

Dr. Hanan Habis Al-Harbi

Enhancing Undergraduate Writing Proficiency: An Examination of Alternative Feedback Methods and Student Perceptions

Dr. Hanan Habis Al-Harbi

Department of English Language and Literature
College of Languages and Translation
Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University

Abstract

This quantitative descriptive study carried out with 34 undergraduates studying English as a major in a public university in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia was designed to (a) explore undergraduate EFL students' perceptions of the effectiveness of each feedback method in enhancing their writing skills and (b) identify students' preferred and least preferred feedback methods for enhancing their writing skills as well as the underlying reasons for these preferences. The primary finding was that peer review is more useful than group review, self-review, and portfolio-based writing assessments. Peer review was preferred for reasons including exposure to diverse perspectives and writing styles, support of quality feedback, support of objective self-assessment, promotion of accountability, reduction of work in comparison to portfolios, and reduction of plagiarism risks. Therefore, ESL / EFL teachers should promote peer review where feasible.

Enhancing Undergraduate Writing Proficiency: An Examination of Alternative Feedback Methods and Student Perceptions

Dr. Hanan Habis Al-Harbi

Department of English Language and Literature
College of Languages and Translation
Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University

Introduction

Writing proficiency is a core component of success for students of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) / English as a Second Language (ESL) (Brockman, 2020; Buono & Jang, 2021; Chien, 2012; Gedamu & Gezahegn, 2023; Good et al., 2010; Graham, 2019; Haas & Brown, 2019; Han & Hyland, 2019; Kendall & Khuon, 2023; Latifi et al., 2021; López-Serrano et al., 2019; Paradis et al., 2010; Rozimela, 2021; Staples et al., 2023; Watts, 2021). Writing proficiency benefits from the provision of feedback through methods such as group review, peer review, self-review, and portfolio-based writing assessments (Cao et al., 2019; Esterhazy & Damşa, 2019; Han & Hyland, 2019; Latifi et al., 2021; Link et al., 2022; Zhang & Zou, 2023). However, there is a gap in the literature on this topic, as there is insufficient information about how EFL students themselves (a) perceive and (b) rank the efficacy of specific feedback methods. The objective of this quantitative descriptive study is to address this gap in the literature.

Literature Review

There is a substantial body of literature on the feedback methods of group review, peer review, self-review, and portfolio-based writing assessments.

Group Review

In group review, feedback is offered collectively (Babaii & Adeh, 2019; Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Liu & Wu, 2019; Rahimi, 2021; Xu et al., 2023). The members of a group take writing

examples in turn and offer critique and other forms of feedback. One advantage of this approach is its interactivity (Ma, 2020). Group members can interact with each other, as well as with the student whose work is being evaluated, to support rich, multi-way discussions that can be very illuminating (Babaii & Adeh, 2019; Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Liu & Wu, 2019; Rahimi, 2021; Xu et al., 2023). Group discussions also offer individuals the opportunity to support opinions against others, which can result in more complex evaluations than if only one point of view is presented in the evaluation (Rassaei, 2021). One possible limitation of group feedback is that it can be difficult for shy participants to make their voices and viewpoints heard in this format (Kuyyogsuy, 2019). The format can also limit students who prefer to offer written over verbal feedback (Babaii & Adeh, 2019; Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Liu & Wu, 2019; Rahimi, 2021; Xu et al., 2023). Indeed, verbal feedback has the disadvantage of now allowing longer, more complex feedback of the kind that writing can support (Babaii & Adeh, 2019; Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Liu & Wu, 2019; Rahimi, 2021; Xu et al., 2023).

Peer Review

In the classic approach to peer review, students exchange papers (which can be done anonymously), and then offer written feedback (Cao et al., 2019; Latifi et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2023; Zhang & Zou, 2023). One advantage of this approach is that, because it is anonymous, students can be franker in their critiques (Issa et al., 2022; Iswandari & Jiang, 2020). A potential disadvantage is that peer review only offers feedback from one peer or a few peers (Iswandari & Jiang, 2020). Peer feedback also presumes that peers are sufficiently good writers to convey their ideas in writing (Cao et al., 2019; Iswandari & Jiang, 2020; Latifi et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2023; Zhang & Zou, 2023).

Self-Review

Self-review is, as its name suggests, an approach in which students provide feedback on their own writing (Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Mufanti et al., 2019; Tsurroya, 2020). The chief disadvantage

of this approach is that it presumes that students have the requisite objectivity and insight related to their own work. One potential benefit is that metacognition and second-order thinking are promoted, as students have to think more about their own processes and outcomes (Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Mufanti et al., 2019; Tsurroya, 2020). Students with particularly limited writing or cognitive skills are less likely to benefit from self-review, however (Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Mufanti et al., 2019; Tsurroya, 2020).

Portfolio-Based Assessments

A portfolio-based assessment requires students to submit a body of writing work, such as that completed over a semester, to a teacher for assessment (Babaii & Adeh, 2019; Hamidnia et al., 2020; Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Liu & Wu, 2019; Mufanti et al., 2019). This approach has the advantage of basing feedback on several writing samples instead of one. Another advantage is the provision of expert feedback from a teacher (Babaii & Adeh, 2019; Hamidnia et al., 2020; Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Liu & Wu, 2019; Mufanti et al., 2019). A potential disadvantage is that a student has to wait for an entire semester or a similar period to receive feedback, which might come too late to be of practical use to the student in the short term of a course of study (Babaii & Adeh, 2019; Hamidnia et al., 2020; Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Liu & Wu, 2019; Mufanti et al., 2019)

Research Questions

The research questions guiding this study were as follows:

RQ1: What are the undergraduate EFL students' perceptions of the effectiveness of each feedback method in enhancing their writing skills?

RQ2: What are students' preferred and least preferred feedback methods for enhancing their writing skills, and what are the underlying reasons for these preferences?

Statement of the Problem

The study aims to investigate the effectiveness of various feedback methods, including peer review, group review, self-

review, and portfolio-based writing assessments. The primary focus is on understanding undergraduate EFL students' preferences and reasons behind their choices in the pursuit of enhancing writing skills. The findings are crucial for informing ESL/EFL educators and curriculum developers about the feedback methods favored by students and the associated reasons. This knowledge can guide instructional practices and curriculum design to align with students' preferences, ultimately contributing to the enhancement of writing skills in the ESL/EFL educational context.

Methodology

The participants were 34 undergraduates studying English as a major in a public university in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. They were enrolled into two sections, and no specific criteria or tests were used to place the participants into their corresponding sections, as they were allowed to register randomly in any section until the maximum number of 20 students was reached. After that, the two sections were randomly assigned to the instructor/researcher by the English Language Department. To join the English language Program, all participants should score 4.5 or higher in IELTS. At the time of conducting the study, they can be considered to be an intermediate level of English, which is equivalent to B1 in the Common European Framework of References, CERF. They had taken two courses in essay writing previously, and it was their third course in essay writing at the time when the study was conducted.

In terms of study design, the participants practiced writing essays in 2-week modules, then one week for portfolio-based writing assessment. They practiced 4 alternative feedback, namely, group review, peer review, self-review (error reflection), and portfolio-based writing assessment. They provided a group-to-group review at the beginning, as they worked collaboratively as a group in generating ideas and providing the structure of the essay and provide feedback for fellow groups when writing a first draft, then peer review for the final draft. After that came self-review (error reflection), in which the students were provided with a prefabricated error-reflection template adapted from Alsahil (2022) to write down

Enhancing Undergraduate Writing Proficiency :An Examination of Alternative Feedback Methods and Student Perceptions

their mistakes, how to correct them, and how this feedback on their mistakes is helpful in future writing. This was repeated for every 2-week module. In the last week, they were asked to do a portfolio-based writing assessment, as they analyzed their progress to specify areas of development and areas that still needed improvement, and how this is helpful in future writing. A 4-point Likert-scale (Franceschetti, 2017; Natrella, 2013; Wright & Hallquist, 2020) questionnaire was conducted to examine students' evaluation of the different feedback, and they were interviewed to decide which kind was the most helpful and which was the least helpful, and they provided reasons for their choices.

Using the Cronbach Alpha test, the reliability of the questionnaire was found to be 0.72, which is considered to be sufficiently high for quantitative research purposes (Aryadoust & Raquel, 2019; Brough, 2018; Edlund & Nichols, 2019; Mertens, 2019; Zikmund, 2010). After the quantitative portion of the questionnaire, participants were asked to open-endedly describe which types of alternative feedback were the most or least helpful, and they provided reasons for their choices.

the questionnaire was made by the instructor/researcher to compare the types of alternative corrective written feedback implemented in this study regarding the different characteristics of each type, and it was informed by the literature on written corrective feedback. To validate the questionnaire, it was cross-checked with 2 faculty members holding both Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics and experience in writing instruction, and modifications were made based on their comments if cases of lack of clarity or redundancy were reported. A pilot test was conducted afterward on a small sample of participants using convenience sampling. All participants completed the questionnaire without reporting any issues.

Ethical guidelines were strictly followed, ensuring that all participants were fully informed about the study and gave their informed consent. Furthermore, steps were taken to maintain the confidentiality of the data gathered.

Results

Quantitative Results

Descriptive statistics. The first step in the analysis was to calculate the means and standard deviations for the 49 quantitative survey questions.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics

Question	Mean	SD
Group-to-group review provided me with diverse and comprehensive feedback on my writing.	2.82	0.9
Participating in group-to-group reviews enhanced my collaborative learning and teamwork skills.	2.88	0.91
Group-to-group review helped me develop communication, negotiation, and cooperation skills.	3.09	0.93
Differentiated expertise within the group allowed for peer mentoring and learning opportunities.	3.06	0.6
Group-to-group review was more time-consuming and challenging to schedule compared to individual peer reviews.	3.09	0.9
In some groups, certain members dominated the review process while others contributed less, leading to unequal workload sharing and feedback.	2.94	0.85
Group dynamics, including conflicts and personality clashes, impacted the quality and effectiveness of feedback.	2.85	0.96
The consistency of feedback across different groups varied widely.	2.94	0.69
Group-to-group review may not provide the same level of privacy as individual peer review.	2.82	0.94
Receiving feedback from multiple group members was overwhelming for some students.	2.85	0.96
Peer feedback helped me identify strengths and weaknesses in my writing.	3.18	0.67
Peer review exposed me to diverse perspectives and writing styles.	3.21	0.59
Peer review encouraged me to think critically about the content, structure, and arguments of the writing.	2.59	0.89
Peer review helped me develop collaboration and communication skills.	2.79	0.84
Peer review reduced the workload on the instructor and allowed them to focus on teaching and guidance.	2.76	0.78
Peer feedback quality was inconsistent and sometimes unhelpful.	2.56	0.93

Enhancing Undergraduate Writing Proficiency :An Examination of Alternative Feedback Methods and Student Perceptions

Question	Mean	SD
The peer review process had the possibility of being biased and subjective.	2.79	0.64
Some peers lacked the expertise to identify and address advanced writing issues.	2.97	0.67
Peer review was time-consuming, and some students did not allocate sufficient time for thorough reviews.	2.94	0.69
Peer review occasionally led to conflicts or hurt feelings due to sensitivity to feedback.	2.26	1.08
In some peer review situations, a few students ended up doing most of the work while others contributed minimally.	2.68	0.91
Self-review promotes independence and ownership of my learning.	2.79	0.91
Self-review encourages critical thinking as I analyze and evaluate my own writing.	3.03	0.76
I can address my own mistakes and improve my writing through self-review.	3.09	0.83
Self-review is a time-efficient process, allowing me to review and improve my work as I write.	3.06	0.74
Self-review helps me develop a better understanding of my strengths and weaknesses as a writer.	2.94	0.78
I may not have the experience or knowledge to identify all errors or areas of improvement in my writing.	2.82	0.87
Self-review can be influenced by my bias and subjectivity, making it challenging to objectively assess my own work.	2.79	0.69
I may lack the expertise to identify and correct more advanced or subtle writing issues through self-review.	2.79	0.81
Self-review might lead to overconfidence or self-doubt in my writing abilities.	2.85	0.74
The effectiveness of self-review can vary among students, and some may not consistently apply the practice.	3.03	0.63
By not seeking external feedback, I may miss valuable learning opportunities and insights from peers and instructors.	3.06	0.81
I may feel less accountable in self-review compared to receiving external feedback.	2.68	0.77
The portfolio includes a diverse selection of my writing samples over time.	3.06	0.69
My portfolio demonstrates improvement in my writing skills over time.	3.21	0.64
My reflective statements provide insights into my writing goals	3.12	0.59

Dr. Hanan Habis Al-Harbi

Question	Mean	SD
and strategies.		
My portfolio includes evidence of peer and self-review, showing my ability to use feedback for improvement.	3.18	0.72
The assessment criteria used for my portfolio are clear and align with the writing skills being evaluated.	3.12	0.48
My portfolio showcases my ability to write effectively in various genres and styles.	3	0.65
My portfolio demonstrates my capacity for critical thinking and constructing well-supported arguments or ideas in writing.	3.09	0.57
The portfolio effectively assesses my writing development over an extended period.	3.18	0.63
My portfolio reflects my unique strengths and accomplishments as a writer.	3.15	0.66
The portfolio assessment method provides flexibility for ongoing improvement and/or final evaluation of my writing skills.	3.06	0.65
The portfolio assessment accurately reflects my writing abilities in real-world scenarios.	2.94	0.6
The process of creating and assessing portfolios is time-consuming for both students and instructors.	2.74	0.67
Portfolio assessment is resource-intensive in terms of both time and materials.	2.85	0.5
Writing effective reflective statements within portfolios can be challenging for some students.	2.85	0.56
Some students may be tempted to include work they did not create themselves, raising concerns about the authenticity of the portfolio.	2.5	0.79
Properly implementing portfolio assessment requires clear guidelines, rubrics, and training for both students and instructors.	3.21	0.54

One-sample *t*-test results. The next step in the results was to identify the items with which participants significantly agreed or disagreed. One-tailed *p* values for the test value of agree (= 3) were calculated.

Table 2

One-Sample t-Test Results (Test Value = 3, Significant Results Bolded)

Question	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Group-to-group review provided me with diverse and comprehensive feedback on my writing.	-1.1433	0.1315
Participating in group-to-group reviews enhanced my	-	0.229

Enhancing Undergraduate Writing Proficiency :An Examination of Alternative Feedback Methods and Student Perceptions

Question	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
collaborative learning and teamwork skills.	0.7533	
Group-to-group review helped me develop communication, negotiation, and cooperation skills.	0.5533	0.2925
Differentiated expertise within the group allowed for peer mentoring and learning opportunities.	0.5733	0.2855
Group-to-group review was more time-consuming and challenging to schedule compared to individual peer reviews.	0.5733	0.2855
In some groups, certain members dominated the review process while others contributed less, leading to unequal workload sharing and feedback.	- 0.4033	0.3445
Group dynamics, including conflicts and personality clashes, impacted the quality and effectiveness of feedback.	- 0.9033	0.1885
The consistency of feedback across different groups varied widely.	- 0.4933	0.312
Group-to-group review may not provide the same level of privacy as individual peer review.	- 1.1033	0.14
Receiving feedback from multiple group members was overwhelming for some students.	- 0.9033	0.1885
Peer feedback helped me identify strengths and weaknesses in my writing.	1.5333	0.068
Peer review exposed me to diverse perspectives and writing styles.	2.0333	0.0255
Peer review encouraged me to think critically about the content, structure, and arguments of the writing.	- 2.6933	0.0055
Peer review helped me develop collaboration and communication skills.	- 1.4233	0.0825
Peer review reduced the workload on the instructor and allowed them to focus on teaching and guidance.	- 1.7633	0.044
Peer feedback quality was inconsistent and sometimes unhelpful.	- 2.7733	0.0045
The peer review process had the possibility of being biased and subjective.	- 1.8733	0.035
Some peers lacked the expertise to identify and address advanced writing issues.	- 0.2533	0.4005
Peer review was time-consuming, and some students did not allocate sufficient time for thorough reviews.	- 0.4933	0.312
Peer review occasionally led to conflicts or hurt feelings due to sensitivity to feedback.	- 3.9633	0

Dr. Hanan Habis Al-Harbi

Question	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
In some peer review situations, a few students ended up doing most of the work while others contributed minimally.	- 2.0733	0.023
Self-review promotes independence and ownership of my learning.	- 1.3133	0.099
Self-review encourages critical thinking as I analyze and evaluate my own writing.	0.2333	0.411
I can address my own mistakes and improve my writing through self-review.	0.6233	0.27
Self-review is a time-efficient process, allowing me to review and improve my work as I write.	0.4733	0.322
Self-review helps me develop a better understanding of my strengths and weaknesses as a writer.	- 0.4433	0.3305
I may not have the experience or knowledge to identify all errors or areas of improvement in my writing.	- 1.1833	0.1225
Self-review can be influenced by my bias and subjectivity, making it challenging to objectively assess my own work.	- 1.7533	0.045
I may lack the expertise to identify and correct more advanced or subtle writing issues through self-review.	- 1.4933	0.0735
Self-review might lead to overconfidence or self-doubt in my writing abilities.	- 1.1533	0.1285
The effectiveness of self-review can vary among students, and some may not consistently apply the practice.	0.2733	0.393
By not seeking external feedback, I may miss valuable learning opportunities and insights from peers and instructors.	0.4233	0.338
I may feel less accountable in self-review compared to receiving external feedback.	- 2.4633	0.0095
The portfolio includes a diverse selection of my writing samples over time.	0.4933	0.312
My portfolio demonstrates improvement in my writing skills over time.	1.8733	0.035
My reflective statements provide insights into my writing goals and strategies.	1.1633	0.127
My portfolio includes evidence of peer and self-review, showing my ability to use feedback for improvement.	1.4433	0.08
The assessment criteria used for my portfolio are clear and align with the writing skills being evaluated.	1.4433	0.08
My portfolio showcases my ability to write effectively in various genres and styles.	0.0033	0.5
My portfolio demonstrates my capacity for critical thinking	0.9033	0.187

Enhancing Undergraduate Writing Proficiency :An Examination of Alternative Feedback Methods and Student Perceptions

Question	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
and constructing well-supported arguments or ideas in writing.		
The portfolio effectively assesses my writing development over an extended period.	1.6433	0.055
My portfolio reflects my unique strengths and accomplishments as a writer.	1.3033	0.1005
The portfolio assessment method provides flexibility for ongoing improvement and/or final evaluation of my writing skills.	0.5333	0.3
The portfolio assessment accurately reflects my writing abilities in real-world scenarios.	-0.5733	0.2855
The process of creating and assessing portfolios is time-consuming for both students and instructors.	-2.3233	0.0135
Portfolio assessment is resource-intensive in terms of both time and materials.	-1.7133	0.048
Writing effective reflective statements within portfolios can be challenging for some students.	-1.5433	0.067
Some students may be tempted to include work they did not create themselves, raising concerns about the authenticity of the portfolio.	-3.7033	0.0005
Properly implementing portfolio assessment requires clear guidelines, rubrics, and training for both students and instructors.	2.2333	0.0165

Significant results. The following prompts were significantly agreed or disagreed with in the survey.

Table 3
Significant Prompts

Agreement	Disagreement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer review exposed me to diverse perspectives and writing styles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer review encouraged me to think critically about the content, structure, and arguments of the writing. Peer review reduced the workload on the instructor and allowed them to focus on teaching and guidance. Peer feedback quality was inconsistent and

sometimes unhelpful.

- The peer review process had the possibility of being biased and subjective.
- Peer review occasionally led to conflicts or hurt feelings due to sensitivity to feedback.
- In some peer review situations, a few students ended up doing most of the work while others contributed minimally.
- Self-review can be influenced by my bias and subjectivity, making it challenging to objectively assess my own work.
- I may feel less accountable in self-review compared to receiving external feedback.
- The process of creating and assessing portfolios is time-consuming for both students and instructors.
- Portfolio assessment is resource-intensive in terms of both time and materials.
- Some students may be tempted to include work they did not create themselves, raising concerns about the authenticity of the portfolio.

Deriving themes from results. Because of the wording in the prompts, some interpretation is required. In particular, it can be concluded that peer review was positively assessed, with students believing that peer review (a) exposed them to diverse perspectives and writing styles; (b) supported quality feedback; (c) was subjective; (d) did not lead to conflict; (e) distributed workload democratically; (f) supported objective self-assessment; (g) promoted accountability, (h) did not create burdens associated with portfolios; and (i) did not promote plagiarism. On the other hand, students indicated that peer review did not support critical thinking or reduce instructor workload.

Qualitative Findings

**Enhancing Undergraduate Writing Proficiency :An Examination of Alternative
Feedback Methods and Student Perceptions**

Table 4

Summary of Qualitative Findings

Category	Benefits
Group Review	- Improves writing skills, helps discover errors, and imparts new skills. - Offers more ideas, enhances understanding, and is enjoyable. - Increases ideas, speeds up and perfects writing, helps find mistakes. - Facilitates idea discussion, new writing methods, and writing assistance. - Aids in understanding and learning from mistakes. - Assists in recognizing personal and group mistakes, eases understanding of lost marks, and enables collaborative work. - Enhances communication and skill improvement. - Exchanges ideas, chooses terms and corrects each other. - Uses colleagues' knowledge, supports cooperation, and identifies each other's mistakes. - Helpful for all group members, requires careful group selection. - Encourages more learning from others.
Peer Review	- Identifies and corrects mistakes, enabling work on them. - Offers diverse writing styles, and new perspectives, and develops critical thinking. - Helps recognize and focus on mistakes, improving clarity. - Understands writing intentions, feels comfortable, and corrects mistakes when needed. - Organizes thoughts. - Encourages collaborative learning, helps detect errors, and fosters self-regulation in learning. - Provides valuable feedback, refines essays, and enhances writing skills through collaboration.
Self-Review (Error Reflection)	- Concentrates on personal mistakes and learning from them. - Recognizes and corrects personal errors, and avoids repetition in exams. - Focuses exclusively on personal writing, enhancing clarity and effectiveness. - Identifies personal mistakes, sets writing goals, and takes responsibility for learning. - Learns from mistakes independently, avoiding group-related embarrassment. - Offers privacy in writing and learning from personal mistakes. - Enables self-detection of mistakes, free from others' judgments. - Focuses solely on personal writing errors, improving efficiency and self-improvement. -

Dr. Hanan Habis Al-Harbi

Category	Benefits
	Allows focused work on weaknesses and feels less self-conscious about writing. - Encourages writing skills, personal learning, and practical application.
Portfolio-Based Writing Assessment	- Provides proper instructions, enhances essay knowledge, and ensures understandable writing over time.

Discussion

The findings were of interest in that, unlike the literature, they emphasized peer review as the only one of the four major forms of feedback about which students had non-neutral feelings. Although students were asked questions about group review, peer review, self-review, and portfolio-based writing assessments in detail, they only had statistically significant levels of agreement or disagreement with prompts related to peer review. One possible interpretation of these findings was that students were neutral about the value of group review, self-review, and portfolio-based writing assessments. The importance of peer review has been emphasized in the literature (Cao et al., 2019; Iswandari & Jiang, 2020; Latifi et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2023; Zhang & Zou, 2023), but this study suggested that peer review is even more useful vis-à-vis group review, self-review, and portfolio-based writing assessments. Peer review was preferred for specific reasons, which were exposure to diverse perspectives and writing styles, support of quality feedback, support of objective self-assessment, promotion of accountability, reduction of work in comparison to portfolios, and reduction of plagiarism risks. Accordingly, ESL / EFL teachers should promote peer review.

Pedagogical Recommendations

1. Structured peer review workshops should be implemented to guide students in providing constructive feedback. This aims to enhance students' ability to receive meaningful insights and critiques.

Enhancing Undergraduate Writing Proficiency :An Examination of Alternative Feedback Methods and Student Perceptions

2. Students should be trained in providing high-quality feedback that goes beyond surface-level corrections. Emphasis should be placed on constructive criticism and specific suggestions for improvement.
3. Activities that support students in objectively assessing their own writing should be integrated. This involves reflective exercises, self-evaluation checklists, and goal setting to enhance their ability to critically assess their work.
4. Professional development opportunities for ESL/EFL teachers to enhance their understanding of effective peer review practices should be offered. Training should cover strategies for facilitating peer review sessions, managing challenges, and integrating peer review into the curriculum.
5. Research should be conducted to explore the long-term impact of peer review on students' writing skills. Investigation into how sustained exposure to peer review influences writing proficiency over an extended period is recommended.
6. Cross-cultural peer review experiences should be fostered to expose students to writing styles and perspectives from different cultural backgrounds. This collaborative approach aims to enrich their learning and broaden their understanding of diverse communication styles.
7. Discussions and activities that raise awareness about plagiarism risks during peer review should be integrated. Students should be educated on proper citation practices and the importance of maintaining academic integrity.

Conclusion

The main finding of the study was that students preferred peer review to group review, self-review, and portfolio-based writing assessments. This finding was based on several advantages of peer review, including exposure to diverse perspectives and writing styles, support of quality feedback, support of objective self-

Dr. Hanan Habis Al-Harbi

assessment, promotion of accountability, reduction of work in comparison to portfolios, and reduction of plagiarism risks. For this reason, EFL teachers should consider promoting peer review. However, the results of the study were limited by the small sample and limited duration. Future studies should attempt to draw larger samples and extend them over longer periods of time.

References

- Alsahil, A. (2022). Behind the scenes: exploring learners' collaborative writing interactions and strategies. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-30
- Aryadoust, V., & Raquel, M. (2019). *Quantitative data analysis for language assessment*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Babaii, E., & Adeb, A. (2019). One, two, ..., many: The outcomes of paired peer assessment, group peer assessment, and teacher assessment in EFL writing. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(1), 53-66. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.1.4.53>
- Brockman, E. (2020). Reframing writing prompts to foster nuanced arguments: To what extent? *English Journal*, 109(6), 37-44. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/b8f7b1531401272f0f034d6a6e4d1e0b/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=42045>
- Brough, P. (2018). *Advanced research methods for applied psychology: design, analysis and reporting*. Routledge.
- Buono, S., & Jang, E. E. (2021). The effect of linguistic factors on assessment of English language learners' Mathematical ability: a differential item functioning analysis. *Educational Assessment*, 26(2), 125-144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2020.1858783>
- Cao, Z., Yu, S., & Huang, J. (2019). A qualitative inquiry into undergraduates' learning from giving and receiving peer feedback in L2 writing: Insights from a case study. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 63, 102-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.08.001>
- Chien, C. W. (2012). Differentiated instruction in an elementary school EFL classroom. *TESOL Journal*, 3(2), 280-291. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/tesj.18>
- Edlund, J. E., & Nichols, A. L. (2019). *Advanced research methods for the social and behavioral sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- Esterhazy, R., & Damşa, C. (2019). Unpacking the feedback process: An analysis of undergraduate students' interactional meaning-making of feedback comments. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(2), 260-274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1359249>
- Franceschetti, D. R. (2017). *Principles of scientific research*. Salem Press.
- Gedamu, A. D., & Gezahegn, T. H. (2023). TEFL trainees' attitude to and self-efficacy beliefs of academic oral presentation. *Cogent Education*, 10(1), 57-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2163087>
- Good, M. E., Masewicz, S., & Vogel, L. (2010). Latino English language learners: Bridging achievement and cultural gaps between schools and families. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 9(4), 321-339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2010.491048>

- Graham, S. (2019). Changing how writing is taught. *Review of Research in Education*, 43(1), 277-303. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X18821>
- Haas, E. M., & Brown, J. E. (2019). *Supporting English learners in the classroom: Best practices for distinguishing language acquisition from learning disabilities*. Teachers College Press.
- Hamidnia, M., Ketabi, S., & Amirian, Z. (2020). Feeding written corrective feedback forward: English language learners' writing improvement in a portfolio-keeping atmosphere. *Teaching English Language*, 14(1), 31-70.
https://www.teljournal.org/article_100594_b5422dbff06f2912aa3f8ac8a72cb843.pdf
- Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2019). Academic emotions in written corrective feedback situations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 38, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.12.003>
- Issa, B. I., Koronkiewicz, B., & Faretta-Stutenberg, M. (2022). Second-language writing in university-level basic language programs: A survey of student and instructor beliefs. *Foreign Language Annals*, 55(2), 383-407. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12609>
- Iswandari, Y., & Jiang, Y. (2020). Peer feedback in college EFL writing: A review of empirical research. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 23(2), 399-413. <https://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT/article/view/2799>
- Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(4), 519-539. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469>
- Kendall, J., & Khuon, O. (2023). *Writing sense: Integrated reading and writing lessons for English language learners*. Routledge.
- Kuyyogsuy, S. (2019). Students' attitudes toward peer feedback: Paving a way for students' English writing improvement. *English Language Teaching*, 12(7), 107-119.
<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Students%E2%80%99-Attitudes-Toward-Peer-Feedback%3A-Paving-a-Kuyyogsuy/7f7ed05afeb3b8f699000b6e1f225ab820f09155?p2df>
- Latifi, S., Noroozi, O., Hatami, J., & Biemans, H. J. (2021). How does online peer feedback improve argumentative essay writing and learning? *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 58(2), 195-206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2019.1687005>
- Link, S., Mehrzad, M., & Rahimi, M. (2022). Impact of automated writing evaluation on teacher feedback, student revision, and writing

Enhancing Undergraduate Writing Proficiency :An Examination of Alternative Feedback Methods and Student Perceptions

- improvement. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(4), 605-634. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1743323>
- Liu, Q., & Wu, S. (2019). Same goal, varying beliefs: How students and teachers see the effectiveness of feedback on second language writing. *Journal of Writing Research*, 11(2), 299-330. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2019.11.02.03>
- López-Serrano, S., de Larios, J. R., & Manchón, R. M. (2019). Language reflection fostered by individual L2 writing tasks: Developing a theoretically motivated and empirically based coding system. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 41(3), 503-527. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263119000275>
- Ma, Q. (2020). Examining the role of inter-group peer online feedback on wiki writing in an EAP context. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(3), 197-216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1556703>
- Mertens, D. M. (2019). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Sage.
- Mufanti, R., Susilo, A., Gestanti, R. A., & Nimasari, E. P. (2019). A constructing and analyzing model for the teaching of grammar. *Asian EFL Journal*, 23(3.2), 159-169. <http://repository.iainponorogo.ac.id/434/>
- Natrella, M. G. (2013). *Experimental statistics*. Courier Corporation.
- Paradis, J., Emmerzael, K., & Duncan, T. S. (2010). Assessment of English language learners: Using parent report on first language development. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 43(6), 474-497.
- Rahimi, M. (2021). A comparative study of the impact of focused vs. comprehensive corrective feedback and revision on ESL learners' writing accuracy and quality. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(5), 687-710. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136216881987918>
- Rassaei, E. (2021). Effects of dynamic and non-dynamic corrective feedback on EFL writing accuracy during dyadic and small group interactions. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 59(2), 233-265. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2016-0044>
- Rozimela, Y. (2021). Reading-based writing model: A blended learning alternative. *English Education: Journal of English Teaching and Research*, 6(2), 164-180. <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v6i2.16992>
- Staples, S., Gray, B., Biber, D., & Egbert, J. (2023). Writing trajectories of grammatical complexity at the university: Comparing L1 and L2 English writers in BAWE. *Applied Linguistics*, 44(1), 46-71. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac047>
- Tsuroyya, C. (2020). Students' perception on peer correction for academic writing performance. *The Journal of English Literacy Education: The*

Dr. Hanan Habis Al-Harbi

- Teaching and Learning of English as a Foreign Language*, 7(1), 11-19.
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/18d9/aa312fb73fb32cd69641ff550c8c4141f1fb.pdf>
- Watts, J. (2021). Teaching English language learners: A reconsideration of assimilation pedagogy in US schools. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 15(1), 1-9.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15595692.2019.1684890>
- Wright, A. G. C., & Hallquist, M. N. (2020). *The Cambridge handbook of research methods in clinical psychology*. Cambridge University Press,.
- Xu, Z., Zhang, L. J., & Parr, J. M. (2023). Incorporating peer feedback in writing instruction: examining its effects on Chinese English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners' writing performance. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 61(4), 1337-1364.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2021-0078>
- Zhang, R., & Zou, D. (2023). A review of research on technology-enhanced peer feedback for second language writing based on the activity theory framework. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(6), 6727-6753.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11469-8>
- Zikmund, W. G. (2010). *Business research methods* (8th ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning.

Enhancing Undergraduate Writing Proficiency :An Examination of Alternative Feedback Methods and Student Perceptions

Appendix A: Survey Questions

Participants will be asked to express their agreement or disagreement with statements using a 4-point Likert scale. The scale is structured as follows:

- 4: Strongly Agree
- 3: Agree
- 2: Disagree
- 1: Strongly Disagree

For each statement, participants are requested to select the response that best reflects their viewpoint. The scale provides a spectrum of options, allowing for nuanced responses to gauge the level of agreement or disagreement with the given statements.

1. Survey Questions:

1.1. Section 1: group-to-group review

- Group-to-group review provided me with diverse and comprehensive feedback on my writing.
- Participating in group-to-group reviews enhanced my collaborative learning and teamwork skills.
- Group-to-group review helped me develop communication, negotiation, and cooperation skills.
- Differentiated expertise within the group allowed for peer mentoring and learning opportunities.
- Group-to-group review was more time-consuming and challenging to schedule compared to individual peer reviews.
- In some groups, certain members dominated the review process while others contributed less, leading to unequal workload sharing and feedback.
- Group dynamics, including conflicts and personality clashes, impacted the quality and effectiveness of feedback.
- The consistency of feedback across different groups varied widely.
- Group-to-group review may not provide the same level of privacy as individual peer review.
- Receiving feedback from multiple group members was overwhelming for some students.

1.2. section 2: peer-review

- Peer feedback helped me identify strengths and weaknesses in my writing.
- Peer review exposed me to diverse perspectives and writing styles.
- Peer review encouraged me to think critically about the content, structure, and arguments of the writing.
- Peer review helped me develop collaboration and communication skills.
- Peer review reduced the workload on the instructor and allowed them to focus on teaching and guidance.

- Peer feedback quality was inconsistent and sometimes unhelpful.
- The peer review process had the possibility of being biased and subjective.
- Some peers lacked the expertise to identify and address advanced writing issues.
- Peer review was time-consuming, and some students did not allocate sufficient time for thorough reviews.
- Peer review occasionally led to conflicts or hurt feelings due to sensitivity to feedback.
- In some peer review situations, a few students ended up doing most of the work while others contributed minimally.

1.3. section 3: Self-Review (Error Reflection)

- Self-review promotes independence and ownership of my learning.
- Self-review encourages critical thinking as I analyze and evaluate my own writing.
- I can address my own mistakes and improve my writing through self-review.
- Self-review is a time-efficient process, allowing me to review and improve my work as I write.
- Self-review helps me develop a better understanding of my strengths and weaknesses as a writer.
- I may not have the experience or knowledge to identify all errors or areas of improvement in my writing.
- Self-review can be influenced by my bias and subjectivity, making it challenging to objectively assess my own work.
- I may lack the expertise to identify and correct more advanced or subtle writing issues through self-review.
- Self-review might lead to overconfidence or self-doubt in my writing abilities.
- The effectiveness of self-review can vary among students, and some may not consistently apply the practice.
- By not seeking external feedback, I may miss valuable learning opportunities and insights from peers and instructors.
- I may feel less accountable in self-review compared to receiving external feedback.

1.4. section 4: portfolio-based writing assessment

- The portfolio includes a diverse selection of my writing samples over time.
- My portfolio demonstrates improvement in my writing skills over time.
- My reflective statements provide insights into my writing goals and strategies.
- My portfolio includes evidence of peer and self-review, showing my ability to use feedback for improvement.
- The assessment criteria used for my portfolio are clear and align with the writing skills being evaluated.

Enhancing Undergraduate Writing Proficiency :An Examination of Alternative Feedback Methods and Student Perceptions

- My portfolio showcases my ability to write effectively in various genres and styles.
 - My portfolio demonstrates my capacity for critical thinking and constructing well-supported arguments or ideas in writing.
 - The portfolio effectively assesses my writing development over an extended period.
 - My portfolio reflects my unique strengths and accomplishments as a writer.
 - The portfolio assessment method provides flexibility for ongoing improvement and/or final evaluation of my writing skills.
 - The portfolio assessment accurately reflects my writing abilities in real-world scenarios.
 - The process of creating and assessing portfolios is time-consuming for both students and instructors.
 - Portfolio assessment is resource-intensive in terms of both time and materials.
 - Writing effective reflective statements within portfolios can be challenging for some students.
 - Some students may be tempted to include work they did not create themselves, raising concerns about the authenticity of the portfolio.
 - Properly implementing portfolio assessment requires clear guidelines, rubrics, and training for both students and instructors.
- 1.5. section 5: open ended participation
- which of these types helped you the most?
 - why did you choose this type of feedback? give me 3 reasons.
 - which of these types helped you the least or was not helpful?
 - why did you choose this type of feedback? give me 3 reasons.