

Original Paper

A Qualitative Study of Non-English Majors' Cognitive and
Affective Strategies in Peer Review in Online Writing
Assessment—Taking *Iwrite* as Example

Ruoqing LAN¹

¹ Beijing International Studies University, Beijing, China

Received: August 22, 2023 Accepted: November 03, 2023 Online Published: November 19, 2023
doi:10.22158/eltls.v5n5p13 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/eltls.v5n5p13>

Abstract

With the development of modern information science and technology, online writing assessment emerges. Some platforms, like iwrite, are widely used by language teacher and learner. Peer review is an important issue in English writing teaching. In recent years, there are a lot of studies relevant to it. Besides, learning strategy is also significant in language teaching research. However, it hasn't been known which cognitive and affective strategies that learners would like to use in peer review on iwrite. Therefore, this study tried to do some investigation. By carrying out the study, it is evident that due to personality and value orientation, different learners adopt various cognitive strategies for the purpose of completing various tasks. The choice and use of certain strategies will have impact on learner's performance in writing. Besides, learners prefer to use positive affective strategies to encourage their partner to behave actively in peer review as well as build up confidence for English writing.

Keywords

online writing assessment, strategies, peer review, iwrite

1. Introduction

Peer review is an important part in the process of English writing teaching and learning. It has impact on the quality of second language learners' output. This is a social interaction paradigm which occurs when writers and readers negotiate and co-construct a written text, mainly in the form of interaction and negotiation during the writing process. What's more, it is also regarded as center in the writing process. Scholars have carried out relevant studies. Deng and Cen (2010) implied the effectiveness of peer review in L2 writing. Peer review has a positive impact on L2 writing. It effectively contributed to the improvement of writing construction skills. The implementation of peer review in English writing

class is not only necessary but also feasible to overcome the drawbacks of traditional writing assessment and to promote learners' social interaction and writing construction skills.

Similarly, Wu (2013) also proposed writing is a significant indicator of English proficiency. As an indispensable component of process-based writing and multiple feedback, peer review is the input created by readers for writers and its purpose is to offer information for writers to revise their own writing. It's also a social interaction paradigm when different learners can figure out the whole text together, which is usually treated as the core of the writing process.

These studies have identified peer review has played a role in English writing teaching and learning. It is an effective way for learners to exchange information. Through peer review, they can put forward their opinions, gain others' learning experiences, and finish the writing tasks. In addition, It can also promote learners' active engagement in English writing instruction. Therefore, in this context, there is a basis in reality for conducting a study on this topic.

Nowadays, as modern information science technology develops, computer-assisted language teaching and learning comes into being gradually. According to Garrett (2009), technology in the service of language teaching and learning emerges as an unstoppable trend. The relationship between teacher and student, pedagogy, theory and teaching practice, efficacy and physical infrastructure have all changed. It is necessary to face the challenge, establish CALL center and support it. This research depicts the prospects of online language teaching and learning. In the same way, Tabuenca, Kalz, Drachsler and Specht (2015) revealed language learning with mobile support has positive effect. Learners can control their learning and use relevant strategies without limitation. We need to modify online courses to help learners control their English learning more freely.

These investigations confirm that with the advancement of information science technology, language learning and teaching has changed greatly. Various aspects in this process, like assessment, learning and teaching strategies, identify, also transform with it. In the transformation, learners play an increasingly important role, and the problems they encounter and the corresponding strategies they use are worthy of our detailed study.

What should be noticed is that since the outbreak of pandemic, online English teaching and learning, particularly writing teaching, learning and assessment, become mainstream gradually. Lots of schools are trying to carry out online or blended learning, for the purpose of ensuring the quality and quantity of language learning (Wen & Yang, 2020). They have also built various forms of online communication platforms with the help of social media, and the interaction and collaboration between learners in online learning has been further enhanced.

In the context of improving learner-centered writing instruction and assessment, learners themselves usually use various strategies to cope with different problems they may encounter, as well as avoid negative feelings, so that they are able to make progress in writing through peer review (Yu, Geng, Liu, & Zheng, 2021).

However, it has not been very clear in online writing assessment, what cognitive and affective

strategies learners are likely to use, what aspects influence their choices and the outcomes. Therefore, in this paper, there will be a qualitative study to investigate cognitive and affective strategies that the learners who are not from English major tend to use when engaging in peer review in *iwrite*, a writing assessment platform online. It's hoped to find out the strategies and their features and the impact they have on learners' writing.

This paper will be divided into following parts. Part 1 is a brief introduction to the topic. Later, in part 2, there will be literature review concerning the research about peer review, writing assessment and strategies and online learning platform. Next, part 3 will present the methodology, part 4 will be a detailed discussion of the results. Finally, part 5 will summarize the study.

2. Literature Review

Having talked about the reasons why do some research on learners' cognitive and affective strategies in peer review in *iwrite*, the following part of this paper will focus on relevant studies from these aspects: peer review, online writing assessment and learning strategies, hoping to find out what have done and what we can do in the future.

2.1 Peer Review

Learning must take place in a social context of mutual participation and negotiation. Only when learners engage in multi-level social interaction can they construct any form of knowledge. The mechanism of peer review provides L2 writers with an important social context for mutual interaction and negotiation. The various interactions between learners in the process of peer review and the various information feedback is presented as different social interaction at different level. All these can not only improve the learner's social interaction and cognitive ability, but also improve his ability of constructing knowledge about English writing, and finally promote the skill of output and internalization (Lave & Wenger, 1990). From the above, it's known that in English writing learning and teaching, peer review takes a significant place. It benefits learners in knowledge construction, social interaction and the advancement of learning skill and strategies.

In China, some scholars have conducted studies concerning peer review from various aspects. Liu (2015) investigated the effects of peer review plus teacher instruction. In the study, he proposed peer review plus teacher instruction are more efficient than the single mode, that is only applying peer review or teacher instruction. It can greatly improve students' English writing and cultivate their motivation, thus arouse their autonomy and sense of identity to the class.

Zeng and Liang (2017) compared two kinds of peer review, Computer-Mediated Peer Response (CMPR) and traditional Face-to-Face Peer Response (FFPR). By comparing their differences, the impact on correction and the improvement of writing, he indicated the comments generated by both of them are mainly in the micro-dimensions, rather than macro-dimensions such as article structure and content. Students do not have enough trust and emphasis on peer peer assessment, and peer feedback, whether through FFPR or CMPR, is not widely adopted. In addition, from the perspective of the quality

of paper writing, FFPR and CMPR have limited impact.

Similarly, Bai, Su and Shen (2017) also investigated peer review in blended learning. The research integrates online peer review based on mobile terminals with face-to-face classroom teaching, constructs a blended learning model incorporating peer assessment, and conducts experiments on the effectiveness of the model in some courses.

The results of these investigations show that peer review is becoming an important language teaching and learning activity in China. The scholars mainly focus on the difference between peer review and traditional writing assessment, the types of peer review, its advantages and effects on teaching practice. On the contrary, they do not pay so much attention to the learners, including their writing strategies, attitudes and the interaction between them.

At the same time, some foreign researchers did some studies in this field. Grant (2016) revealed peer review process completion and learners' perception in the context of online study versus blending learning. The research implied that learners' strategies and attitudes when they participate in peer review in a completely online mode or in blended mode of English writing learning. Learners tend to perform better in blended mode of peer review.

Apart from patterns of peer review, learners' engagement is also a hot issue in this field. Choi, Schallert, Jee and Ko (2021) investigated the influences of interpersonal dynamics on peer review and following revision online. Relying on dyadic functioning levels, telecollaborative partners performed different reader and writer roles and addressed different aspects of L2 writing. The ways partners responded to and incorporated peer feedback into their revisions varied systematically by level of dyadic functioning. Hyland and Zhang (2021) explored how to foster students' engagement in peer review. By carrying out empirical study, they found most students actively engaged with the integrated approach and that it effectively promoted students' behavioral, affective, and cognitive engagement with review on their writing and encouraged thoughtful revisions. In other words, students' engagement with feedback can be facilitated with an integrated approach and the integration of different types of feedback merits attention from both researchers and practitioners in higher education.

In conclusion, one of the most significant findings to emerge from these studies is that with the development of information science technology, peer review has changed a lot. At present, scholars mainly concern the patterns of peer review, the characteristics of various peer review and learners' engagement and interaction. Learners' strategies are less mentioned in these studies.

2.2 Online Writing Assessment

As far as the research of peer review is concerned, for understanding the topic better, it's necessary to look back to the previous research on online language assessment, especially writing test.

Liu (2013) focused on the application of modern technology in assessment in China. According to him, language assessment can be conducted online. Besides, automatic scoring has become possible. It adopts the latest achievements in statistics, natural language processing and artificial intelligence, and scores the composition according to certain scoring standards. It has many advantages, such as reliable

and objective scoring, not affected by human factors and economical to a certain extent. Immediacy and interactivity.

The studies mentioned above illustrate the possibility and advantages of conducting online writing assessment from a theoretical level. In addition, some scholars have also launched empirical research on online writing assessment. Brunfaut, Harding and Batty (2018) studied the effect of delivery mode on the two writing tasks (reading-into-writing and extended writing) within the Trinity College London Integrated Skills in English (ISE) test suite across three proficiency levels, from CEFR B1 to C1. Through investigation, they revealed delivery mode had no discernible effect, apart from the reading-into-writing task at ISE I, where the paper-based mode was slightly easier. Test-takers generally held more positive perceptions of the online delivery mode, although technical problems were reported.

In addition, Eugenia and Chamorro (2022) study cognitive validity evidence of computer-based and paper-based writing tests and compare differences in the impact on EFL test-takers in assessment in class. They are cognitively valid, as they activated cognitive processes necessary to perform a writing assessment task. However, each test mode impacted EFL students' cognitive processes differently. The PB mode triggered greater detailed macro-planning of content and text organization. On the contrary, the CB mode triggered micro-planning of text organization and after-writing revisions at both high and low levels. There were no significant differences in task representation and translating processes.

Taken together, the results of these studies suggest that with the development of information technology, the writing test has also changed. Today, writing tests are increasingly computer-based or computer-assisted. In this context, it is possible to carry out remote and online writing assessments. Second, the content of the test is more comprehensive than before. In addition, some attention has been paid to learners' cognitive and emotional status in online writing assessments.

2.3 Learning Strategies

In this paper, we have presented the relevant studies about peer review and online writing assessment. For understanding the topic better, the section that follows moves on to focus on the research concerning English learning strategy, particularly writing strategy.

Through investigation, Wu and Zhang (2009) proposed that there is relationship between self-efficacy, learning strategies and independent learning ability. Both learning strategies and self-efficacy have significant regression effects on the last one; cognitive and affective strategies are the most predictive of independent learning ability, and compensation strategies are also highly predictive of it; self-efficacy has a higher predictive effect on independent learning ability. The regression effect was significant, indirectly influencing academic achievement through independent learning ability.

Besides, Tan and Zhang (2015) further discuss the multidimensional relationship between learning strategy, independent learning and ability and achievement of non-English major students. Memory, metacognitive and cognitive strategies in independent learning have significant forecasting ability on students' learning performance. Moreover, learning strategies have a significant impact on achievement

and independent learning ability.

The research above have shown how strategies function in the process of language learning. They can be regarded as a complex system and have impact on learners' learning performance and achievements. This helps us see learning strategies from a macro perspective. However, most of studies in the early days on learning strategies are about the interpretation of theories, and there are few empirical studies. Subsequently, Sardegna, Lee and Kusey (2017) explored learning strategies, self-efficacy and choice for pronunciation learning and figured out a structural model according to it. Perceived practical and linguistic values related to pronunciation learning led students to be concerned about their pronunciation and thus increased their intentional behavior to improve their pronunciation skills. Also, the greater the intentional behavior, the more likely students were to select strategies to advance their pronunciation skills.

In contrast, during the same period, Gallardo-del-Puerto, Basterrechea and Mat3nez-Adri3n (2017) focused on compensatory strategies (CSs) that young learners prefer to use in EFL contexts, especially in content-and-language-integrated-learning (CLIL) environment. Learners exhibited a relatively high use of CSs in general. Moreover, no differences emerged regarding the total amount of CSs as a function of target language proficiency. Besides, the proficient learners were found to draw on some non L2-based strategies such as avoidance, foreignizing and miming to a lesser extent than less proficient learners.

These investigations show us with the development of learning strategy studies. In the beginning, scholars preferred to perform grounded theory elucidation with the aim of presenting a general picture of this field. Subsequently, due to the practical needs of language teaching and learning, related research in this field has shifted from simple theoretical elaboration to empirical research to better solve problems in teaching practice. Nowadays, as English education reforms gradually, student-centred philosophy becomes more and more important in teaching and learning. It's necessary to do some research on specific strategies that learners may use in certain environment, like cognitive, affective, meta-cognitive and other strategies in online or blending study.

3. Methodology

So far, this paper has introduced the topic and previous studies about peer review, online writing assessment and learning strategies. In the following pages, there will be a presentation of methodology, which includes research questions, context, the participants, instruments, data collection, data analysis and a brief introduction to research process.

3.1 Research Questions

From the studies mentioned in the previous part, it can be seen that with the development of information science and technology, peer review and writing assessment have change together. Computer-assisted language learning gradually becomes mainstream. The forms, contents and strategies in writing assessment are different. Lots of online language assessment platforms, like *iwrite*,

emerge gradually. In addition, emotional attitudes and cognition of learners are also increasingly valued.

However, there has not been much research on the strategies learners use in peer review on *iwrite*, especially cognitive and affective strategies. Furthermore, the factors that influence their choice of strategies and corresponding results have not been clear so far. Regarding to the situation, the followings are research questions:

- (1) What are the cognitive and affective strategies that learners would like to use when participating in peer review in *iwrite*?
- (2) What factors have impact on them when choosing the strategies?
- (3) How these strategies influence their behavior in peer review in *iwrite*?

3.2 Research Context and Participants

The study took place in Beijing International Studies University. As requires by the university's syllabus, non-English major students need to take the compulsory course Academic Writing in Year 3, aiming to have knowledge about the norms and skills of academic writing to improve their writing ability so that they can cope with various writing tasks. During the practice week of this course, the system randomly assigned other students to them in order to finish peer review. In the middle of the course, a writing task was given out to them. They needed to write an argumentative essay and hand in *iwrite* and then they did peer review. Several weeks later, they finished another task, writing a narration. Next, they still needed to review their partner's essay.

Over 400 students took the course. 5 students (A, B, C, D and E) at the intermediate or advanced level were invited to participate in this research. They were all non-English majors and came from Financial Management and International Relationship. There are 4 girls and 1 boy among them. It was worth nothing that there was variation in the students' English proficiency though they engaged in the same course. At the beginning of the course, *iwrite* assigned them with a partner and they needed to revise their writing together. Several weeks later, the system would give out a midterm homework and assigned them with another partner.

The first task was writing an argumentative essay about environmental protection, *should plastic bags be banned*, 150 to 800 words. After finishing writing, students needed to hand in their essays in *iwrite* and then they were assigned a partner to conduct peer review. Several weeks later

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

There were semi-structured interviews in this study and the data were collected in this way. Before carrying out the interviews, a guideline was figured out (see Note). Questions in the guideline referred to Fan and Xu (2020), Yu (2021), Luo and Hyland (2016), Han and Hiver (2018), Hui, Cheng and Li (2020). Due to time limitation and the small sample, there were not so many questions in the guideline. Those questions were divided into following aspects: participants' attitudes toward *iwrite* and peer review, like "What do you think of peer review in *iwrite*" "How do you think about your partner's comments? What is the focus of it"; cognitive strategies they used such as "After receiving feedback

from peers, how did you use the feedback to revise your essay?” “When revising, do you compare your own essay, your peers’ feedback, and your peers’ essay to achieve better results?”; and affective strategies, including “Do you encourage your partner to finish writing assignments by saying something like ‘You can do better’”. During the interview, the questions were adjusted according to the state of the participants.

Every semi-structured interview lasted from 15 to 30 minutes. What’s more, the interviews were conducted in text in the social software WeChat. At the beginning of every interview, participants were asked what they think about *iwrite* and peer review on *iwrite*. In the following, there were the questions concerning their cognitive strategies. Later, they talked about affective strategies they prefer to use in the process of peer review. In the end, they were asked what they learned in peer review and whether they would like to engage in peer review again. Furthermore, they offered their suggestions to online writing assessment platform *iwrite*.

On the basis of the above procedures, three sources of the study were collected: participants’ opinion on *iwrite* and online peer review, their cognitive strategies and affective strategies. After interview, a qualitative analysis was conducted regarding to these aspects. By analyzing chatting records, cognitive strategies and affective strategies that students commonly used in peer review emerged. In addition, through qualitative analysis, it was also possible to know the characteristics of cognitive and affective strategies used by learners. Besides, by conducting qualitative analysis, it could understand learners’ attitudes towards peer review, as well as opinions and suggestions on *iwrite*.

4. Results and Discussion

Having showing methodology of this research in part 3, the following part will present results of the study (see Appendix II to VI). The results will be analyzed from these aspects: their attitudes towards *iwrite* and peer review, cognitive strategies and affective strategies that participants chose in peer review, the factors affecting their choice and the impacts of those strategies have on their peer review in *iwrite*.

4.1 Attitudes towards Iwrite and Peer Review

The first question of semi-structured interview are related to attitudes towards *iwrite*, partner’s feedback and peer review, that is “What do you think of peer review on *iwrite*? What’s your opinion on the feedback on your essay, and what is the point of your partner’s comments? (你觉得 *iwrite* 平台的同伴互评活动怎么样? 你是怎么看待同伴对你作业的反馈, 你觉得他们给你的反馈的重点在哪一方面?)”

Five participants held similar opinions. A proposed: “Personally, I think this activity is good. In peer review, I can know what others care about, which reflects as a group at the same level, what we will have in peer review. I think *iwrite* is beneficial. From my perspective, we are more willing to open our hearts to someone who is at the same level. If we are talking to the teacher, we may all feel inferior. And it is also very important that peer review is anonymous in *iwrite*.”

Besides, B and E also talked about this. B revealed in peer review, she was able to discover some problems existing her essay. Furthermore, from her point of view, the feedback and comments from partner mainly lay in the citations of the arguments and the structure of the essay. E said peer review was pretty useful. It increased the interaction among classmates. In this case, she was more serious. This activity could ensure that students were able to reach a good tacit understanding and complete the homework better. Her partner's feedback on my homework is relatively concise, such as an overall evaluation of expression, structure, and content.

C and D held the same opinion. Both of them believed that through peer review, they could get a more detailed and comprehensive evaluation, and understand some new ideas, which would be beneficial for the revision of their essays.

These results provide some evidence for the topic that compared with traditional writing assessment offline, peer review in *iwrite* has some advantages. First of all, these participants were able to take part in peer review without worrying too much. In an environment where there is sufficient mutual understanding and trust, they could complete their tasks more freely. Secondly, due to the similar level and no restrictions on time, space and status, these participants and their partners can reach a consensus and learn from each other's strengths and weaknesses more easily, thereby improving their English writing ability.

As Tian and Zhou (2022) propose, students can absorb a variety of feedback and modify their writing many times, which shows the feasibility of applying computer-based peer review to online writing courses. As the main body of feedback absorption activities, they are able to actively judge the accuracy and applicability of different feedback, and make decisions on whether to take or not under the dynamic interaction of feedback characteristics, learner factors and online course environment, giving full play to their main role.

Therefore, it is concluded that participants had a positive attitude towards *iwrite* and its peer review activities. Both of them stated that the activities have played an important role in the process of English writing, providing materials for the writing task and promoting the improvement of their writing ability.

4.2 Cognitive Strategies

Apart from attitudes towards *iwrite* and peer review, cognitive strategies that these participants used in the process of peer review are also deserved to investigate. Questions 2 to 4 explore the cognitive strategies that participants used in peer review by studying how they revised their essays and how they interacted with their partner when engaging in peer review.

Question 2 is "In the process of peer review, do you give your comments to your partner as soon as possible so that they can correct their essay and complete the task (在同伴互评的过程中, 你是否会尽快地把自己的意见反馈给同伴, 使他们可以更好地改正自己的写作文本, 从而完成任务)?" The participants gave different answers to this question. According to A, he followed up the review from time to time. From his perspective, peer review gave him the opportunity to communicate with others, and enabled him to find the problems of the essay. While getting guidance, they can also put forward

their views to each other. He often logged in *iwrite* every two or three days to see if his partner had finished, and then made comments in time.

B and D had the same opinion. From their point of view, others' essays should be taken seriously. Moreover, in the process of review, they could see different ideas and ways of thinking, which was quite helpful. Besides, when reviewing partner's essay, you will also have a feeling of revision, which enabled them to find some common problems that they made even if they may have the same mistakes. On the contrary, they were likely to ignore the problems in their own essays naturally. Helping partner find deficiencies was also beneficial for them to improve their writing ability.

In contrast, C and E were different from other participants in this aspect. In C's opinion, she just give feedback on the content of the essay. Sometimes she may have doubts about other problems such as grammar and the structure of the essay but she didn't make any comment on it, because in addition to her level, she thought that her partner had some new ideas. E proposed due to procrastination, she usually finished the task in the last two days. Her comments were more about praise, which made her partner more confident. Perhaps because of online assessment, the effectiveness is not so strong.

Question 3 and 4 are about the suggestions given by partner and what they did in the revision. Question 3 asks participants how to revise their writing after receiving feedback. Opinions on this issue vary greatly among individuals. E thought that peer review and the course was not so important. She did not pay much attention to it. Thus, after receiving the feedback, she didn't make any revision. The rest of participants all said they would modify their essays after peer review. C and D stated in terms of the framework, they added some sub-points, like argumentative methods and the arguments needed. As for the structure, there were more transitional sentences and summary sentences. Furthermore, long sentences need to be simplified. They proceeded like this. A focused on cohesion and coherence and modified the essay step by step.

The most obvious finding to emerge from the analysis is that the cognitive strategies used by the five participants in peer review were quite different, because there are certain differences in personal value orientation, personality, and English writing learning experience and attitude. First of all, as shown by participant E, it is possible to apply different cognitive strategies to deal with various matters depending on whether the peer review activities are given or not. In addition, personal perceptions has impact on the choice of learning strategies. From the investigations mentioned above, if the student did not draw enough attention to peer review, they would be probable to use strategies that are general rather than specific, or use no strategies at all. Kim, Tian and Crossley (2021) revealed that paying much more attention or having greater attentional capacity enable learners to learn a lot from peer review, then have better achievement in English writing learning.

4.3 Affective Strategies

Up to now, this part has demonstrated participants' attitude towards peer review and *iwrite*, as well as their cognitive strategies. It is now necessary to explore the affective strategies they may use in peer review on *iwrite*.

Question 5 “When engaging in peer review on *iwrite*, would you say something like ‘You can be better’ to encourage your partner to find problems in writing thus complete the writing task successfully”, discusses the feelings and relevant affective strategies that learners may use in the interaction with partner in peer review. The answers are varied. A said: “I don’t often have ambiguous words in my comments. I prefer to find more good expressions in partner’s essay, and then directly say it. I would like to take such a direct way to express my appreciation. What’s more, I personally appreciate others more than criticize. However, the suggestions I want to receive are criticism more than appreciation. This is my habit.” C had the same opinion. She admitted she just pointed out the expressions that could be modified.

On the contrary, B, D and E held the opposite view. From their perspective, proper encouragement could enhance their partner’s confidence. Furthermore, it could also motivate the partner to take part in peer review, as well as other writing learning activities. In this context, they would be interested in English writing. Besides, such expressions helped to fill out the content. Therefore, for them, they were willing to say something to encourage their partners.

The next question is “If your partner’s feedback does not meet your expectations, how do you overcome the negative emotions such as loss, frustration, and sadness?” Five participants showed different orientations on strategies for dealing with negative emotions. All of them stated at first they may be a little disappointed. Later, they would try to modify their writing referring to partner’s comments with positive emotion. For them, it was a process of self-improvement. Additionally, they said they did not put too much emotional value on it.

The investigation of affective strategies has shown that in peer review, participants tended to encourage their partners to face the mistakes in their writing bravely. In this process, they were likely to use some positive expressions to promote the interaction between themselves and their partners, so as to achieve the purpose of promote learning through peer review. Besides, such a positive interaction was also helpful for their self-reflection and self-improvement.

In summary, although there is a subtle distinction in specific affective strategies, the similarity also exist. It mainly lies in the relationship between participants and their partners and effects of the strategies on peer review, as well as English writing learning.

4.4 The Willing to Engage in Peer Review and Suggestions for *Iwrite*

The last two questions concern the willing to engage in peer review in future and suggestions for *iwrite*. Question 7 “As a provider and receiver of feedback, what have you learned from it? Would you like to participate in the peer review activity again (作为反馈的提供者和接受者, 你在其中学到了什么? 你是否愿意再次参加同伴互评活动) ?” investigates whether the participants are willing to engage in peer review again. All the participants said they would like to take part in peer review in *iwrite* again. A emphasized the benefits it brought to interaction and communication between his partner and him. B, C and D proposed that they acquired some writing skills in the process of peer review. What’s more, this activity provided them with new ideas about the topics of writing assignments. While E’s views were

vague and not expressed clearly.

The last question, “Do you have any suggestions for improving peer review on *iwrite* (你对 *iwrite* 平台的同伴互评活动的改进有什么建议)?” asks participants how they thought peer review should be improved. A thought when assigning peer review, it’s necessary to match the time and amount of homework everyone completes, which can reduce everyone’s burden. B hoped the operation could be simplified. C proposed everyone can be assigned two essays, which is helpful to learn more in peer review. D had the same advice. E hoped finishing the homework could be combined with peer review, so as to save energy.

Taken together, these results imply that most of the participants were eager to take part in this activity and the reasons concerned the acquisition of writing skills, the improvement of writing ability and the active interaction between their classmates and themselves. Regarding to suggestions for *iwrite*, the participants expected the assignments, the allocation of time and the operation of *iwrite* could be transform in the future. These behavioral choices are based on the cognitive and affective strategies mentioned above and there are still some individual differences.

5. Conclusion

During the data concerning cognitive and affective strategies obtained from five participants in the semi-structured interview, this study explores the cognitive and affective strategies that learners are likely to use in peer review on *iwrite*, the factors that have impact on their choices and the influences of their strategies bring to peer review on *iwrite* and writing learning. By reviewing previous studies related to the topic, it is clear that there have been lots of relevant research peer review, online writing assessment and learning strategies. But there is still room for a comprehensive inquiry that combines these three dimensions.

By carrying out qualitative analysis, it is concluded that because of personality and value orientation, particularly personal perceptions about peer review, different learners are likely to use various cognitive strategies for the purpose of completing various tasks. Cognitive strategies can predict learners’ performance in peer review on *iwrite*. Regarding to affective strategies, learners prefer to use the positive one rather than negative, because in their opinion, positive expressions can motivate their classmates to participate in peer review actively. What’s more, such expressions can also build up their self-confidence, thus improve writing ability and make progress in English writing learning.

However, there are still some limitations of this study. First of all, the sample size was insufficient. Only five participants were invited to take part in semi-structured interviews. The small size is not enough to reflect actual use of cognitive and affective strategies in peer review. Second, there is lack of introduction to *iwrite* and its relevant research. Relevant concepts and instruments should be described in detail in the paper, which will enrich the content and allow readers to have a more comprehensive understanding of the research topic. Third, only qualitative analysis is not convincing enough. The combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis make the argument more sufficient.

References

- Bai, H. Q., Su, Y. F., & Shen, S. S. (2017). An empirical study on a blended learning model integrated peer review. *e-Education Research*, 38(12), 79-85.
- Brunfaut, T., Harding, L., & Batty, A. O. (2018). Going online: The effect of mode of delivery on performances and perceptions on an English L2 writing test suite. *Assessing Writing*, 36, 3-18.
- Chamorro, M. E. G. (2022). Cognitive validity evidence of computer-and paper-based writing tests and differences in the impact on EFL test-takers in classroom assessment. *Assessing Writing*, 51, 100594.
- Choi, E., Schallert, D. L., Jee, M. J., & Ko, J. (2021). Transpacific telecollaboration and L2 writing: Influences of interpersonal dynamics on peer feedback and revision uptake. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 54, 100855.
- Deng, L. M., & Cen, Y. (2010). Investigating the efficacy of peer review feedback mechanism for the development of Chinese L2 learners' writing proficiency. *Foreign Language Education*, 31(1), 59-63.
- Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 50, 100775.
- Gallardo-del-Puerto, F., Basterrechea, M., & Martínez-Adrián, M. (2020). Target language proficiency and reported use of compensatory strategies by young CLIL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 3-18.
- Garrett, N. (2009). Computer-assisted language learning trends and issues revisited: Integrating innovation. *The modern language journal*, 93, 719-740.
- Grant, S. (2016). Peer review process completion rates and subsequent student perceptions within completely online versus blended modes of study. *System*, 62, 93-101.
- Han, J., & Hiver, P. (2018). Genre-based L2 writing instruction and writing-specific psychological factors: The dynamics of change. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 40, 44-59.
- Hui, L. H., Cheng, Y., & Li, X. Y. (2020). The influence of digital identity on college students' foreign language learning in new media context. *Foreign Language Learning Theory and Practice*, 2, 57-63.
- Kim, M., Tian, Y., & Crossley, S. A. (2021). Exploring the relationships among cognitive and linguistic resources, writing processes, and written products in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 53, 100824.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1990). *Situated learning legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, J. D. (2013). Modern educational technology and language testing. *Technology Enhanced Foreign Language Education*, 4, 46-51.
- Liu, Y. H. (2015). Effects of group peer feedback and teacher feedback on English majors' writing. *Foreign Language World*, 1, 48-55.

- Luo, N., & Hyland, K. (2016). Chinese academics writing for publication: English teachers as text mediators. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 33, 43-55.
- Sardegna, V. G., Lee, J., & Kusey, C. (2018). Self-efficacy, attitudes, and choice of strategies for English pronunciation learning. *Language Learning*, 68(1), 83-114.
- Tabuenca, B., Kalz, M., Drachler, H., & Specht, M. (2015). Time will tell: The role of mobile learning analytics in self-regulated learning. *Computers & Education*, 89, 53-74.
- Tan X., & Zhang, Z. H. (2015). Relationships among language learning strategies, learner autonomy and CET 4 scores. *Foreign Language Learning Theory and Practice*, 1, 59-65+88+96-97.
- Tian L. L., & Zhou, Y. (2022). A study of integrated feedback uptake in an online English writing course. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*, 1, 95-104.
- Wen, Q. F., & Yang, J. (2020). Analysis of strategic values of online Chinese language education through a comparative study of online language education by international institutes under the epidemic COVID-19. *Language Teaching and Linguistic Studies*, 6, 1-8.
- Wu, X. Y., & Zhang, Q. Z. (2009). Correlation between self-Efficacy, learning strategies, self regulated learning and academic achievements. *Foreign Language Education*, 30(3), 43-46+62.
- Wu, Y. H. (2013). Effects of peer review on self-efficacy: An empirical study of college English writing. *Shandong Foreign Language Teaching*, 34(6), 68-72.
- Yu, S. (2021). Feedback-giving practice for L2 writing teachers: Friend or foe?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52, 100798.
- Yu, S., Geng, F., Liu, C., & Zheng, Y. (2021). What works may hurt: The negative side of feedback in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 54, 100850.
- Zhang, Z. V., & Hyland, K. (2022). Fostering student engagement with feedback: An integrated approach. *Assessing Writing*, 51, 100586.
- Zeng Y. H., & Liang, Y. (2017). Effects of different modes of peer response on Chinese university students' EFL writing: An empirical study. *Foreign Languages Research*, 34(4), 53-57.

Note

Guideline for semi-structured interview in English and Chinese

1. Please briefly share your English writing learning experience.

请你简要地分享一下自己的英语写作学习经历。

2. What do you think of peer review in *iwrite*?

你觉得 *iwrite* 平台的同伴互评活动怎么样?

3. How do you feel about peer feedback on your assignments? What was the focus of the feedback on your assignments?

你觉得同伴对你的作业的反馈怎么样? 同伴对你作业反馈的重点在哪一方面?

4. In peer review, do you give your feedback to your peers quickly so that they can correct their writings as soon as possible, thus completing the writing task with high quality? Please give a brief

account of what you do.

在同伴互评的过程中，你是否会尽可能快地把自己的意见反馈给同伴，使同伴可以尽快地改正自己的不足，从而高质量地完成写作任务？请简要地讲述一下自己的做法。

5. How do you use feedback to correct your writing after receiving it from your peers?

当收到同伴的反馈后，你是怎么利用同伴的反馈来修正自己的作文的？

6. Would you compare your assignment to the feedback from your classmates and their assignments when revising it?

在修正的时候，你是否会把自己的作业、同伴给的反馈意见、同伴的作业对照来看以取得更好的写作效果？

7. When doing peer reviews on *iwrite*, do you encourage your peers to find better solutions to problems in their assignments?

在 *iwrite* 平台上进行同伴互评的时候，你是否会鼓励同伴对其作业中出现的问题找到更好的解决方法？

8. Will you say something like “You can write better” to encourage your partner to continue writing?

你是否会通过说一些鼓励的话语来激励同伴继续英语写作？

9. How do you overcome negative emotions like loss, frustration, and sadness when your classmates give you feedback that does not meet your expectations?

当同伴给你的互评反馈没有达到心里的预期时，你是怎么来克服失落、挫败、难过这些不良情绪的？

10. Can you briefly summarize the strategies you used in peer review in *iwrite*?

能否简要地总结一下你在 *iwrite* 平台的同伴互评活动中运用到的策略？

11. What did you learn from peer review as both a giver and receiver of feedback? Would you be willing to participate in peer review again?

作为反馈的提供者和接受者，你在其中学到了什么？你是否愿意再次参加同伴互评活动？

12. What are your suggestions for improving peer review on *iwrite*?

你对 *iwrite* 平台的同伴互评活动有什么改进的建议？