



Self-Assessment, Peer Assessment, Teacher Assessment and their Comparative Effect on EFL Learners' Second language Writing Strategy Development

Majid Nemati

Department of English Language and Literature, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.

nematim@ut.ac.ir

Mehran Ghafoori (Corresponding Author)

Department of English Language Teaching, Islamic Azad University, Abhar Branch, Abhar, Iran.

ghafoorimehr@gmail.com

Parviz Birjandi

Department of English Language Teaching, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

pbirjandi@srbiau.ac.ir

Siros Izadpanah

Department of English Language Teaching, Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Zanjan, Iran.

cyrosizadpanah@yahoo.com

ARTICLE INFO:

Document Type: **Research Paper**

Received date:

2021.10.20

Accepted date:

2021.11.27

Print ISSN: **2251-7995**

Online ISSN: **2676-6876**

Abstract

The effect of assessment types (self, peer, and teacher) on the EFL writing strategies development was examined in this study. Sixty upper-intermediate EFL learners at Qazvin Islamic university in four groups (one control and three experimental groups) were studied. One-way ANOVA checked homogeneity of the groups prior to the treatments and, then, the participants' records and diaries were employed to gather data. Explanatory and descriptive analyses were implemented to analyze and classify the strategies the EFL learners picked up. This provided the type, frequency, and percentage of the strategies the participants mostly employed. The results revealed that the experimental groups, namely, self-assessment, peer assessment and teacher assessment groups employed more cognitive and metacognitive strategies than the control group. Affective strategies were more appealing to the control group. Focusing on the diction of the words, concentrating on the complex structures used by different writers, and making use of the structures the participants became interested in or found suitable were the most frequently referred to strategies. Teaching strategies the participants more picked up in this study might enhance EFL learners' writing development at TEFL centers.

Keywords:

Self, Peer, and Teacher assessment, Writing Strategies

DOI: 10.22034/ELT.2021.48543.2456

Citation: Nemati, M., Ghafoori, M., Birjandi, P., Izadpanah, S. (2021). Self-Assessment, Peer Assessment, Teacher Assessment and their Comparative Effect on EFL Learners' Second Language Writing Strategy Development. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 13(28), 201-216. Doi:

10.22034/ELT.2021.48543.2456

Introduction

Writing is an activity demanding concentration, discipline, and careful thought, and it is not just a simple direct product of what the brain can do at a particular moment or knows and, thereby, described by many researchers as a ‘complicated cognitive task’ (Gregg & Steinberg, 2016; Rastle et al., 2021). Most learners regardless of being low achievers or high achievers find writing a difficult task. One important indicator of communicative competence is having mastery over second language writing (McCrostie, 2007).

Having meta-cognitive knowledge concerning the writing task, use of cohesive devices, writing strategies, language proficiency, and L1 writing competence are among the important factors to influence the process and product of writing. What seems particular is that writing strategies are significant since many researchers claim that through the analysis of writing strategies teachers can simply distinguish successful writers from less successful ones (Arifin, 2020; Zhao & Liao, 2021). Writing strategies can facilitate self-regulation, learner autonomy, and greater proficiency (Hsiao & Oxford, 2002). Therefore, exactly what strategies and how many strategies ESL learners have access to or emerge in the process of their writing can not only assist them in second language learning but also facilitate their writing development (Stirling, 2021).

Graham and Perin (2007, p. 15) also assert that “teaching adolescents strategies for planning, revising, and editing their compositions has shown a dramatic effect on the quality of students’ writing. Strategy instruction involves explicitly and systematically teaching steps necessary for planning, revising, and/or editing text. The ultimate goal is to teach students to use these strategies independently”.

Moreover, assessment is an essential component in educational systems since it may have an impact on learning and, being made authentic, provides feedback. Moreover, via meaningful involvement of learners in the learning process, assessment can bring about motivation. Enhancing instruction by assisting the teacher to be informed about students’ strengths and weaknesses is another benefit of assessment (Giraldo, 2021).

Alavi and Taghizadeh (2014) emphasize the role dynamic assessment and its different forms including peer assessment, self-assessment, and teacher assessment may play in the development of second language writing.

Peer and self-assessment along with teacher assessment have proved themselves as useful and mediating tools for teaching and learning in different skills and sub-skills including writing (SeyedErfani & Agha Ebrahimiyan, 2013), speaking (Hill & Sabet, 2009), reading (Guterman, 2002), speaking and listening (Ableeva, 2008), listening (Ableeva, 2010), grammar (Kovacic et al., 2012), and vocabulary (Saeidi & Hosseinpour, 2013).

Most of the researches in the ELT field have concentrated on the ESL situations (Astin, 2012; Brown et al., 2013; Grabe & Kaplan, 2014) and the EFL context, therefore, has been vastly neglected. In the Iranian context, the majority of studies on writing development have focused on the traditional approaches to learning and little if any attention has been directed to other alternative approaches. Furthermore, the effect of such assessment types on EFL learning strategy development, specially the writing skill, has not been investigated significantly in this

context. Teachers in EFL classrooms have started to use assessment by learners and assessment by their peers. This motivates the current researcher to tackle this aspect of second language writing development in relation to writing strategies.

Purpose of the Study

The present researchers' personal observations and experience also assert that writing courses offered at universities for EFL classes are mostly "method-oriented" (Kumaravadivelu, 2006) and, more often than not, focus on mechanics and structures of EFL writing, while it has rarely become the focus of concern to assist the learners to utilize the writing strategies that they discover during the course. Observing the relationship between each of these assessment types to second language writing strategy development can be fruitful in being informed about the most frequent and common strategies taken.

The aim of this research, accordingly, was to investigate the effect of various types of dynamic assessment as teacher, peer, and self-assessment on the Iranian EFL learners' second language writing strategy emergence.

Research question. What are the most prominent strategies the EFL learners develop in the process of second language writing achievement under the effect of self, peer, and teacher assessment?

The research question is qualitative in nature as it seeks for the strategies the learners rely on, discover, learn from one another, or develop while they are practicing their homework and assessment activities throughout the study. Such data would be process-oriented both in terms of its collection and its analysis. The learners would be trained to record each and every related event and concept in their notebooks. They actually rely on a portfolio oriented recording and as they develop in their writings throughout the study period, they provide the teacher with the information required and the teacher constructs a processed- based, flexible axial framework to analyze and reanalyze the learners' achievements (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Literature Review

A great interest in the application of assessment in curriculum has been traced based on gradual changes in our learning attitude from the conventional way of teaching and assessing, to new approaches like dynamic teaching and assessing (Bachman, 2015; Poehner, 2008). As Farhady (2006) claims, "assessment has perceived a paradigm shift from a discrete-point component-based perspective to a task-based, performance-oriented approach" (P.28).

As Ebadi and Rahimi (2019) define, assessment is the process of compiling, exchanging, and discussing information from diverse and multiple sources used to improve subsequent learning to provide a profound view of what students know, understand and can accomplish with the help of their knowledge due to their educational experiences.

Wanner and Palmer (2018) define peer assessment as an assessment in which members of a class provide feedback and grade the performance of their peers implementing relevant criteria. Marks may be assigned by students or negotiated with teachers. As Bachman et al. (2010, p. 12) present, "self-assessment refers to assessment or evaluation of oneself or one's actions, attitudes, or performance. That is why each learner should be encouraged and trained to go through a process of self-assessment". Teacher assessment, as the name speaks for itself, is

related to the type of assessment in which the teacher gets control of the assessment procedure and there is no room for the learners to be involved in the assessment (Bachman, 2015).

Strategy emergence, as O'malley et al. (1990, p. 6) put it, is defined as “any learning or communicative strategy which the learner may evolve throughout second language development process”. These strategies may be the outcome of successful ways the learner takes in the journey of second language development in general and within the development of any of the skills s/he is dealing with (Oxford, 1990).

Writing Strategies as O'malley et al. (1990, p. 134) define “are cognitive and meta-cognitive procedures writers use to control the production of writing”.

As different forms of dynamic assessment are considered to be formative not summative, William (2013), Figure 1, postulates 5 key strategies for effectiveness of formative assessment.

	Where the learner is going?	Where the learner is right now?	How to get there?
Teacher	Clarifying, sharing, and understanding learning intentions	Engineering effective discussions, activities, and tasks that elicit evidence of learning	Feedback that moves learning forward
Peer		Activating students as learning resources for one another	
Learner		Activating students as owners of their own learning	

Figure 1. The five “Key Strategies” of Formative Assessment (from William, 2013, p.16)

Gordon (2015) conceptualizes planning, assessment, and repair as meta-cognitive skills in the recursive process of writing. In this taxonomy, “planning” can include rudimentary ideational formulation, strategy selection, and goal setting. Assessment involves (a) evaluating the material which is going to be written according to one’s own schemata, and (b) evaluating the writing concerning its relationship to the specific purpose of the assignment, the output accuracy, and grammatical/lexical correctness. Repair takes place at any of the stages in the writing process. A student can repair (a) his/her understanding of the assignment; and (b) the production of the writing at any phase in the process and within any of the layers of the activity.

Students are distinguished by their individual constraints and the external constraints imposed by context and the assignment when attempting to write under a cognitive load. They are attempting to develop their skills and strategies to mediate this cognitive load. As a result, this cognitive load should be manageable for the students and students should possess the necessary skills to handle them (Pham, 2020).

In conclusion, the effect of assessment types as extra-curricular activities influencing the SL learner achievements has been noticed by the ELT researchers (Atkinson, 2003; Petersen, 2003) as they have tried to present the importance of such activities in the language development of the ESL learners. Various tasks such as summarizing, reporting, simplifying, analyzing, and re-writing of the materials such as journals, short stories, newspapers, dramas, and fictions have been the matter of research in the ESL context (Sundari et al., 2018). Second language writing, therefore, could be enhanced through designing homework which is analytical, argumentative, and thought bringing (Grabe & Kaplan, 2014)._ The importance of

peer assessment and its inspirations and influences on the development of creative writing also have been discussed in the literature (Wanner & Palmer, 2018). The relationship between creative writing, talent and inspiration, accompanied with and energized by stages of development, within a systematic strategy have also been stressed in the literature (Smith, 2005). Social and affective strategies of writing, based on Carson and Longhini (2002), are used by writers to have interaction with the target society for the support and to concentrate on their attitudes, motivation, and emotions in the process of writing.

Arndt (1987) investigation on ESL writing strategies is one of the earliest researches done in which she assigned eight categories to make codes for the strategies the learners used in their writing namely: Planning, Global planning, Rehearsing, Repeating, Re-reading, Questioning, Revising and Editing. She used these classifications to categorize Chinese students' writing strategies. It was found that Chinese students changed the words while L2 writing, but rehearsed the words more in L1 writing. She related this finding to the students' less ability to find alternative words. Also, the participants were not satisfied with their decisions in ESL than in L1, meaning they had more limited vocabulary sources to use and they were not sure about the words they had selected.

Riazi (1997) investigated on four Iranian doctoral students of education. The research was based on the learners' key aspects of the academic courses, their strategies for composing, and conceptualizations of their writing tasks. He outlined their composing strategies among cognitive, meta-cognitive, social strategies, and search strategies. Figure 2 represents the composing strategies compared together.

In this study, macro-strategies to perform academic tasks were used by Iranian doctoral students. Mental representations related to the academic writing tasks were to be shaped by these strategies. Task completion needed participants' cognitive strategies which directed them to think about, work with, and manipulate materials. These specific strategies included taking notes, inferencing, and elaborating; using of mother tongue knowledge and transferring skill across their two languages; as well as editing and revising multiple drafts of their papers. In their learning to write in the specific context of their graduate studies, Riazi (1997) found that the participants tried to connect their L1 and ESL. Self-regulatory strategies, being among meta-cognitive strategies, assisted the participants to have control on performing the writing tasks, and, accordingly, reducing their anxiety when not knowing what to do.

In another research, Victori (1999) recognized seven types of writing strategies that were based on think-aloud protocol analysis and the interviews. Planning strategies helped the writer to anticipate what ideas will come next. Monitoring strategies were used by the writers when they wanted to check and verify their writing process. Evaluating strategies were used when the writers reconsidered their written text, the modifications done on the written text, planned ideas, and their objectives. Resourcing strategies were implemented by the writers when they applied other sources of information about the language, such as using dictionary to check the new vocabulary items. Repeating strategies included the repeating pieces of language in writing.

Composing Strategies	Constituents	Phase of Composing Process
<i>Cognitive Strategies</i>		
Interacting with materials to be used in writing by manipulating them mentally or physically	Note-taking	Reading & Writing
	Elaboration	Reading & Writing
	Use of mother tongue	Reading & Writing
	Knowledge and skill transfer from L1	
	Inferencing	Reading
	Drafting (revising & editing)	Writing
<i>Metacognitive Strategies</i>		
Executive processes used to plan, monitor, and evaluate a writing task	Assigning goals	Task representation & reading
	Planning (making & changing outlines)	Writing
	Rationalizing appropriate formats	Reading & Writing
	Monitoring & evaluation	Reading/writing/task representation
<i>Social Strategies</i>		
Interacting with other persons to assist in performing the task or to gain affective control	Appealing for clarifications	Task representation
	Getting feedback from professors & peers	Writing
<i>Search Strategies</i>		
Searching and using supporting sources	Searching and using libraries (books, journal, Eric, microfiche)	
	Using guidelines	
	Using others' writing as model	Reading and writing

Figure 2. Composing strategies (Adapted from Riazi, 1997)

Reduction strategies were applied when the writers wanted to solve a problem, either by paraphrasing to avoid a problem or removing it from the text. In L1 strategies participants used the mother tongue with the purpose of transcribing the right idea/word in their L1, evaluating and making sense of the ideas written in the target language, or generating new ideas.

Method

Participants

The participants of the study included 60 students (both girls and boys) at Qazvin Islamic Azad University. These participants were selected out of 90 ones who had enrolled in extracurricular conversation classes by the university as intermediates. They took part in a pretest (which was a standardized copy of paper-based TOEFL) for the sample homogenization. The age range of the learners was nineteen up to twenty-six and sixty learners whose scores fell 1SD below and above the mean, and this way met the requirements, were chosen for the purpose of the study. These participants were of various disciplines and were randomly divided into four groups, each including 13 to 16 learners. Three groups were the experimental groups as the Peer Assessment Group, the Teacher Assessment Group, and the Self-Assessment Group and the fourth group shaped the control group. The study was an attempt to compare three different types of dynamic assessment affecting the learners' behavior in writing strategy development. Therefore, the control group was required to compare the writing strategy development of the learners in each group with an intact group.

Instruments

The data needed for the research were collected by means of a Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), in the quantitative section. In the qualitative section of the study, the

learners' portfolios, learners' diaries, and the teacher's observations and recordings were used to collect the data. Having gathered the relevant data, the classification presented by O'malley et al. (1990) was implemented to count and get the frequency of the strategies used.

To make sure if the participants were engaged in programs, and to get familiar with what they actually did (the strategies they took) to improve their abilities, the learners all were trained to present diaries. These diaries formed a portfolio for each participant and also included the instructor's feedback and comments as well as the participants' reports on their own learning. In each session, the teacher's suggestions and notes for each learner were accommodated continuously. It was possible for the instructor to check everybody's ups and downs in writing and discuss the details of the activities with learners as their number in each class was limited. An axial recording system of data was developed based on each learner's diaries and the learner's progress was re-evaluated based on a qualitative, formative, and process-based mode. This provided information on the probable strategies the learners picked up, the novelty of the strategies discovered, and the frequency of the strategies employed.

Procedure and Data Analysis

Shared activities in all groups. All the groups enjoyed the same instructor, coursebook, hours of instruction, physical conditions, and teaching aids. The control group received no assessment-based treatment; therefore, the most significant difference in the three experimental groups was the form of feedback and assessment presented in the classroom. All groups received similar materials, which was a coursebook with the title "TOEFL Writing Flash: Essential Practice for Higher Writing Scores" (Broukal, 2007), which included 12 sections and each section consisted of grammar part, vocabulary in context part, and a writing model. Then a topic was suggested for the learners to write. The course book also presented some writing tips in the first lesson which were practiced in the subsequent sections. These writing tips followed the rating framework presented in the ETS manual (2000), reproduced in Alderson and Tankó (2010). About 45 minutes of the classroom allotted time was devoted to the course book and its exercises, checking the learners' writings, and the rest of the time was devoted to specific activities of every single group. The learners were also briefed about how to write diaries, develop portfolios, and report their own feelings, findings, and the strategies they got acquainted with. All students in groups were requested to hand in their diaries each session to be checked and analyzed. Of course, they received feedback from the teacher and were required to follow the teacher's suggestions to solve the problems present in their learning process. This in itself created an environment in which cooperation, exactness, and qualitative assessment were evident.

Specific activities in the groups. In the experimental group I (Peer Assessment Group) the instructor helped the learners develop the second language writing, meanwhile, he informed the learners of the role they were to play in the classroom, almost every session, to either score each other's performances or rate one another's writing development. The students were trained to develop checklists and use them in the classroom to keep reactors of their classmates' performances. They were also briefed about various writing strategies through pamphlets and lectures. Gradually this form of assessment paved the way for self-assessment as to the most

beneficial and promising form of assessment (Bachman et al., 2010). In the peer assessment group, the peer provided feedback if there were some mistakes and they acted as a mediator.

In the experimental group II (Teacher Assessment Group), the instructor provided feedback and assessed the students' process of learning. In the first intervention sessions, the students were encouraged to take part in the class discussions and they were informed that the teacher would assess them almost every session, and in case they felt they had been weak in a session, they could compensate for that in the coming sessions. The teacher corrected the learners' papers and provided them with the feedback required.

In the experimental group III (Self-assessment group) the learners firstly were familiarized with the concept of self-assessment and they were trained to develop self-assessment checklists. Then they practiced self-assessment and were asked to assess themselves at the end of each session of the classroom. Of course they received respective feedback from the teacher, something which was decreased as the learners increased the quality of their self-assessments. Various quizzes and classroom discussions were presented in the intervention sessions.

Nothing especial happened in the control group and they had their own way of learning. It means that the learners in this group only received a mid-term and a final test as well as the conventional course-book oriented activities which were of course accompanied with the learners' active participation in classroom activities. Meanwhile, no trace of any sort of assessment was found in the classroom of the control group. Instead the participants of this group were encouraged toward covering materials for the tests (mid-term and final). Hence, they were test-oriented not assessment-oriented. In the control group, the same teaching materials, except the peer, teacher, and self-assessment model, were provided for the participants, and they just received conventional way of learning second language writing and there was no mediation by the teacher.

The participants attended their classes twice a week for 12 sessions. The time of each session was 90 minutes and just 45 minutes of each session were allocated to the treatment.

Diaries and portfolios. All four groups of the learners received instructions in terms of writing records and diaries of their works and were trained to be familiar with the nature of most frequent strategies in developing writing such as employing dictionaries, making use of expressions and idioms, and the like, meanwhile the strategies the researcher was seeking for among the learners' portfolios were what learners did and the ways they employed to present more fruitful writings. All the learners, therefore, were instructed to complete their records in which they reported their diaries as well as their homework and their learning experience reports.

Employing both descriptive and explanatory methods, the learners' prominent strategies were selected, categorized and reported.

A descriptive analysis, in which different views presented by the instructor in the classrooms were distinctly recorded and described, was used to analyze the data collected through the learners' diaries, portfolios, and reports as well as the researcher's observations and recordings by means of notes, corrections and suggestions. The data, then, was summarized and categorized.

An explanatory analysis was done and explanations were presented based on the open/axial coding and structuring, and the analysis belonging to them (axial code trees for each core concept and matrix for structuring). Frequency tables were implemented to classify and categorize the results. The prominent, successful strategies employed by the learners also were taken into view while presenting the explanations. Learners' diaries were also taken into consideration to see if they had been in line with the instructions given, the homework program, and the correct record of the strategies taken.

Design

The present study enjoyed a phenomenological descriptive design in which qualitative measure of data analysis was accounted for (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Therefore, observations, and portfolios were employed both to collect the data and analyze them. The qualitative analysis of the emerging strategies was based on portfolio and classroom observations to elaborate and cross-check the qualitative results. The study encompassed both dependent and independent variables as follows: Teacher assessment, self-assessment, peer assessment considered as the independent variables and writing strategy development as the dependent variable towards writing development.

Results

Subject Selection

Sixty participants of the study were selected through a standard version of TOEFL PBT administration to 90 EFL learners at Islamic Azad University of Qazvin. Table 1 represents descriptive statistics of subject selection.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of TOEFL; Subject selection

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
TOEFL	90	41	82	61.78	11.314
Valid N (listwise)	90				

To compare the means of the four randomly assigned groups on the TOEFL test, a one-way ANOVA was run in order to make sure that they enjoyed the same level of general proficiency knowledge prior to the main study. On the average, the Teacher Assessment ($M = 62.31$, $SD = 7.64$), Self-Assessment ($M = 62.69$, $SD = 6.12$), Peer Assessment ($M = 63.40$, $SD = 6.57$) and Control ($M = 64.63$, $SD = 7.21$) groups showed close mean scores on the TOEFL test (Table 2).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics TOEFL by groups

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Teacher Assessment	13	62.31	7.642	2.119	57.69	66.93	52	74
Self-Assessment	16	62.69	6.129	1.532	59.42	65.95	52	72
Peer Assessment	15	63.40	6.577	1.698	59.76	67.04	52	72
Control	16	64.63	7.219	1.805	60.78	68.47	52	75
Total	60	63.30	6.763	.873	61.55	65.05	52	75

The assumption of homogeneity of variances was also met (Levene's $F(3, 56) = .373, P > .05$). It was concluded that the four groups had homogenous variances on the TOEFL test (Table 3).

Table 3. Test of homogeneity of variances TOEFL by groups

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.373	3	56	.773

The results of the one-way ANOVA ($F(3, 56) = .33, P > .05; \omega^2 = .03$ it represents a weak effect size) (Table 4). Based on these results, there were not any significant differences between the mean scores of the four groups on the TOEFL test, i.e. they had the same level of general language proficiency knowledge.

Table 4. One-Way ANOVA TOEFL by Groups

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	47.043	3	15.681	.331	.803
Within Groups	2651.557	56	47.349		
Total	2698.600	59			

The Research Question

The research question sought to discover the most prominent strategies the EFL learners developed when achieving second language writing ability under the effect of various types of assessment. Appendix A represents the type, frequency, and percentage of the strategies the participants mostly employed in detail.

The 454 observed strategies were categorized into 17 general learning strategy types based on the classification presented by O'malley et al. (1990).

Viewing the frequency table (Appendix A), the most frequent strategies that emerged in the learners of different groups would fall in the domains of cognitive and Meta cognitive strategies. Moreover, for the control group, socio-affective strategies were interesting.

The most frequent strategies for all groups were: **a.** concentrating on and employing the written English grammatical structures: structures such as inversion, subjunctive, dangling, and the like, **b.** summarizing texts, focusing on maintaining the content, cohesion, length, cohesiveness, and other discourse features, **c.** consulting with the instructor and applying the suggestions made, **d.** concentrating on the text organization and the placement of various parts of a text based on the purpose and the genre type, and **e.** planning and trying to write the way native speakers write and employing the same structures in new situations (Appendix A).

The strategies which were less frequent for all groups of learners included: **a.** minimizing the problems and also eradicating them through being open to criticisms, whether presented by the teacher or peers, **b.** searching for the differences between American and British English models of writing, and **c.** being eager to chat with/talking/writing to the native speakers whenever possible (in the seminars, meetings, conferences, via the net, or while being abroad).

Discussion

As the findings of the descriptive analysis indicate, Iranian EFL learners showed high potential to initiate specific strategies to solve their problems in writing. The emergence of strategies and their frequency can be attributed to the immediate needs of the second language learners to solve their EFL writing problems. These strategies can be teacher-directed, peer-supported, or self-oriented. It seems using well-recognized language learning strategies is correlated to second language writing development. As it seems, the strategy emergence among the learners taking part in the study has been the result of all of these factors being in line with Petersen (2003); Rose et al. (2018) and Sasaki et al. (2018). Ferretti and Graham (2019) also imply that the strategies good language learners present or emerge could be helpful in paving the ground for the other learners.

The results of this study, in general, indicated that the participants of the study reported frequent use of various language learning strategies. In fact, these strategies reflect specific actions that are implemented continuously by the EFL learners when involved in the process of learning language. This finding accords with the researches which consider language learning as a cognitive activity in which the learner is an active participant, and is capable of processing linguistic information and affecting learning outcomes (Gregg & Steinberg, 2016; Wei, 2020; Zabihi, 2018; Zhao & Liao, 2021).

The EFL learners, at the present research, tended to employ strategies that enabled them to keep more vocabulary in mind. They, also, reported using reading strategies and those related to avoiding literal translation to prevent ambiguity (Furnham & Marks, 2013). Coping feelings so as to remain relaxed and positive was reported to be managed by using affective strategies (Carson & Longhini, 2002; Zabihi, 2018).

The present research was limited to assessment types (peer, self, and teacher) as independent variables. The reason for the differences in the strategy type that emerged in the four groups might be the personal interests, talents, and some other learner differences which have not been the main focus of this research.

Conclusion and Implications

Materials developers may hire the findings of the present research to include more assessment-oriented tasks in the course books developed. ESL and EFL teachers can make use of these findings in their classes helping the learners get more familiar with the creative writing strategies and critical thinking processes in order to think and write more creatively.

EFL learners can rely on analyzing what they read and learning from them. The ongoing feedback they receive from the teacher plus the strategies they initiate to solve the ever-present problems of second or foreign language writing also are considered positive and can energize the learner to develop better language performance.

References

- Ableeva, R. (2008). The effects of dynamic assessment on L2 listening comprehension. In J. P. Lantolf & M. Poehner (Eds.), *Socio-cultural theory and the teaching of second languages* (pp. 57-86). London: Equinox Press.
- Ableeva, R. (2010). *Dynamic assessment of listening comprehension in second language learning* [Ph.D Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University].
- Alavi, S. M., & Taghizadeh, M. (2014). Dynamic Assessment of Writing: The Impact of Implicit/Explicit Mediations on L2 Learners' Internalization of Writing Skills and Strategies. *Educational Assessment, 19*(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2014.869446>
- Alderson, C., & Tankó, G. (2010). *Into Europe: The writing handbook*. London: British Council.
- Arifin, S. (2020). Investigating the L2 Writing Strategies Used by Skillful English Students. *2020, 53*(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpp.v53i1.24939>
- Arndt, V. (1987). Six writers in search of texts: A protocol-based study of L1 and L2 writing. *ELT Journal, 41*, 257-267.
- Astin, A. W. (2012). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Atkinson, D. (2003). L2 writing in the post-process era: Introduction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 3-15.
- Bachman, L. F. (2015). Justifying the use of language assessments: Linking Test performance with consequences. *JLTA Journal, 18*, 3-22.
- Bachman, L. F., Palmer, A. S., & Palmer, A. S. (2010). *Language assessment in practice: Developing language assessments and justifying their use in the real world*. Oxford University Press Oxford.
- Brown, G. A., Bull, J., & Pendlebury, M. (2013). *Assessing student learning in higher education*. Routledge.
- Carson, J. G., & Longhini, A. (2002). Focusing on learning styles and strategies: A diary study in an immersion setting. *Language learning, 52*(2), 401-438.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Ebadi, S., & Rahimi, M. (2019). Mediating EFL learners' academic writing skills in online dynamic assessment using Google Docs. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 32*(5-6), 527-555. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1527362>
- Farhady, H. (2006). Twenty-five years of living with applied linguistics: Collection of articles. *Tehran, Iran: Rahnama*.
- Ferretti, R. P., & Graham, S. (2019). Argumentative writing: theory, assessment, and instruction. *Reading and Writing, 32*(6), 1345-1357. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-019-09950-x>
- Furnham, A., & Marks, J. (2013). Tolerance of ambiguity: A review of the recent literature. *Psychology, 4*(09), 717-728.
- Giraldo, F. (2021). A Reflection on Initiatives for Teachers' Professional Development Through Language Assessment Literacy. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 23*(1), 197-213. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v23n1.83094>
- Gordon, A. M. (2015). Paper Based Testing vs. Mobile Device Based Testing in an EFL Environment: What's the Difference?
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (2014). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. Routledge.

- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools. A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. *Alliance for Excellent Education*.
- Gregg, L. W., & Steinberg, E. R. (Eds.). (2016). *Cognitive processes in writing*. Routledge.
- Guterman, E. (2002). Toward dynamic assessment of reading: Applying metacognitive awareness guidance to reading assessment tasks. *Journal of Research in reading*, 25(3), 283-298.
- Hill, K., & Sabet, M. (2009). Dynamic speaking assessments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(3), 537-545.
- Hsiao, T. Y., & Oxford, R. L. (2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: A confirmatory factor analysis. *The modern language journal*, 86(3), 368-383.
- Kovacic, A., Bubas, G., & Coric, A. (2012). Mobilising students' grammar skills through collaborative e-tivities with Web 2.0 tools. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 34, 132-136.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. Routledge.
- McCrostie, J. (2007). Examining learner vocabulary notebooks. *ELT Journal*, 61(3), 246-255.
- O'malley, J. M., O'Malley, M. J., Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge university press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies-What every teacher should know*. Heinle & Heinle.
- Petersen, G. (2003). The effects of reading, television viewing, and extracurricular activities on student academic achievement. *Unpublished PhD dissertation, Arkansas State University, Arkansas, USA Retrieved September, 1, 2012*.
- Pham, Q. H. P. (2020). *Goal Setting in the Efl Classroom: Students' Writing Competence, Linguistic Development, and Perspectives*. Michigan State University.
- Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting L2 development* (Vol. 9). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Rastle, K., Lally, C., Davis, M. H., & Taylor, J. (2021). The dramatic impact of explicit instruction on learning to read in a new writing system. *Psychological Science*, 32(4), 471-484.
- Riazi, A. (1997). Acquiring disciplinary literacy: A social-cognitive analysis of text production and learning among Iranian graduate students of education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(2), 105-137.
- Rose, H., Briggs, J. G., Boggs, J. A., Sergio, L., & Ivanova-Slavianskaia, N. (2018). A systematic review of language learner strategy research in the face of self-regulation. *System*, 72, 151-163.
- Saeidi, M., & Hosseinpour, A. (2013). The effect of dynamic assessment as an instructional tool on Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary learning. *Journal of basic and applied scientific research*, 3(10), 421-429.
- Sasaki, M., Mizumoto, A., & Murakami, A. (2018). Developmental trajectories in L2 writing strategy use: A self-regulation perspective. *The modern language journal*, 102(2), 292-309.
- SyedErfani, S., & Agha Ebrahimiyan, A. (2013). Web 2.0 incorporated dynamic assessment to assess writing ability of Iranian EFL learners. *Global Journal of Human Social Science Linguistics & Education*, 13(14), 49-55.
- Smith, H. (2005). *The writing experiment strategies for innovative creative writing*. Melbourne: Allen & Unwin.
- Stirling, B. (2021). *Speaking and writing strategies for the TOEFL iBT*. Nova Press.
- Sundari, H., Febriyanti, R. H., & Saragih, G. (2018). Using Task-based Materials in Teaching Writing for EFL Classes in Indonesia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 7(3), 119-124. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.3p.119>
- Victori, M. (1999). An analysis of writing knowledge in EFL composing: A case study of two effective and two less effective writers. *System*, 27(4), 537-555.

- Wanner, T., & Palmer, E. (2018). Formative self-and peer assessment for improved student learning: the crucial factors of design, teacher participation and feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(7), 1032-1047. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1427698>
- Wei, X. (2020). Assessing the metacognitive awareness relevant to L1-to-L2 rhetorical transfer in L2 writing: The cases of Chinese EFL writers across proficiency levels. *Assessing Writing*, 44, 100452.
- William, D. (2013). Assessment: The Bridge between Teaching and Learning. *Voices from the Middle*, 21(2), 15-20.
- Zabihi, R. (2018). The role of cognitive and affective factors in measures of L2 writing. *Written Communication*, 35(1), 32-57.
- Zhao, C. G., & Liao, L. (2021). Metacognitive strategy use in L2 writing assessment. *System*, 98, 102472. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102472>



Appendix A. Type and frequency of the Strategies the participants mostly employed

Row		Strategy Used	Frequency Count					Percent
			SA	PA	TA	Control	total	
1	Cognitive	Focusing on the written English grammatical structures and employing them in ones' writings: structures such as dangling, subjunctive, inversion, and the like	22	18	14	11	65	14.31%
2	Socio-affective	Consulting with the teacher and putting to application the suggestions made.	13	14	13	11	51	11.23%
3	Cognitive	Summarizing texts, focusing on the content maintenance, length, cohesion, cohesiveness, and other discourse features.	10	12	11	10	43	9.47%
4	Cognitive	Focusing on the text organization and the placement of various parts of a text based on the purpose and the genre type	13	12	10	6	41	9.03%
5	Meta-cognitive	Planning and trying to write the way native speakers write and employing the same structures in new situations.	10	9	9	8	36	7.92%
6	Meta-cognitive	Analyzing texts and focusing on the methods of writing, modes, moves, and the internal concepts presented in them.	8	7	10	7	31	6.82%
7	Cognitive	Keeping a portfolio of notes to be reviewed in case required.	7	8	9	7	29	6.38%
8	Cognitive	Reading a lot of issues in English, specifically the books and articles in ones major and copying the most interesting and most frequently used structure and sentences to be used later.	9	7	5	6	27	5.94%
9	Cognitive	Using monolingual dictionaries to find out the meaning of the words and to follow the modeling presented in the examples. Employing a diction-oriented perspective.	6	6	7	6	25	5.50%
10	Meta-cognitive	Focusing on the genre types and examining their differences in style, diction, and form of presentation.	5	6	6	4	21	4.62%
11	Meta-cognitive	Following the creative modes found in the narratives and trying to produce similar ones in second language writing	6	4	4	4	18	3.96%
12	Socio-affective	Discussing the English words, collocations, expressions, idioms, structures, and concepts with friends and the teacher, comparing the notable structures with those of the native culture.	5	4	4	3	16	3.52%
13	Meta-cognitive	Concentrating on the method of expansion and writing development found in the course books of writing in English and using them.	3	4	3	3	13	2.86%
14	Cognitive	Learning form authentic materials and following the way openings and closings are developed in various situations and writing types	4	3	3	2	12	2.64%
15	Socio-affective	Being open to criticisms to minimize the problems and also eradicate them, whether presented through the teacher or peers	4	2	2	2	10	2.20%
16	Socio-affective	Seeking for the differences between British English and American English models of writing.	2	2	2	2	8	1.76%

17	Socio-affective	Being very interested in writing/ talking to/chatting with the native speakers whenever possible (in the meetings, seminars, via the net, and conferences or while travelling abroad.	2	2	2	2	8	1.75%
----	-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------

