

REAPING BENEFITS THROUGH EFFECTIVE PEER REVIEW IN A COLLABORATIVE LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

Vaida Misevičiūtė^{1,2}

¹Vytautas Magnus University, ²Kaunas University of Applied Sciences

Abstract. Research studies now and again promote alternative assessment tools because they engage students in reflective practices that do not only improve the quality of the acquired knowledge, but also enhance responsibility towards working and learning ultimately developing lifelong learning skills. Literature review revealed that many practitioners doubt the value of reflective practice through a process of peer learning and peer assessment claiming the activities are too time consuming and students are not mature enough or lack confidence and motivation to assess peers critically. The aim of the research is to assess students' perception of peer and teacher evaluations. The research is based on a process peer assessment and evaluation activity that has been carried out with the university students in C1 General English class over the two very different semesters: one regular and one online (affected by COVID-19). The course under investigation has been designed based on the best practices that have been discovered through literature review like modeling, oral feedback, peer review forms, classroom atmosphere, and cultural aspects of review. Against general perception, students seemed to enjoy the peer review process and valued it even more than teacher feedback when the peer reviewers were motivated. Engagement in peer review online demonstrated even deeper subject learning along with demonstration of lifelong learning skills. Several comments alluded to the idea that the learning process was more rewarding than final evaluation. Reflective practice in this process assignment showed enhanced students' engagement in learning, reflection, and peer evaluation; therefore, supporting clear benefits for students and teachers engaged in the activity, and overall value that the reflective assignment has on learning.

Keywords: collaborative learning, peer assessment, lifelong learning, language classroom.

Introduction

Never before has the question of reflective learning been more acute in education than that enhanced by the recent pandemic of COVID-19. It has become very clear that the old-fashioned ways of teaching where the teacher is the provider of knowledge, and the student is an inactive receiver is not working anymore. Even though education specialists have talked for more than half a century about more effective ways of learning through meta-cognition, collaboration, and transformation, those theories for the most part remain in the textbooks and discussions yet not in practice. Peer review is a method that is not used in Lithuania (Cesniene, 2015). She is the only researcher so far to analyze peer review in Lithuanian context. It is safe to conclude that peer review may be very much alive in theory; however, it is coming very slowly into the classrooms and research.

During the COVID 19 pandemic, the online environment clearly pushed teachers to search for more engaging teaching strategies that force students to think more critically and reflect. One way such reflective practice can be achieved is through discussing and analyzing information; that is through peer review and collaboration (Elola & Oskoz, 2016). Therefore, the research on peer review is extremely important in the current context.

Adapting curriculum to collaborative and reflective teaching is time consuming and requires meticulous planning. It is considerably easier to assign a presentation on a certain topic that is due in two months than to actually guide students through the steps of making one: from choosing and narrowing the topic, to drafting, revising, editing and delivering the presentation. The students often do not understand why they need to put so much work into the assignment when they can get exactly the same grade from a short product assignment.

Furthermore, a language teacher needs to reconfigure a traditional grammar based curriculum into a process based curriculum where grammar takes a secondary role and the process becomes a primary goal. Adapting the syllabus to an alternative way should be the goal of every teacher as reflective process approach learning has been supported by the notion of Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development which assumes that learners can perform at a higher level when they receive support from others (Sammons et.al, 2016). While multiple research studies prove the benefits of peer review and collaboration in the learning process (Allen & Katayama, 2016; Chang, 2015; Sammons, et.al, 2016; Wang, et. al,2018), this way of teaching is not commonly practiced or analyzed in Lithuaniae, (Cesniene, 2015). The novelty of this research study is to examine student's readiness to engage and evaluate peer review in Lithuanian setting.

The article aims to analyze the best practices known in literature for peer review and unveil Lithuanian university students' readiness to participate in reflective practice through process learning. The primary goal of this study was to examine students' perceptions about collaborative learning and specifically, peer and teacher feedback. The subject matter of this research is process approach applied to presentation assignment. In order to achieve the aim, the literature was analyzed for best peer review practices, the course was designed and taught using the discovered guidelines, and the students were asked to reflect about different type of work. The theoretical analysis and descriptive statistical analysis have been applied in the research.

Collaborative learning

Collaborative learning is an approach of learning when students talk amongst themselves in groups or peers. A more scientific explanation of collaborative learning was offered by Vygotsky (1997) who derived a concept of learning called zone of proximal development. There are tasks that students can accomplish on their own, and tasks that they cannot complete by themselves. In the zone of proximal development, students can learn when guidance from a more knowledgeable person is provided. Therefore, in Vygotsky's definition of zone of proximal development, the importance of learning through communication and interactions with others rather than just through independent work is stressed. Collaboration is the key in clarifying the needs, in questioning knowledge, and truly comprehending concepts (Vygotsky, 1997).

Collaborative learning has been implemented in ESL classrooms for many years around the world. In Lithuania, the group or pair work is not a novelty and is used relatively frequently. However, peer review is not part of a typical repertoire. The purpose of this research study is to examine students' attitudes towards peer review. Among the more tangible benefits, researchers discovered that peer work can help students generate ideas, help evaluate content, and help negotiate meaning. Furthermore, peer review helps develop lifelong learning skills such as ability to work together, to trust and appreciate difference, to build responsibility for evaluating the work of others. Therefore, the study seeks to see if students recognize these benefits in the collaborative learning environment.

Process approach

Collaborative learning is frequently associated with process approach, especially in writing. Janet Emig, James Britton and his colleagues in Britain's School Council Project, the Development of Writing Abilities revolutionized teaching of writing through the new "process approach" (Kroll, 1991; Lindemann, 1995). The major claims coming from their research declared that all writers had to go through similar stages: brainstorming, listing, free writing, clustering, outlining, writing and re-writing (revising), and finally editing. Therefore, the process approach focused on the collaboration among peers in trying to write across different rhetorical patterns, in understanding the importance of the audience, and in clarifying goals for writing. Students achieved better results because they learned through actively engaging and experiencing writing and reading each other's work. According to Brammer and Rees (2007) report, "The process of having students critique each other's papers has become commonplace in the composition classroom and in English composition textbooks". Even though process approach is common in teaching essay writing, it is believed that preparing a presentation requires to undergo similar steps. It is as important and beneficial to engage students in peer or group work when collecting ideas, organizing information, finding solutions, or finding best ways to deliver an effective presentation.

Peer review

Peer review research receives mixed reviews. Most research studies looked at the benefits of the peer review for the native speakers. Conclusively, most of these studies agree the peer review is beneficial for the native speakers. One of the more massive international studies was carried out by Mulligan, Hall & Raphael (2013) who measured the attitudes towards peer review of more than 40,000 authors around the globe. This study revealed that the majority of the native language researchers value peer review very highly. Furthermore, they find peer communication to be one of the essential elements in learning. On the contrary, multiple studies of peer review among second language researchers indicate more diverse results. There is much more skepticism about peer review, yet on the whole, researchers often point to the apparent benefits when several conditions are met. The presentation assignment in the C1 course has been designed based on the literature review and the soundest advice that comes from multiple studies.

To begin with, in order for the peer review to be effective, most of the research is pointing out that students need to be trained in peer review (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Lam, 2010; Rahimi, 2013). Therefore, throughout the course students are constantly given opportunities to engage in peer reviews. A teacher frequently works as a model on how to provide critical review that is valuable. Training on how to be specific, training on how to provide polite feedback that is constructive, training on how to accept criticism, specifically, helping students understand that any feedback is an excellent place for debate and reexamination of ideas. Questioning and examining feedback may lead to altering a position, but often it simply means that the writer needs to provide stronger support to deliver his or her points clearer.

Another discovery for effective peer review was presented by Chang's (2015) study that showed how ESL Taiwanese college students were trained through teacher-modeling like complimenting and identifying problems in sample drafts. She concluded that group work helped to enforce peer review skills. Therefore, in the second stage of this course, students had to submit a background information paragraph on Padlet, a social media site. Based on the samples and class discussion on what makes a problem clear, the students were urged to read two peer samples and comment on the effectiveness of their writing. The students were asked to provide feedback. Finally, students could provide additional information if they encountered the problem and possessed some valuable information to exchange. The teacher also scanned through several student paragraphs on Padlet and posted a general feedback that addressed the most typical problems for all students to see and consider. This feedback was offered in order to function as another sample of how to write feedback, but also to draw student attention to most important problems. The students were encouraged to use a more specific feedback of their peers, but also a more global teacher feedback to move onto the next stage. Similar procedures were applied to the writing of the solution in stage 4. In this regard, stage 5 where the teacher provided individual review to the students additionally served as a model.

Adding an oral component to a successful feedback session is another component that was added to the course. Wang (2018) revealed that students regarded oral discussions as being valuable in comprehending the intended meaning of the feedback. Therefore, during the course students were allotted class time to have an oral discussion—a friendly exchange of ideas about their impressions and ideas of the peers' presentations. During the Fall 2019 semester, students were given two class sessions to view two peer presentations and have a

conversation about them. Unfortunately due to the COVID-19 pandemic the two class sessions in the Spring 2020 had to be transferred to an online environment. Students had to make arrangements to meet their peers and talk by themselves. This constituted to a significant difference in how students perceived peer review. One more significant addition to the course was informed by the finding that utilization of peer review forms may improve the review process. Hansen & Liu (2005) proposed that the use of peer review forms led to a more efficient revision as students had clear guidelines. Therefore, while engaging in peer review, the students were given a peer review form. Peer review forms were due the next day. The forms were to be submitted to peers and the teacher. A written report allowed students to deepen their reflection and focus their observations.

Another crucial factor that was discovered in research was classroom atmosphere. Allen and Katayama (2016) discovered that a comfortable atmosphere in the classroom results in more honest feedback since the students know each other. In the classroom building a community is one of the vital goals—at the beginning of the course students are asked to bond through several bonding activities. In addition, the importance of negative criticism has been addressed. The teacher explained that not all negative feedback is bad. The intention of negative criticism if supported by suggestions and explanations may be beneficial. More importantly, the students were asked to keep in mind that every critical comment is a suggestion, and the writer himself/herself has a final decision to accept or reject it.

Finally, many studies reveal the importance of peer work in cultures where people prefer to work alone. Kurihara (2017) concluded that peer editing was essential for Japanese students as culturally unacceptable collaboration exposed them to collaborative style of learning and helped prepare for future work environment. During the course, it was expected that students would learn to trust each other. A constant reminder was offered to the students that the teacher has to examine 80-90 presentations, and it is impossible to give a deep and full feedback to all the students. Therefore, an encouragement to value and listen to the peers who have more time and can give more detailed feedback was provided. It was the goal in the course to instruct students that learning occurs in dialogue and hope that these skills will be transferred in the work environment in the future.

Methodology

During the general English C1 level class (6 credit hours) in the university setting, the

students were asked to conduct a power point presentation on a topic of their choices. The principles of the process writing have been applied to the presentation assignment. Similarly to the steps in essay writing instruction such as brainstorming, organizing, and revising, the students follow the same steps.

The presentation was based on the rhetorical mode of a problem-solution and underwent several clearly defined stages: 1. Choosing and focusing on a topic (week 1) followed by teacher feedback; 2. Presenting a problem (week 2) followed by student feedback on Padlet, an online collaborative platform; 3. Examining reasons of the problem (week 3) followed by practice through a shared word document; 4. Finding a solution (week 4) followed by feedback from peers on Padlet; 5. Submitting draft 1 for teacher feedback (week 5); 6. Submitting draft 2 for peer feedback (week 6); and 7. Submitting final draft of the presentation for the final evaluation (week 7).

For reliability purposes, the study was carried out in two semesters, Fall 2019 and Spring 2020. It is critically important to note that Spring 2020 was an exceptional semester due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The students were on the 6th step of the process when the instruction had to be moved to an online environment. Therefore, peer review and the final presentation had to be done virtually. The students lost an opportunity to meet each other in the classroom and conduct peer reviews face to face and were simply assigned groups to do peer reviews during the class period. Regrettably, it was impossible to monitor if students connected and exchanged ideas in writing only, or if they called each other on personal phones. Furthermore, it is also hard to say if they used 45 minutes or took shorter or longer to complete the task.

A questionnaire was used to collect the data over two consecutive semesters in Fall 2019 and Spring 2020. 46 surveys were collected (22 and 24 in the two semesters). In order to analyze the the value of peer review, three questions were selected: (a) Did you prefer process assignment (presentation) or product assignments (some writing assignments that were given and evaluated right away)? Please explain your answer. What benefits do you see in one or another way of learning? (b) Did you find peer evaluation valuable? Please explain your answer. What have you learned from this step? (c) Did you find teacher feedback more valuable than peer feedback? Please explain your answer. Why one or the other was important in the process?

The quantitative statistical analysis was performed, yet some questions allowed students to explain their answer. Therefore, since some questions were qualitative in nature, the research

analysis provides deeper insights. Students were not given any suggestions as to how to answer the questions. Students decided individually how much to share, or what to reflect on; therefore, some students offered one or two learning outcomes while other offered four or five ideas. Quantitative analysis was performed with yes no questions, yet qualitative responses in this study were collected into one pool regardless of the semester, age, gender, English language level, or other variables simply because of the small student sample. The survey was carried out after the process assignment was evaluated by the teacher after 6 weeks of study.

Participants

A total of forty-six students participated in the study (22 students completed the course in the Fall 2019 semester, and 24 students in the Spring 2020). Perfect attendance and participation in every step of the process assignment can be observed in 60% of the students in the Fall semester and 50% in the Spring semester. It means that other students missed peer review assignment or missed one or more training sessions and lectures. The study did not separate students in terms of their academic year (first, second, third, or fourth year students) due to a small sample of students. Furthermore, the students represented many different majors and fields of study at the university. All of the participating students were Lithuanian students enrolled in C1 English course.

Research results

Preference for process or product approach assignments

(a) Did you prefer process assignment (presentation) or product assignments (some writing assignments that were given and evaluated right away)? Please explain your answer. What benefits do you see in one or another way of learning?

Overall satisfaction with process approach assignments was clearly visible in both years. 87% of the students in the Fall 2019 preferred process assignment (3% preferred product, and 9% did not specify their choice) and 68% of the students in the Spring 2020 preferred process assignment (20% preferred product, and 12% did not specify their choice). More than a half of the participants during both semesters preferred process approach because they saw significant improvements in their presentations. 32 out of 46 students provided further explanations. Analyzing the responses about why they enjoyed the process, and what they have learned from the process, three directions took shape (Table 1). Students reflected on the content

(presenting), language skills (grammar and vocabulary), and lifelong learning skills such as time management, trusting their partners, thinking critically.

Table 1. Students’ reflections on learning by skills from both semesters

Content area skills	Number of students
I learned to use references properly	17
I learned how to support ideas	9
I learned how to look for articles	8
I learned more about organization	8
I learned how to focus my ideas	7
I learned about hooking the audience	2
Language skills (grammar and vocabulary)	
Improved grammar	2
Improved vocabulary	2
Lifelong learning skills	
I learned time management	16
I learned to think more critically	15
I learned to enjoy research	5
I learned to trust peers	5

On the content area, it is interesting that many students wanted to reflect on the references. Plagiarism was addressed quite heavily in the course because students typically do not think that documenting every source on the slides is necessary. For many students it was a revelation that pictures in the presentations also needed to be documented to avoid plagiarism. Due to such sensationalism about documentation during the class, it is not surprising that the point got so much attention in their responses. The fact that students reflected on content learning (how to support information, to effectively look for articles, to organize ideas, or to focus ideas) merely proves that students desperately need process approach because every step is analyzed and strategies are provided to tackle these issues. It shows that students often are left alone to deliver presentations without much guidance on how to choose proper key words, how to evaluate the seriousness of the source, or how to support reasons in creative ways.

Even though a small percentage of students reflected on the other skills that were taught such as hooking the audience, inserting and reading graphs, concluding, pacing, etc., it is still clear that students appreciate learning strategies and skills that will serve them in other subjects at the university.

Language skills did not get much student attention. Students felt satisfied with the process approach because they could manipulate English in communicating something other than a grammar exercise. Using English to deal with academic tasks, academic content gave them confidence and

satisfaction that they accomplished a lot. Even though during the class grammar lessons were integrated with presentation skills, they became secondary. For example, cleft sentences were introduced and modeled as significant for the presentation (for example, the reason I would like to discuss is... or the problem that I would like to draw attention to is...). In addition, students reviewed reported speech that is important in reporting research findings and results. Furthermore, adverb clauses were introduced and practiced in order to enhance sentence variety in the presentations. While talking about reasons, a particular attention was paid to more advanced commenting words that could replace commonly used “so” or “because,” and while discussing a solution such conjunctions as “so that” or “in order that” were practiced.

These skills and knowledge of reviewed grammar structures were apparent in many student presentations, yet the students did not comment on this knowledge on the survey. Apparently, there were other things that the students felt were more important besides grammar in this task. Only two students commented that grammar improved during this task meaning that possibly a closer or stronger attention needs to be drawn to correct grammar. One lesson per week was dedicated to vocabulary during the course. A special attention to academic vocabulary was devoted and word lists presented in each week including most common academic word list, useful words while talking about reasons or effects (like bring about, foster, consequence of, stems from, etc.), or a list of academic phrases useful for presentation. Only two students mentioned vocabulary improvement during this task, but it is apparent that presenting is not a stress free activity, and it is not easy to integrate vocabulary when there is more at stake.

It is not easy to speculate why the students did not feel a significant improvement in grammar or vocabulary. It is possible that at the moment of the survey, other more significant reflections came to their mind. A limitation of the survey in that a specific question regarding grammar or vocabulary was not asked.

Against expectation, students reflected on lifelong learning skills. Managing to allocate time for tasks at the university level and improved critical observation skills in preparing a presentation were most commonly noted skills. While not significantly large numbers reflected on such points as enjoying the research process or trusting their peers, trusting themselves, or even learning that it can be fun to share ideas in English are remarkable accomplishments in a 7 week language classroom. The seed that learning can be fun has been planted in some of these students, and it is clear that they

will continue to learn and enjoy the process of learning.

Group or peer review analysis

(b) Did you find peer evaluation valuable? Please explain your answer. What have you learned from this step?

During the Fall 2019 semester, an outstandingly high percentage with peer and group review was observed. 82% of the students valued peer review, 14% of the students did not feel it was beneficial (mostly explaining that peer review quality depended on the peer motivation), and 4% of the students did not offer an answer as they did not participate in peer review process. Among the qualitative answers the reasons why students valued peer review were very fairly uniform.

Table 2. Students’ attitudes about peer and teacher review

Reflections on peer review	Nr. of students
Less intimidating to make a mistake	13
Same age—similar concerns and style of communication	13
More time to discuss and negotiate meaning	5
Confirm understanding, yet quality of discussion highly depended on peer motivation	1
Trust myself. Everyone is learning, we all make different mistakes	1
Reflections on teacher review	
More experienced	15
More reliable	15
Clearer and with examples	5
More constructive	5

The results regarding students’ attitudes are represented in the Table 2 above. This section had fewer responses and even shorter comments, yet among the students who answered (20 total), the majority of the students pointed out that consulting and talking to peers was easier because they were of the same age and were not afraid to ask questions. Only five students really enjoyed the heated discussion in the group, and felt that they were very successful in negotiating meaning together. Some pointed to the fact that they learned from the mistakes of others and improved their presentations. Namely, when the peers were confused during the presentations, the presenters realized there was an error in logic or the point lacked explanation. By asking questions, they helped each other to clarify information in their presentation. Granted, only a very small percentage of students made such deep observations, but the fact that such deep observations occurred after 5 weeks of instruction is highly promising. This means that students would

become more perceptive and would come to these realizations if similar teaching methods were used in their future classes.

All in all, it is important to note that there was an apparent pride in the final product. Students realized that presentations require a lot of time, energy, and preparation, and that learning can occur from one another.

The results of the Spring 2020 during the COVID-19 crisis, peer reviews were conducted online, and the percentages dropped quite a bit. Only 55% of the students regarded peer review as valuable, 32% of students considered it ineffective, and 13% of the students did not provide an answer as they did not participate in the peer review process. The qualitative answers were short, random and insignificant for deeper discussion.

(c) Did you find teacher feedback more valuable than peer feedback? Please explain your answer. Why one or the other was important in the process?

During the Fall 2019, 60% of the students valued teacher’s feedback more. It is not a surprising result as a teacher is normally viewed as an authority in the classroom. Therefore, what is important in this part is that 27% of the students valued the feedback they received from their peers more than teacher feedback. To change students’ point of view and values in one semester is not an easy task. This is an amazing result. It shows student readiness and desire to be independent and trust what they learned or want to learn. During the lectures, the value of peer feedback was stressed heavily, and the students were made to understand that a teacher had only about 10 minutes to review the work while the peers had 30 minutes to review the work. Quality of the feedback highly depends on the time that one has for peer review, and the students appreciated the time that was allotted to their work and dialogue in groups of three. While reviewing the work of others, the students had a chance to negotiate the information that had been discussed in class. Such ideas as “learning from the mistakes of others,” “confirming my understanding of the material,” “trust in myself: were a few of the ideas that emerged as a result of this question.

Unfortunately, the results of the online peer review during the Spring 2010 semester were not so promising. More students (67%) relied on the teacher feedback and only 8% of the students valued peer review as a more beneficial feedback. The result again is very understandable as the students were not monitored heavily during the process, and they simply accomplished the task because it was a requirement. Since peer review is typically not encouraged or valued much in the system, it is very clear that the students did not put much energy into this assignment. This finding confirms previous

studies of Katayama (2016) concluding that classroom atmosphere and relationships are needed for the peer review to be successful. In addition, the importance of the oral component in peer review provided by Wang (2018) deserves considerable attention.

Limitations

The findings of this study could be applicable to other classrooms where peer review is used as a learning tool. An obvious limitation is the small sample. Another limitation is the unusual learning environment during COVID-19. The pandemic brought a lot of fear, confusion and depression to students, so their minds were not always in the school subjects. Finally, the questionnaire could ask more specific questions to elicit deeper understanding of acquiring content, language, and lifelong learning skills.

Another limitation in the study is student age. Due to the small size of the participants it was impossible to analyze this data by student maturity (for example freshmen versus seniors). First year students are not as critically engaged in learning as more experienced and mature students.

Conclusions

The findings of the study with Lithuanian students confirm with the premise of the course that the process learning is valued more than the product approach. This result remains consistent in the classroom and online environment. Another fairly predictable result was teacher feedback. In fact, students value teacher feedback very highly. Incidentally, the lack of daily interaction with the teacher during the COVID -19 pandemic showed diminishing results in teacher trust, yet the sample

is not large enough to make strong conclusions. On the other hand, the fact that there is a decrease in teachers' influence when students are taught at a distance is an argument that deserves further investigation.

The results of the study support the findings of Katayama's (2016) findings about the importance of classroom atmosphere. It became apparent that the friendly classroom atmosphere creates more trust and willingness to participate in peer review, and the results of this study showed a big drop in the value and interest of peer review. Similarly, the results support the findings of Wang's (2018) study where oral contact was found to be essential in peer review. During the face to face classroom, students had two class periods, a total of 90 minutes dedicated to oral exchanges about their work in the computer lab. The results showed that students valued peer review more when they had clearly defined classroom time to exchange ideas orally during the peer review. For the most part, during the COVID-19 crises, the students opted for written feedback rather than oral conversation, and did not dedicate a full 90 minutes to discussions.

All in all, the results show a huge potential for this type of teaching. The results reveal many benefits not only in the content area but also lifelong learning skills. Considering that students were exposed to this kind of learning for the first time in their learning process, and the process lasted only 6 weeks, the results seem to be especially relevant. Teaching to learn differently is not a task that can be accomplished within one semester—it is also a process that needs to be fostered and encouraged in every classroom. The fact that students were able to reflect and adapt to this new way of learning so fast only leads to the conclusion that they are ready and capable of being pushed and encouraged to engage in more critical and reflective practice.

References

1. Allen & Katayama, A. (2016). Relative second language proficiency and the giving and receiving of written peer feedback. *System (Linköping)*, 56, 96–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.12.002>
2. Brammer, C. & Rees, M. (2007). Peer review from the students' perspective: Invaluable or invalid? *Composition Studies* 5(2), 71-85
3. Čėsniėnė. (2015). Rašymo įgūdžių tobulinimas taikant studentų tarpusavio vertinimo metodą.
4. Chang. (2015). Teacher modeling on EFL reviewers' audience-aware feedback and affectivity in L2 peer review. *Assessing Writing*, 25, 2–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2015.04.001>
5. Elola, & Oskoz, A. (2016). Supporting Second Language Writing Using Multimodal Feedback. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(1), 58–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12183>
6. Hansen, & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci004>
7. Hyland, & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
8. Kroll, Barbara (1991). Teaching Writing in the ESL Context. In M. Celce-Murcia (Eds.) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp.219-232). Boston, Mass.: Newbury House.
9. Kurihara, N. (2017). Do Peer Reviews Help Improve Student Writing Abilities in an EFL High School Classroom? *TESOL Journal*, 8(2), 450–470. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.282>
10. Lam. (2010). A Peer Review Training Workshop: Coaching Students to Give and Evaluate Peer

- Feedback. *TESL Canada Journal*, 27(2), 114–127. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v27i2.1052>
11. Lindemann, Erika. (1982). *Rhetoric for writing teachers*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 12. Mulligan, A., Hall, L., & Raphael, E. (2013). Peer review in a changing world: An international study measuring the attitudes of researchers. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 64(1), 132–161. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22798>
 13. Sammons, Lindorff, A. M., Ortega, L., & Kington, A. (2016). Inspiring teaching: learning from exemplary practitioners. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 1(2), 124–144. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPC-09-2015-0005>
 14. Vygotsky, Lev. (1997). "Interaction between Learning and Development" Archived 2016-01-25 at the Wayback Machine. W.H. Freeman and Company, New York.
 15. Wang, Yu, S., & Teo, T. (2018). Experienced EFL teachers' beliefs about feedback on student oral presentations. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 3(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-018-0053-3>

VEIKSMINGO TARPUSAVIO VERTINIMO SIEKIS NAUDOJANT BENDRADARBIAVIMO METODĄ KALBŲ MOKYME

Santrauka

Moksliniuose darbuose dėstytojai yra kaskart skatinami naudoti alternatyvias vertinimo priemones, nes jos įtraukia studentus į reflekyvią praktiką, kuri ne tik gerina įgytų žinių kokybę, bet ir skatina atsakingiau pažvelgti į mokymosi procesą, bei ugdo mokymosi visą gyvenimą įgūdžius. Literatūros apžvalga atskleidė, kad daugelis praktikų mokantys kalbos abejoja reflekyvios praktikos verte. Dažnai minima, kad kolegų vertinimo metodas užima per daug laiko, o studentai nėra pakankamai subrendę arba jiems trūksta pasitikėjimo ir motyvacijos kritiškai vertinti kolegas. Tyrimo tikslas – įvertinti studentų suvokimą apie kolegų ir dėstytojų vertinimus. Tyrimas pagrįstas procesinio mokymosi principu pritaikant tarpusavio vertinimo veiklas. Tyrimas atliktas su C1 bendrosios anglų kalbos lygio studentais per du skirtingus semestrus: vieną įprastą ir kitą nuotolinį (paveiktą COVID-19). Dalykas buvo sukurtas remiantis geriausia praktika atrasta analizuojant tarpusavio vertinimo mokslinę literatūrą. Priešingai bendrai nuomonei, studentai mėgavosi tarpusavio vertinimo procesu. Motyvuotų studentų vertinimai daugeliu atvejų buvo pripažinti naudingesni nei dėstytojų vertinimai. Išitraukimas į tarpusavio vertinimą internete atskleidė dar gilesnį dalykų mokymąsi ir mokymosi visą gyvenimą įgūdžių demonstravimą. Tyrimo rezultatai parodė, kad mokymosi procesas buvo naudingesnis nei galutinis įvertinimas, o reflekyvi praktika yra labai veiksminga mokymosi procese. Reflekyvi praktika parodė sustiprintą mokinių išitraukimą į mokymąsi, refleksiją ir kolegų vertinimą bei davė aiškią naudą studentams ir dėstytojams

Reikšminiai žodžiai: mokymasis bendradarbiaujant, tarpusavio mokymosi metodas, tarpusavio vertinimas, mokymasis visą gyvenimą, kalbų mokymas.

Information about the author

Vaida Misevičiūtė. Vytautas Magnus University, Institute of Foreign Languages, lecturer. Kaunas University of Applied Sciences, Centre of Languages, lecturer. Field of research interests: language teaching. E-mail address: vaida.miseviciute@go.kauko.lt