suggestive comments by asking their peers to discuss more ideas in the text. Students appreciated their peer suggestions by elaborating on their ideas when revising their text. This finding was similar to that of present study. As indicated in table 2, distribution was the second area which students mostly revised (30.4%), especially when peer-feedback was adopted.

2. What are students' opinions of three different types of assessment?

To address this question, the author analyzed students' answers during interview session. Each student was asked his opinion of three different assessments (teacher-, peer-, and self-).

Table 3. Students' opinions of three types of assessment

No	Description	Teacher assessment	Peer assessment	Self assessment
1	Beneficial	16 (40%)	12 (26.1%)	17 (48.6%)
2	Reliable	17 (42.5%)	4 (8.7%)	0
3	Strict	7 (17.5%)	5 (10.9%)	0
4	Time-consuming	0	4 (8.7%)	10 (28.6%)
5	Inaccurate	0	16 (34.8%)	0
6	Difficult to do	0	5 (10.9%)	8 (22.8%)
	Total	**40 (100%)**	**46 (100%)**	**35 (100%)**

The data above revealed that students made 40 comments on teacher-assessment. They mostly showed positive responses (82.5%) by saying it was beneficial and reliable, but few comments (17.5%) indicated it was strict at the same time. Meanwhile, students made 46 comments on peer-assessment. Some comments (34.8%) positively showed it was beneficial and reliable. However, some other comments appeared to indicate negative responses (65.2%) by saying it was strict, time-consuming, inaccurate and difficult to do. The comments on self-assessment seemed to have equal number of both attitudes. Among 35 comments, nearly half (48.6%) of them positively indicated it was beneficial, and just over half (51.4%) of the comments negatively indicated it was time consuming and difficult to do.

The following was the sample of students' answers during interview session which have been translated. When asked their opinion about teacher-assessment, three students positively commented that:

> *S4: I believe that teacher-assessment is the most reliable. Teacher is an experienced professional in assessing students' works.*
> *S5: I definitely appreciate teacher-assessment. I found his comments and feedbacks very helpful. I like the way he provides written comments on my essay. It is very clear and effective.*
> *S7: Teacher's comments help me improve the organization of my essay. I mean, I can organize my essay better than before. His comments also help me improve the content and the language of my essay.*

Although most of students positively supported the practice of teacher-assessment, two of them seemed to give negative responses.

> *S1: I like teacher-assessment because it is the most reliable. But, although it is the most reliable assessment, it is also the strictest at the same time.*
> *S9: Rather than teacher-assessment, I prefer peer-assessment because it is the most lax. I notice that teacher strictly assesses my work.*

The data above revealed that students mostly appreciate teacher-assessment because they found it very reliable, helpful, and effective. This finding was similar with that of previous studies (Ferris, 1995, 1997; Tsui and Ng, 2000). Although students' perceived usefulness was varied in reference to different areas of writing, they found that students generally appreciated teacher-assessment. On the contrary, S1 and S9 showed negative attitudes toward teacher-assessment practice. This finding echoed what previous studies (Chang, et al., 2012; Lin, et al., 2001; Sadler and Good, 2006) found. In their study, the participants argued that the teacher-assessment was the strictest, and the peer-assessment was the most lax. With regards to peer-assessment, most students appeared to disagree with it. When asked their opinions, two students gave negative comments. They said:

> *S5: I don't mind my writing is assessed by my classmate. However, I don't fully trust his capability in assessing my writing. I have experienced peer-assessment practice before. When I read my peer comments and feedback, I found them very inaccurate.*
> *S7: In my opinion, it is difficult to critize my peer's work, especially when it comes to my best friend's work. I mean, there is always a sense of tolerance when I have to mark my friend's work. I had better not participating in this activity.*

Despite the significant number of rejecters, there had few students showed positive attitude toward peer-assessment. Two students commented:

S9: In my opinion, peer-assessment is a good way to enhance learning. I can improve my writing by learning my peer's comments and critics. In return, I can also help my peer improve his work by giving suggestions. In sum, peer-assessment enables us to help each other.

S3: Peer-assessment practice is beneficial especially for students who never experienced it before, like me. I think, this activity is quite flexible. I mean, I can contact my peer to confirm what I don't understand, even outside the class. Something I can't do when it comes to teacher-assessment.

The interview data above showed that S5 did not respect peer-assessment because of its inaccuracy. This finding aligned with that of Park (2018). In her study, some students were dissatisfied with their peers' inability to provide accurate feedback. Therefore, it was common for students to doubt peer-assessment practice in many cases (Rollinson, 2005). In the case of S7, he preferred not joining peer-assessment because of his tolerance feeling to his friend work. This finding echoed what Falchikop (1995) examined. He found that students were less strict in assessing each other. The same finding was reported by Pond, et al. (1995). They named it "friendship-marking" since students were difficult to mark each other's work. Conversely, S9 and S3 clearly said that they supported the idea of peer-assessment practice because they could perceive its benefits. This finding was in line with that of previous studies (Lundstrom and Baker, 2009; Min, 2005). They reported that students found peer-assessment very helpful for the development of their writing skill. Further, they found that peer-assessment beneficial for reviewers as well since they could learn writing styles and develop critical analysis in assessing their own writing.

In terms of self-assessment, three students stated their negative opinions. They argued that self-assessment possessed several drawbacks.

S3: We are not used to assessing our own work. Although we had been prepared by self-assessment training before, I am still not confident. I think I need more training.

S8: I think self-assessment is a time-consuming process. I experienced it last semester. You know, I had to go back-and-forth to my teacher asking for clarification since I am not sure with my own assessment.

S10: I have no any experiences in assessing my own work. I think assessment should be done by teacher. Teacher is more experienced and reliable. Other than that, it is the teacher's job, not the student's.

Despite the negative responses above, several students perceived the benefits of self-assessment practice. S1 and S6 commented:

S1: I believe that self-assessment practice has some benefits. This activity helps me develop my awareness on how to review my own work. It also stimulates my motivation and engagement in learning process.

S6: Self-assessment practice enables me to see my own progress and it gives me greater ownership on my own learning. I mean, I can see how much I have improved.

153

The interview data above showed that S3 and S10 were lack of skill and training which made them negatively respond to self-assessment practice. This finding aligned with that of Lam (2013). He reported that the total number of 42.5% negative comments to self-assessment was given by students during interview session. Meanwhile, S8 concerned with the "time-consuming" issue in self-assessment practice. In this respect, Haris (1997) argued that self-assessment for students could be designed to become more practical in terms of time and resources. In this case, he suggested that self-assessment be an integral part of regular classroom activities. On the other hand, positive responses given by S1 and S6 above seemed to support the idea by Nunan (1988, p. 116). He argued that the practice of self-assessment is an effective method for the development of critical self-awareness. In addition, Little (2005) argued that teacher should involve his learners in all the learning process, including the assessment process. Therefore, self-assessment skills should be provided to facilitate learners in the real self-assessment practice.

Conclusion
The present study investigated the effects of three different types of assessment (teacher-, peer-, and self-) on students' text revisions. The results revealed that students made the total of 2,096 revision changes across 40 drafts, with lower percentage of self-feedback incorporated into revisions. Additionally, this indicated that students had a tendency to engage in self-assessment practice more often when revising their drafts. Meanwhile, addition and distribution were the most common types of revision changes made by students. In terms of size of revision, the highest proportion (over 40%) was made up by word revision. With regards to function of revision, the vast majority was made up by the discourse-related level (cohesion and coherent) by over 35%. The second finding showed that most of the comments on teacher-assessment were positive (82.5%), as opposed to negative comments were dominantly (65.2%) addressed to peer-assessment. However, a balanced percentage was showed by both positive and negative comments on self-assessment.

Several limitations occurred in this study such as small sample of data and small number of participants. Future research may apply the same methods on a larger scale, or in different educational contexts. Despite these limitations, several implications can be clearly seen. For example, this study provided practical insight to EFL teachers into how three types of assessment (teacher-, peer-, and self-) can be developed to help improve students' writing skill. Besides, it informed EFL teachers with some suggestions to analyze students' perceptions regarding the three assessments to help facilitate quality-enhancing text revisions

References

Andrade, H., & Y. Du. (2007). Student response to criteria-referenced self-assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 32*(2), 159–181.

Birjandi, P., & N. Hadidi Tamjid. (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.

Chang, C. C. , Tseng, K.H., & Lou, S. J. (2012). A comparative analysis of the consistency and difference among teacher-assessment, student self-assessment and peer-assessment in a Web-based portfolio assessment environment for high school students. *Computers & Education, 58*, 303-320.

Chen, Y. M. (2008). Learning to self-assess oral performance in English: a longitudinal casestudy'. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(2), 235–262.

Cresswell, A. (2000). Self-monitoring in student writing: developing learner responsibility. *ELT Journal, 54*(3), 235–244.

Davison, C. & C. Leung. (2009). Current issues in English language teacher-based assessment. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(3), 393–415.

Falchikov, N. (1995). Peer feedback marking: developing peer assessment. *Innovation in Education and Training International, 32*, 175–187.

Harris, M. (1997). Self-assessment of language learning in formal settings. *ELT Journal*, *51*, 12-20.

Lin, S.-J., Liu, Z.-F., & Yuan, S.-M. (2001). Web-based peer assessment: attitude and achievement. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, *44*(2), 13.

Little, D. (2005). The common European framework and the European language portfolio: involving learners and their judgments in the assessment process. *Language Testing*, *22*, 321-326.

Matsuno, S. (2009). Self-, peer-, and teacherassessments in Japanese university EFL writingclassrooms'. *Language Testing, 26*(1) 75–100.

Nunan, D. (1988). The learner-centered curriculum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nicol, D. J., & D. Macfarlane-Dick. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, *31*(2), 199–218.

Pond, K., Ul-Haq, R., & Wade, W. (1995). Peer review: a precursor to peer assessment. *Innovation in Education and Training International,32*, 314-323.

Sadler, P., & Good, E. (2006).The impact of self- and peer-grading on student learning. *Educational Assessment*, *11*(1), 1-31.

Sengupta, S. (2000). An investigation into the effects of revision strategy instruction on L2secondary school learners. *System* 28(1), 97–113.

Taras, M. (2003). To feedback or not to feedback in student self-assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*(5), 549–565.

Appendix:

Sample of Interview Questions:

1. What is your opinion about the way your teacher assesses your work?
2. What is the good and bad things of teacher-assessment?
3. Have your work been assessed by your peers? If so, how do you think it is?
4. Do you think peer-assessment is beneficial? In what way?
5. If compared with teacher-assessment, what is the negative side of peer-assessment?
6. Have you assessed your own work? If so, how do you know about the procedure of self-assessment?
7. To what extent does self-assessment benefit you?
8. Among the the three assessments (teacher-, peer-, and self-), which one do you prefer the most? Why?