

When Assessment Becomes Learning: Collaborative Assessment and Self-Reflection in EFL Writing Classes

¹*Tintin Susilowati, ²Ana Maghfiroh, ³Aries Fachriza

¹UIN Kiai Ageng Muhammad Besari, Indonesia

²Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo, Indonesia

³Universitas Darussalam Gontor Ponorogo, Indonesia

Abstract: Writing remains a demanding skill for EFL students because it requires coordinating idea development, linguistic accuracy, organization, revision, and evaluative judgment. This study explored students' perceptions of the integrated use of Collaborative Assessment (CA) and Self-Reflection (SR) in supporting writing development. Using a qualitative exploratory case study design, the research involved 51 English Education Department students from three writing classes at a State Islamic University in Indonesia. Data were collected through CA and SR questionnaires administered after six meetings of writing instruction incorporating collaborative assessment and reflective activities, followed by semi-structured interviews to obtain deeper insights into students' experiences. The data were analyzed using thematic and interactive analysis involving data condensation, data display, conclusion drawing, and verification. The findings indicate that students perceived CA and SR as complementary learning-oriented assessment practices. CA supported writing development by enabling students to discuss drafts, exchange feedback, identify writing problems, learn from peers, and receive lecturer guidance during assessment. SR strengthened this process by helping students recognize past mistakes, understand the purposes of their writing, plan their ideas, monitor their language use, and identify areas for improvement. Together, CA and SR transformed assessment from a product-oriented judgment into an interactive and reflective learning process. These findings suggest that EFL writing instruction should integrate collaborative feedback cycles with structured self-reflection to help students move from receiving feedback to using it critically for revision, self-awareness, and continuous improvement in writing.

Keywords: collaborative assessment, self-reflection, EFL writing, feedback literacy, writing development, exploratory case study

1. Introduction

Writing is widely recognized as one of the most demanding skills in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning because it requires learners to coordinate idea generation, linguistic accuracy, organization, rhetorical awareness, and revision simultaneously. Unlike receptive skills, writing requires students to transform thoughts into coherent, meaningful, and reader-oriented texts, making it a complex cognitive and communicative process (Graham, 2019; Javadi-Safa, 2018). In EFL higher education contexts, this complexity becomes more pronounced because students often have limited exposure to authentic English use and insufficient experience in developing academic texts. As a result, many English Department students still

*Correspondence: tintinsusilowati@iainponorogo.ac.id

Submitted: July 28, 2025

Revised: April 17, 2026

Accepted: April 27, 2026



This is an open-access article under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

struggle to express ideas clearly, elaborate arguments, organize paragraphs coherently, apply appropriate vocabulary, and maintain grammatical accuracy (Chamba et al., 2019; Orooq & Razeq, 2022; Qin et al., 2022; Wang & Xie, 2022). These difficulties indicate that writing problems are not only linguistic but also conceptual, procedural, and reflective. Students do not merely need correction after completing a text; they need learning processes that help them understand how writing works, how weaknesses can be identified, and how drafts can be revised meaningfully.

In many EFL writing classrooms, however, assessment is still frequently understood as a final judgment of students' written products rather than as a learning process that supports development. When writing assessment focuses mainly on scores, errors, or teacher correction, students may become dependent on the lecturer's evaluation. They may not develop the ability to judge the quality of their own writing. This limits their opportunities to become active participants in feedback, revision, and self-improvement. Recent scholarship on feedback and assessment emphasizes that effective writing development requires students to engage with feedback, interpret comments, evaluate the quality of their writing, and make informed revision decisions (Carless & Boud, 2018; Tai et al., 2018; Winstone et al., 2017; Yu & Liu, 2021). In this sense, assessment should not only measure writing achievement but also cultivate students' feedback literacy, evaluative judgment, and self-regulated learning. Such an orientation is particularly important in EFL writing instruction, where students often need sustained guidance to connect feedback with actual improvement in content, organization, language use, and coherence.

Collaborative Assessment (CA) offers one way to reposition assessment as a learning-oriented and interactive process. Through CA, students are not passive recipients of evaluation; instead, they participate in assessing written work, discussing draft quality, identifying problems, exchanging feedback, and learning from peers and the lecturer. This process allows students to compare different texts, recognize strengths and weaknesses, clarify writing problems, and negotiate possible revisions. Previous studies have shown that collaborative assessment and peer-supported feedback can improve students' writing ability, enhance revision quality, and support the development of evaluative judgment (Cao et al., 2019; Fan & Xu, 2020; Gao et al., 2019; Kiasi & Rezaie, 2021; Taufiqulloh et al., 2024). Teacher-student collaborative assessment has also been found to help learners identify writing weaknesses more clearly and revise their drafts more effectively (Shuguang & Qiufang, 2018; Xiaomeng & Ravindran, 2023). These findings suggest that CA can make writing assessment more dialogic, constructive, and pedagogically meaningful, particularly when peer feedback is supported by lecturer guidance.

Alongside collaborative assessment, Self-Reflection (SR) is equally important because it enables students to examine their own writing process, recognize previous mistakes, evaluate their progress, and plan improvement for future writing tasks. Reflection helps students move beyond surface-level correction by encouraging them to consider why certain problems occur and how their writing can be improved. In EFL writing, SR is closely related to metacognitive awareness because students need to monitor their planning, idea development, organization, language use, and revision strategies. Studies have shown that reflective practices, including reflective journals and self-reflection-based instruction, can strengthen students' writing awareness, improve organization and coherence, and support more strategic development of writing (Farahian et al., 2021; Gebremariam & Asgede, 2023; Simarmata & Sulistyningrum, 2023; Sudirman et al., 2021). Metacognitive writing research also confirms that students' ability to plan, monitor, and evaluate their writing is strongly associated with writing performance (Qin et al., 2022; Teng et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022). Therefore, SR can serve as a bridge between receiving feedback and using it critically to inform revision and self-improvement.

Although CA and SR have both been recognized as valuable for writing development, previous research has often examined them separately. Studies on collaborative assessment tend to emphasize peer interaction, teacher-student feedback, or improvement in writing performance. In contrast, studies on self-reflection usually focus on reflective journals, metacognitive strategies, or students' self-awareness in writing. Less attention has been paid to how students perceive the integration of CA and SR in EFL writing classes,

especially when CA is used first to generate collaborative feedback, and SR is then used to help students internalize that feedback and revise their writing more thoughtfully. This gap is important because the success of learning-oriented assessment depends not only on the design of the activity but also on how students experience, understand, and value it. Students' perceptions can reveal whether CA and SR are seen as meaningful, supportive, motivating, or challenging in actual classroom practice (Bader et al., 2019; Golzar et al., 2022; Vattøy & Smith, 2019; Xiang et al., 2022). Without examining students' perceptions, educators may know that CA and SR are theoretically useful but may not fully understand how learners respond to these practices and how they believe these practices support their writing development.

The novelty of the present study lies in its focus on students' perceptions of CA and SR as integrated and complementary assessment practices in EFL writing instruction. Rather than investigating collaborative assessment or self-reflection in isolation, this study explores how students perceive both practices as part of a connected learning process. CA provides external support through peer discussion, lecturer guidance, and collaborative feedback, while SR encourages internal processing through self-evaluation, awareness of weaknesses, and reflection on previous writing experiences. By examining both practices together, this study offers a more process-oriented understanding of how assessment can become learning in EFL writing classrooms. This focus is relevant to the article's classroom context, in which 51 English Education Department students from three writing classes participated in CA and SR activities and then reported their perceptions through questionnaires and interviews.

If this gap remains unaddressed, writing instruction may continue to treat feedback and reflection as separate or incidental classroom activities rather than as mutually reinforcing processes. Students may receive peer or lecturer feedback without fully understanding how to use it, or they may reflect on their writing without sufficient external input to guide deeper revision. In such conditions, assessment may remain product-oriented, and students may continue to depend heavily on teacher correction rather than developing the capacity to evaluate and improve their own writing. Investigating students' perceptions of integrated CA and SR is therefore important because it can help lecturers design assessment practices that are more interactive, reflective, and development-oriented. It can also show how students experience feedback, collaboration, and reflection as part of their journey toward becoming more independent and self-aware writers.

Based on this background, the present study aims to explore students' perceptions of the implementation of Collaborative Assessment and Self-Reflection in supporting writing development in EFL higher education. Specifically, it examines how students perceive CA as a learning and assessment process, how they perceive SR in relation to writing awareness and improvement, and how integrating both practices contributes to their writing development. Accordingly, this study is guided by the following research question: How do students perceive the use of Collaborative Assessment and Self-Reflection in supporting the development of their writing skills?

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a qualitative, exploratory case study design to investigate students' perceptions of how Collaborative Assessment (CA) and Self-Reflection (SR) support writing development. This design was selected because the study focused on understanding students' experiences, interpretations, and perceived benefits of CA and SR within a specific instructional context rather than measuring causal effects or comparing experimental groups. An exploratory case study is appropriate when researchers seek to examine a contemporary educational practice in depth and generate contextualized insights into how participants experience a particular phenomenon (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Rashid et al., 2019). In this study, the case concerned the implementation of CA and SR in writing classes at the English Education Department of a State Islamic University in Indonesia. The qualitative orientation enabled the researchers to capture students'

perceptions of collaborative feedback, peer and lecturer involvement, self-evaluation, and reflective revision as part of their writing development process.

2.2 Research Context and Participants

The study was conducted in three writing classes at the English Education Department of a State Islamic University in Indonesia. The instructional process lasted for eight class meetings. During the first six meetings, students participated in writing instruction that incorporated CA and SR activities. The remaining meetings were used to collect and verify students' perceptions of the learning experience. The participants comprised one English lecturer and 51 students enrolled in three classes: 18 from TBI.A, 16 from TBI.B, and 17 from TBI.C. These participants were selected because they were directly involved in the writing classes where CA and SR were implemented, making them relevant sources of information for understanding how both practices were experienced in classroom writing instruction.

Purposive sampling was used to select the participants. This technique was appropriate because the study required participants with direct experience of the phenomenon under investigation who could provide rich, relevant, and context-specific information (Moser & Korstjens, 2018). Since all students had participated in CA and SR activities, they were considered capable of reflecting on how these practices contributed to their learning to write, assessment experience, and revision process.

2.3 Implementation of Collaborative Assessment and Self-Reflection

Collaborative Assessment and Self-Reflection were implemented as connected instructional and assessment practices in the writing classes. In the CA stage, students worked collaboratively to review written work, discuss writing problems, exchange feedback, and assess drafts with support from peers and the lecturer. The assessment activities involved several combinations, including self-assessment, peer-assessment, teacher-assessment, peer-teacher-assessment, self-teacher-assessment, and integrated self-, peer-, and teacher-assessment. These activities were intended to help students identify strengths and weaknesses in their writing, better understand the writing criteria, and learn from multiple sources of feedback.

After the CA activities, students engaged in SR to reflect on their writing experiences and reconsider their previous drafts. This stage encouraged students to identify mistakes, examine their understanding of writing principles, evaluate the quality of their ideas, and connect feedback from collaborative assessment with their own revision decisions. In this way, CA provided external support through discussion and feedback, while SR provided internal support through self-evaluation and reflective awareness. The integration of both practices was intended to help students move from receiving feedback to using it more critically and constructively in writing development.

2.4 Research Instruments

Data were collected using two questionnaires and follow-up semi-structured interviews. The first questionnaire was an eight-item Collaborative Assessment questionnaire designed to explore students' perceptions of CA as both a learning and assessment practice. The items addressed students' experiences of working in small groups, understanding writing material under the lecturer's guidance, explaining writing concepts using examples, gaining confidence after review, learning from peers, assessing writing under the lecturer's supervision, engaging in collaborative assessment activities, and experiencing the lecturer's role in ongoing assessment.

The second questionnaire was a Self-Reflection questionnaire designed to examine students' perceptions of SR in relation to writing learning and assessment. The items focused on students' understanding of writing purposes, planning before writing, expressing ideas logically, using appropriate and varied vocabulary, paying attention to language use, receiving feedback from others, improving writing through the CA process, and reflecting on weaknesses in writing. These questionnaire items were used to obtain structured information about students' perceptions across the learning and assessment dimensions of CA and SR.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted to complement the questionnaire data and obtain richer explanations of students' experiences. This interview format was appropriate because it allowed the researchers to explore predetermined issues and ask follow-up questions to clarify participants' responses (Ruslin et al., 2022). The interviews focused on students' experiences with CA and SR, the benefits they perceived, the challenges they encountered, and how both practices helped them understand and improve their writing.

2.5 Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was carried out in several stages. First, students participated in writing instruction integrating CA and SR across six meetings. During these sessions, students produced written work, engaged in collaborative assessment activities, received feedback from peers and the lecturer, and reflected on their writing performance. Second, after students had experienced the implementation of CA and SR, the questionnaires were administered to collect their perceptions in a structured manner. Third, follow-up semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected students to gain deeper insight into their questionnaire responses and clarify how CA and SR influenced their writing-learning experiences.

Before data collection, students were informed about the purpose of the study and the role of their responses in understanding how CA and SR are used in writing instruction. They were encouraged to provide honest responses based on their actual classroom experiences. The combination of questionnaires and interviews allowed the researchers to collect both broad patterns of perception and more detailed qualitative explanations.

2.6 Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using thematic and interactive analysis following Miles et al. (2014) framework, which consists of data collection, data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. First, the questionnaire and interview data were collected and organized around the study's main focus: students' perceptions of CA, SR, and their contributions to writing development. Second, data condensation was conducted by selecting, simplifying, and focusing on information relevant to the research question. Responses that reflected similar meanings were grouped into preliminary categories, such as collaborative learning, peer feedback, lecturer guidance, confidence in writing, awareness of mistakes, planning, language use, and reflective revision.

Third, the condensed data were displayed in tables and thematic descriptions to make patterns easier to identify. Quantitative summaries from the questionnaire, such as percentages of agreement and strong agreement, were used to support the qualitative interpretation of students' perceptions. Interview excerpts were then used to explain and enrich these patterns. Finally, conclusions were drawn by identifying recurring themes across the questionnaire and interview data and verifying whether the interpretations were consistent across different sources of evidence. This interactive process allowed the researchers to move back and forth between the data, emerging themes, and interpretations to ensure that the findings accurately represented students' perceptions.

2.7 Trustworthiness

Several strategies were used to enhance the study's trustworthiness. First, data were collected from multiple sources, including CA and SR questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, enabling the researchers to compare and validate patterns across different forms of evidence. Second, member checking was conducted by asking selected participants to confirm that the interpreted data accurately reflected their experiences. Member checking is widely used in qualitative research to strengthen credibility by returning interpretations to participants for confirmation (McKim, 2023). Third, coding consistency was maintained by using a coding template throughout the analysis. A systematic coding procedure helps make qualitative analysis more transparent, organized, and traceable (Bingham, 2023). These procedures were applied to reduce researcher bias and ensure that the findings were grounded in participants' actual responses.

3. Findings

The results show that students generally perceived Collaborative Assessment (CA) and Self-Reflection (SR) positively in supporting their writing development. In this study, CA and SR were implemented as connected assessment practices: students first engaged in collaborative assessment activities involving peers and the lecturer, and then used self-reflection to reconsider their earlier drafts, identify weaknesses, and revise their writing more consciously. The findings indicate that CA was perceived as particularly strong in the assessment dimension. At the same time, SR was valued for helping students understand their writing process, recognize mistakes, and improve planning, language use, and revision awareness. These patterns are consistent with the visual summary in Figure 1 of the manuscript, where CA received 91% for learning and 96% for assessment, while SR received 88% for learning and 89% for assessment.

3.1 Students' Perceptions of Collaborative Assessment in Writing Development

Students reported positive perceptions of Collaborative Assessment as both a learning activity and an assessment practice. As shown in Table 1, most students agreed or strongly agreed that CA helped them work happily in small groups, understand writing material under the lecturer's guidance, explain writing concepts through examples, gain confidence after their writing was reviewed, and learn from peers through assessment. The strongest response in the learning dimension was for the item "learning from each other through assessment," with 51% agreeing and 45.1% strongly agreeing. Similarly, 46% agreed, and 49% strongly agreed that they enjoyed working in small groups. These results suggest that students viewed CA as a collaborative learning process that allowed them to exchange ideas, compare writing, and learn from one another's strengths and weaknesses.

Table 1. Students' Perceptions of Collaborative Assessment for Learning and Assessment

Dimension	Indicator	Main Response Pattern	Interpretation
Learning	Working happily in a small group	46% agreed; 49% strongly agreed	Students experienced CA as enjoyable and collaborative
Learning	Understanding material under the lecturer's guidance	35.3% agreed; 47% strongly agreed	Lecturer's guidance supported students' comprehension
Learning	Explaining writing concepts using examples	45.1% agreed; 45.1% strongly agreed	CA helped students understand writing through examples
Learning	Having confidence after the review	49% agreed; 33.3% strongly agreed	Feedback increased confidence in revised writing
Learning	Learning from others through assessment	51% agreed; 45.1% strongly agreed	Peer learning was a major benefit of CA
Assessment	Assessing writing under the lecturer's guidance	54.9% agreed; 43.1% strongly agreed	Students valued guided assessment
Assessment	Activating collaborative assessment activities	45.1% agreed; 54.9% strongly agreed	CA was strongly accepted as an assessment process
Assessment	Activating the lecturer role through ongoing assessment	45.1% agreed; 51% strongly agreed	Ongoing lecturer involvement strengthened CA

The interview findings support these questionnaire results. Several students explained that CA helped them understand writing principles more clearly by allowing them to discuss examples, ask questions, and compare their work with their peers' writing. One participant stated that collaborative assessment helped students better understand the principles of writing, while another explained that it provided contextual learning through examples and explanations. A further response indicated that students could build writing

skills by learning from their friends' writing and observing both strengths and weaknesses. These responses suggest that CA was not perceived merely as a scoring activity, but as an interactive learning process that helped students construct writing knowledge through discussion, feedback, and shared evaluation.

In the assessment dimension, students' responses were even more positive. The item "activating collaborative assessment activities" received the highest overall response, with 45.1% agreeing and 54.9% strongly agreeing. Similarly, 54.9% agreed, and 43.1% strongly agreed that assessing writing under lecturer guidance was useful, while 45.1% agreed and 51% strongly agreed that the lecturer's role was activated through ongoing assessment. These findings indicate that students valued the combination of peer involvement and lecturer guidance. CA was perceived as meaningful because it allowed students to participate in the assessment while still receiving support from a more knowledgeable source. Thus, students appeared to view CA as a constructive, guided assessment process rather than merely an independent peer-review task.

3.2 Students' Perceptions of Self-Reflection in Writing Development

Students also expressed positive perceptions of Self-Reflection as a practice that supported learning to write and assessment. As shown in Table 2, students generally agreed or strongly agreed that SR helped them understand the purpose of writing, begin writing with planning, express ideas logically, use appropriate and varied words, pay attention to language use, receive feedback positively, improve writing through CA, and reflect on weaknesses in their writing. In the learning dimension, the strongest response was to "understanding the writing purpose," with 66% agreeing and 27% strongly agreeing. This indicates that SR helped students become more aware of the direction and purpose of their writing.

Table 2. Students' Perceptions of Self-Reflection for Learning and Assessment

Dimension Indicator		Main Response Pattern	Interpretation
Learning	Understanding the writing purpose	66% agreed; 27% strongly agreed	SR helped clarify the writing direction
Learning	Starting writing with planning	63% agreed; 31% strongly agreed	SR supported strategic preparation
Learning	Expressing ideas logically	65% agreed; 10% strongly agreed	SR helped, but logical organization remained more challenging
Learning	Using appropriate and varied words	65% agreed; 22% strongly agreed	SR supported vocabulary awareness
Learning	Giving attention to language use	61% agreed; 31% strongly agreed	SR promoted awareness of accuracy and language form
Assessment	Feeling happy to get feedback from others	36% agreed; 59% strongly agreed	Students valued feedback as part of reflection
Assessment	Improving writing from the CA process	59% agreed; 35% strongly agreed	SR helped students use CA feedback for revision
Assessment	Reflecting on writing weaknesses from CA	57% agreed; 22% strongly agreed	Most students could identify weaknesses, though some still found it difficult.

The interview data further clarify how SR supported students' writing development. Students reported that SR helped them identify previous mistakes, understand examples of appropriate and less appropriate paragraphs, learn how to write better paragraphs, recognize weaknesses in their writing, and improve sentence construction. One participant stated that SR helped identify past mistakes, while another explained that SR made it easier to understand reasonable and less appropriate paragraphs. Other students noted that SR helped them understand their weaknesses and learn how to write appropriate sentences. These

responses show that students perceived SR as useful because it encouraged them to look more critically at their writing and to connect feedback to future improvement.

In the assessment dimension, students responded most positively to receiving feedback from others, with 36% agreeing and 59% strongly agreeing that they felt happy to receive feedback. This suggests that students did not perceive feedback as threatening; rather, they saw it as a useful resource for improving their writing. The item “improving writing from the CA process” also received strong responses, with 59% agreeing and 35% strongly agreeing, indicating that students were able to use collaborative feedback as a basis for revision. However, the item “reflecting on writing weaknesses from the CA process” received a slightly lower response, with 57% agreeing and 22% strongly agreeing, while some students disagreed. This suggests that although most students benefited from SR, some learners still found it challenging to identify weaknesses independently.

3.3 The Integrated Role of Collaborative Assessment and Self-Reflection

The results indicate that CA and SR were perceived as complementary rather than separate practices. CA helped students obtain external input through peer discussion, lecturer guidance, and collaborative feedback. In contrast, SR helped them process that input internally by identifying mistakes, reconsidering writing choices, and planning improvement. The visual summary in Figure 1 supports this interpretation: CA received higher percentages than SR, particularly in assessment, but both practices were positively perceived in learning and assessment dimensions. This suggests that students valued CA for its interactive and guided nature, while they valued SR for its reflective and self-awareness-building function.

The integration of CA and SR appeared to support writing development in three main ways. First, it helped students understand writing principles more clearly through examples, explanations, and discussion. Second, it encouraged students to recognize their strengths and weaknesses by comparing their work with others and reflecting on their own drafts. Third, it supported revision by helping students use feedback more purposefully. The findings therefore suggest that students experienced CA and SR not only as assessment activities, but as learning processes that promoted participation, feedback use, reflective thinking, and writing improvement. These results answer the research question by showing that students perceived the use of Collaborative Assessment and Self-Reflection positively in supporting the development of their writing skills. CA was viewed as especially useful for collaborative learning, guided assessment, peer-supported understanding, and lecturer-supported feedback. SR was perceived as useful for clarifying writing purpose, planning ideas, improving language awareness, receiving feedback positively, and reflecting on weaknesses. However, the findings also indicate that deeper self-evaluation and logical idea development may require further scaffolding, as these aspects received relatively fewer responses than other items.

4. Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that students perceived Collaborative Assessment (CA) and Self-Reflection (SR) as meaningful practices for supporting writing development in EFL higher education. Rather than viewing assessment merely as a mechanism for assigning scores or identifying errors, students experienced CA and SR as learning-oriented processes that helped them understand writing concepts, receive useful feedback, recognize weaknesses, and revise their work more consciously. This finding is important because writing development requires more than correcting linguistic errors; it involves the gradual construction of knowledge about ideas, organization, coherence, vocabulary, grammar, and revision. In this sense, the positive student responses suggest that CA and SR can reposition writing assessment from a product-oriented activity into a developmental process in which students actively participate in improving their own texts. This interpretation is consistent with [Carless and Boud's \(2018\)](#) notion of feedback literacy, which emphasizes that students need to understand, evaluate, and use feedback rather than simply receive it. It also aligns with [Andrade and Brookhart's \(2020\)](#) view that classroom assessment can function as a form of co-regulation, helping students monitor and improve learning through interaction, guidance, and reflection.

Students' positive perceptions of CA show that collaborative assessment created a more interactive and supportive writing environment. The results revealed that students particularly valued working in small groups, learning from peers, discussing writing problems, and assessing drafts under the lecturer's guidance. These findings suggest that CA helped reduce the isolation often associated with writing by allowing students to share difficulties, compare drafts, clarify concepts, and learn from multiple perspectives. This is pedagogically significant because EFL students often struggle not only with grammar and vocabulary but also with understanding how to develop, organize, and revise ideas. Through CA, students were able to observe examples of stronger and weaker writing, discuss why certain choices were effective or problematic, and become more aware of the quality of their writing. Similar findings have been reported by [Shuguang and Qiufang \(2018\)](#), who found that teacher-student collaborative assessment helped learners identify weaknesses in their writing and revise more effectively. Recent studies also confirm that collaborative assessment can enhance writing performance and create more positive attitudes toward writing instruction ([Kiasi & Rezaie, 2021](#); [Xiaomeng & Ravindran, 2023](#); [Taufiqulloh et al., 2024](#)). The present study extends this line of research by showing that students valued CA not only for its support of assessment but also for making learning to write more dialogic, engaging, and socially mediated.

Another important finding is that lecturer guidance remained central in students' positive experience of CA. Although peer collaboration was highly valued, students also responded positively to being assessed on their writing under lecturer supervision and to the lecturer's ongoing role in the assessment process. This indicates that collaborative assessment was most meaningful when peer interaction was supported by expert guidance. In EFL writing classrooms, students may not always feel fully confident in judging the quality of peers' writing or in deciding how to revise their own drafts. Lecturer involvement can therefore help validate feedback, clarify writing criteria, and prevent misunderstandings during peer assessment. This finding supports [Han and Xu's \(2020\)](#) argument that teacher feedback can shape the development of students' feedback literacy and influence how students engage with peer feedback. It also resonates with [Tai et al.'s \(2018\)](#) concept of evaluative judgment, which highlights students' ability to make informed decisions about the quality of work. In this study, CA appeared to support evaluative judgment by allowing students to compare texts, discuss quality indicators, and receive guidance from both peers and the lecturer. Thus, CA should not be interpreted simply as peer assessment; it is more accurately understood as a guided, dialogic, and shared assessment process.

The findings also show that SR played an important role in helping students develop greater awareness of their writing process. Students perceived SR as useful for understanding the purpose of writing, planning before writing, selecting appropriate vocabulary, paying attention to language use, and identifying previous mistakes. These responses suggest that SR encouraged students to move beyond surface-level correction and reflect on how their writing was constructed. Reflection enabled students to look back at their drafts, consider the feedback they had received, and identify what needed improvement. This finding is consistent with research showing that reflective practices can strengthen metacognitive awareness and support writing development ([Farahian et al., 2021](#); [Sudirman et al., 2021](#); [Simarmata & Sulistyaningrum, 2023](#)). It also supports the findings of [Gebremariam and Asgede \(2023\)](#), who demonstrated that self-reflection-based instruction positively affected undergraduate students' essay-writing achievement. In the present study, SR was valuable because it helped students connect prior writing experiences to new understandings, making revision more purposeful rather than merely corrective.

However, the results also suggest that some aspects of SR were more challenging than others. Although students generally responded positively to SR, responses regarding expressing ideas logically and reflecting on writing weaknesses were lower than for other items. This indicates that deeper reflection and higher-order writing awareness may not develop automatically. Students may be able to recognize surface-level issues such as vocabulary or grammar more easily, but identifying problems in logic, coherence, idea development, and argument structure requires more advanced metacognitive ability. This interpretation is supported by [Qin et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Teng et al. \(2022\)](#), who argue that planning, monitoring, and evaluating

are important metacognitive strategies that strongly influence writing performance. It is also consistent with [Dymont and O'Connell's \(2011\)](#) reminder that reflection varies in quality and does not necessarily lead to deep learning unless students are guided in reflecting. Therefore, while SR is beneficial, lecturers need to provide clear reflection prompts, writing criteria, examples of reflective responses, and guided questions that direct students' attention to content, organization, coherence, and language use.

One of the most significant contributions of this study is the finding that CA and SR were perceived as complementary processes. CA provided students with external input through peer discussion, lecturer feedback, and collaborative evaluation, while SR helped students internalize that input through self-evaluation and reflective revision. This sequence is pedagogically powerful because feedback alone does not guarantee improvement. Students need opportunities to interpret feedback, compare it with their own understanding, and decide how to apply it in revision. CA helped students see their writing from others' perspectives, whereas SR helped them process those perspectives and transform them into personal learning. This finding aligns with [To and Panadero \(2019\)](#), who found that peer assessment can strengthen students' self-assessment processes. It also supports [Yu and Liu's \(2021\)](#) argument that feedback literacy in academic writing requires students to engage actively with feedback and use it for improvement. In this study, the integration of CA and SR helped connect feedback reception with reflective action, which is essential for sustainable writing development.

The findings further suggest that integrated CA and SR can help address common problems in EFL writing instruction. Many EFL students experience writing as a solitary and difficult task, especially when the assessment focuses mainly on errors or final products. Under such conditions, students may become dependent on teacher correction and may not learn how to evaluate or revise their own writing independently. By contrast, CA and SR create a more participatory writing environment. CA allows students to engage in dialogue about the quality of their writing, while SR encourages them to examine their own choices and weaknesses. This combination supports both social and individual dimensions of writing development. Socially, students learn through discussion, peer comparison, and guidance from lecturers. Individually, they develop self-awareness, planning ability, and reflective judgment. This dual process is particularly relevant for EFL higher education, where students need to become more autonomous writers capable of revising and improving their work beyond teacher correction.

The pedagogical implications of these findings are clear. First, writing lecturers should integrate collaborative assessment into writing instruction as a regular part of the drafting and revision process, not merely as an occasional peer-review activity. Students need structured opportunities to discuss drafts, identify writing problems, evaluate examples, and exchange feedback using clear assessment criteria. Second, lecturer guidance should remain visible throughout CA activities, as students benefit from expert clarification, modeling, and feedback validation. Third, SR should be scaffolded with specific reflection prompts that guide students in examining the purpose of their writing, organization of ideas, paragraph coherence, vocabulary choice, grammar, and revision decisions. Fourth, CA and SR should be deliberately sequenced: students can first receive and discuss feedback through CA, then complete SR tasks that require them to identify what they have learned, what problems remain, and how they will revise their drafts. Such a sequence can help students move from external feedback to internal regulation and from participation in assessment to independent improvement in writing.

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations. First, the study focused on 51 students from three writing classes within one English Education Department, so the findings may not be fully generalizable to other EFL contexts, institutions, or proficiency levels. Second, the study relied on students' perceptions, as captured through questionnaires and interviews; therefore, the findings reflect perceived benefits rather than direct measurement of improvements in writing. Future studies should include an analysis of students' drafts before and after the implementation of CA and SR to examine how these practices influence the quality of actual writing. Third, although the study explored students' perceptions after classroom implementation, it did not examine how these perceptions changed over time. Longitudinal research would be useful to

investigate whether repeated engagement with CA and SR gradually improves students' feedback literacy, reflective ability, and writing autonomy. Fourth, the study did not conduct a detailed comparison of the individual contributions of CA and SR, since both practices were implemented as an integrated approach. Future research may compare CA-only, SR-only, and integrated CA-SR models to identify how each approach contributes to different aspects of writing development.

These findings demonstrate that CA and SR can make writing assessment more interactive, reflective, and development-oriented. Students perceived CA as valuable because it enabled them to learn from peers, receive lecturer-supported feedback, and participate actively in evaluating writing. They perceived SR as useful because it helped them recognize mistakes, understand the purpose of their writing, plan more carefully, and become more aware of their weaknesses. Most importantly, the integration of CA and SR appears to transform assessment into a learning process: CA brings feedback into dialogue, while SR turns feedback into self-awareness and revision. This supports the study's central argument that writing development in EFL classrooms can be strengthened when students are not only assessed by others but also guided to assess, reflect, and revise more consciously.

5. Conclusion

This study explored students' perceptions of how Collaborative Assessment (CA) and Self-Reflection (SR) support EFL writing development. The findings show that students perceived both practices positively, not merely as assessment techniques but as complementary learning processes that helped them understand, evaluate, and improve their writing. CA was valued because it enabled students to learn through peer discussion, collaborative feedback, lecturer guidance, and shared evaluation of writing problems. Through this process, students gained a clearer understanding of writing principles, became more confident after their drafts were reviewed, and learned to identify strengths and weaknesses in written texts. SR further strengthened this process by encouraging students to revisit past mistakes, clarify their writing purposes, plan their ideas more carefully, pay attention to vocabulary and language use, and reflect on areas for improvement. The integration of CA and SR, therefore, helped transform writing assessment from a product-oriented judgment into a more interactive, reflective, and development-oriented practice. However, the findings also indicate that some aspects, particularly logical idea development and deeper self-evaluation, still require stronger instructional scaffolding. Pedagogically, writing lecturers should integrate collaborative feedback cycles with structured reflection prompts so that students can move from receiving feedback to using it critically to revise and self-improve. Although this study provides useful insights, it was limited to students' perceptions within a single institutional context and did not directly measure changes in writing performance. Future research should involve larger, more diverse samples, analyze students' written drafts before and after the implementation of CA-SR, and examine how repeated engagement with collaborative assessment and self-reflection develops students' feedback literacy, reflective capacity, and writing autonomy over time.

6. Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the participating school, English teacher, and eleventh-grade students for their contributions to this study. Special appreciation is extended to the students for their willingness to share their experiences, perceptions, and challenges with using English role-play content on Instagram Reels for speaking practice. The authors also thank the individuals who provided feedback during the preparation and refinement of the research instrument and manuscript. The authors sincerely thank the English Education Department, the writing lecturer, and the students who participated in this study. Appreciation is also extended to the students in classes TBI.A, TBI.B, and TBI.C for their active involvement in the Collaborative Assessment and Self-Reflection activities and for sharing their perceptions during data collection. The authors are grateful to all individuals who provided support, feedback, and assistance in preparing this research.

7. Declaration of AI Use

The authors used a GPT-based AI tool during the manuscript preparation stage to support language editing, academic tone refinement, and clarity of expression. The use of AI was limited to improving the text's presentation. It did not replace the authors' role in designing the study, collecting data, analyzing responses, interpreting findings, or drawing conclusions. All revisions generated with AI assistance were critically reviewed, adjusted, and approved by the authors. The authors remain fully responsible for the scholarly content, accuracy, and integrity of the final manuscript.

8. References

- Alawerdy, A. S., & Alalwi, F. S. (2022). Enhancing English as a foreign language university students' writing through explicit instruction of conjunctions as cohesive devices: An experimental study. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 1053310. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1053310>
- Andrade, H. L., & Brookhart, S. M. (2020). Classroom assessment as the co-regulation of learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 27*(4), 350–372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2019.1571992>
- Ariyanti, A. (2016). The teaching of EFL writing in Indonesia. *DINAMIKA ILMU, 263–277*. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v16i2.274>
- Atashian, S., & Al-Bahri, K. (2018). Towards Arab Students' Grammatical Errors in Academic Writing & their Perceptions. *Arab World English Journal, 1*, 140–145. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/mec1.10>
- Bader, M., Burner, T., Hoem Iversen, S., & Varga, Z. (2019). Student perspectives on formative feedback as part of writing portfolios. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*(7), 1017–1028. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1564811>
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 544–559. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2008.1573>
- Bingham, A. J. (2023). From data management to actionable findings: A five-phase process of qualitative data analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 22*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231183620>
- Cao, Z., Yu, S., & Huang, J. (2019). A qualitative inquiry into undergraduates' learning from giving and receiving peer feedback in L2 writing: Insights from a case study. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 63*, 102–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.08.001>
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43*(8), 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Chamba, M., Reinoso, M., & Rengifo, E. (2019). Authentic materials to foster writing skills in College EFL learners. *English Language Teaching, 12*(6), 112. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n6p112>
- Chen, A. H. (2022). The effects of writing strategy instruction on EFL learners' writing development. *English Language Teaching, 15*(3), 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v15n3p29>
- Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: A case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 1*, Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y>
- Chong, S. W. (2021). Reconsidering student feedback literacy from an ecological perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 46*(1), 92–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1730765>
- Dyment, J. E., & O'Connell, T. S. (2011). Assessing the Quality of Reflection in Student Journals: A Review of the Research. *Teaching in Higher Education, 16*(1), 81–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2010.507308>
- Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 50*, 100775. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100775>

- Farahian, M., Avarzamani, F., & Rajabi, Y. (2021). Reflective thinking in an EFL writing course: To what level do portfolios improve reflection in writing? *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 39, 100759. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100759>
- Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL Learners' writing skills: Problems, factors, and suggestions. *Journal of Education & Social Sciences*, 4(2), 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.20547/jess0421604201>
- Fraile, J., Gil-Izquierdo, M., Zamorano-Sande, D., & Sánchez-Iglesias, I. (2020). Self-regulated learning and formative assessment process on group work. *RELIEVE*, 26(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.7203/relieve.26.1.17402>
- Gan, Z., Hu, G., Wang, W., Nang, H., & An, Z. (2021). Feedback behaviour and preference in university academic English courses: Associations with English language self-efficacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(5), 740–755. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1810628>
- Gao, Y., Schunn, C. D. D., & Yu, Q. (2019). The alignment of written peer feedback with draft problems and its impact on revision in peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(2), 294–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1499075>
- Gebremariam, H. T., & Asgede, D. M. (2023). Effects of students' self-reflection on essay-writing achievement among Ethiopian undergraduate students: a counterbalanced design. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-023-00203-7>
- Gebremariam, H. T., & Asgede, D. M. (2023). Effects of Students' Self-Reflection on Improving Essay Writing Achievement Among Ethiopian Undergraduate Students: A Counterbalanced Design. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 8(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-023-00203-7>
- Golzar, J., Momenzadeh, S. E., & Miri, M. A. (2022). Afghan English teachers' and students' perceptions of formative assessment: A comparative analysis. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), Article 2107297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2107297>
- Graham, S. (2019). Changing how writing is taught. *Review of Research in Education*, 43(1), 277–303. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732x18821125>
- Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2020). The development of student feedback literacy: The influences of teacher feedback on peer feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(5), 680–696. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1689545>
- Huang, Y., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). Facilitating L2 writers' metacognitive strategy use in argumentative writing using a process-genre approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1036831. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1036831>
- Javadi-Safa, A. (2018). A brief overview of key issues in second language writing teaching and research. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 6(2), 12. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.6n.2p.15>
- Kiasi, G. A., & Rezaie, S. (2021). The effect of peer assessment and collaborative assessment on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing ability. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(13), 08–16. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.13.2>
- Lee, M.-K., & Evans, M. (2019). Investigating the operating mechanisms of the sources of L2 writing self-efficacy at the stages of giving and receiving peer feedback. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(4), 831–847. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12598>
- Marlaini, M. (2021). Implementing Self-Reflection Writing in EFL Writing Class: A Classroom Action Research in Madrasah Aliyah. *VISION*, 17(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.30829/vis.v17i2.1152>
- McKim, C. (2023). Meaningful member-checking: A structured approach to member-checking. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 7(2), 41–52.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Moser, A., & Korstjens, I. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 3: Sampling, data collection, and analysis. *European Journal of General Practice*, 24(1), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375091>

- Naghdipour, B. (2016). English writing instruction in Iran: Implications for second language writing curriculum and pedagogy. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 32, 81–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.05.001>
- Ni'ma, H. N. A., Sumardi, S., & Tarjana, S. S. (2019). Students' perceptions of reflective journals as a self-assessment to promote writing skills in EFL classes. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 2(4), 626–632. <https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v2i4.8417>
- Orooq, G., & Razeq, A. H. (2022). Use of Authentic Materials in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms: Challenges, Reasons, Types, and Frequency. *Journal of Educational Sciences – Qatar University*, 20(20), 161–175. <https://doi.org/10.29117/jes.2022.0092>
- Phoophuangpairroj, R., & Pipattarasakul, P. (2022). Preliminary Indicators of EFL essay writing for teachers' feedback using automatic text analysis. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 8(1), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.8.1.55>
- Putra, I. G. K. M., Santosa, M. H., & Pratiwi, N. P. A. (2021). Students' perceptions of online peer feedback practice in EFL writing. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 8(2), 213–231. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v8i2.21488>
- Qin, C., Zhang, R., & Xiao, Y. (2022). A questionnaire-based validation of metacognitive strategies in writing and their predictive effects on the writing performance of English as a foreign language student writers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1071907. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1071907>
- Rashid, Y., Rashid, A., Warraich, M. A., Sabir, S. S., & Waseem, A. (2019). Case study method: A Step-by-Step Guide for Business Researchers. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919862424>
- Ruslin, R., Mashuri, S., Rasak, M. S. A., Alhabsyi, F., & Syam, H. (2022). Semi-structured interview: A methodological reflection on the development of a qualitative research instrument in educational studies. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 12(1), 22–29.
- Shuguang, S., & Qiufang, W. (2018). Teacher-student collaborative assessment (TSCA) in integrated language classrooms. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i2.13301>
- Simarmata, H. A., & Sulistyaningrum, S. D. (2023). Exploring students' metacognitive strategies through self-reflection in writing assessments. *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC)* 6(1), 530-541.
- Storch, N. (2019). Collaborative writing as peer feedback. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 143–162). Cambridge University Press.
- Subawa, I., Nitiasih, N., & Putra, I. (2017). The effect of collaborative assessment and learning style on students' writing competency. *International Journal of Language and Literature*, 1(4), 193. <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijll.v1i4.12582>
- Sudirman, A., Gemilang, A. V., & Kristanto, T. M. A. (2021). The power of reflective journal writing for university students from the EFL perspective. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 8(3), 1061–1079. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i3.19105>
- Sun, Q., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). Understanding learners' metacognitive experiences in learning to write in English as a foreign language: A structural equation modeling approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 986301. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.986301>
- Taherdoost, H. (2022). Designing a questionnaire for a research paper: A comprehensive guide to designing and developing an effective questionnaire. *Asian Journal of Managerial Science*, 11(1), 8–16. <https://doi.org/10.51983/ajms-2022.11.1.3087>
- Tahmasbi, S., Karimnia, A., & Rahimi, A. (2022). A combination of action research and reflective journal writing in an English as a foreign language class: Learners' psychological points of view and their grammar use in writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 810775. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.810775>
- Tai, J., Ajjawi, R., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Panadero, E. (2018). Developing evaluative judgement: Enabling students to make decisions about the quality of work. *Higher Education*, 76(3), 467–481. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0220-3>

- Taufiqulloh, T., Fadhly, F. Z., & Rosdiana, I. (2024). Effects of collaborative assessment on undergraduate students' writing performance. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 11(3), 1574–1595. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v11i3.37704>
- Teng, M. F., Qin, C., & Wang, C. (2022). Validation of metacognitive academic writing strategies and the predictive effects on academic writing performance in a foreign language context. *Metacognition and Learning*, 17(1), 167–190. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-021-09278-4>
- Tian, L., & Li, L. (2018). Chinese EFL learners' perception of peer oral and written feedback as providers, receivers, and observers. *Language Awareness*, 27(4), 312–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2018.1535602>
- Tian, L., Liu, Q., & Zhang, X. (2022). Self-regulated writing strategy is used when revising based on automated, peer, and teacher feedback in an online English as a foreign language writing course. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 873170. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.873170>
- To, J., & Panadero, E. (2019). Peer assessment effects on the self-assessment process of first-year undergraduates. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(6), 920–932. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1548559>
- Toba, R., Noor, W. N., & Sanu, L. O. (2019). The current issues of Indonesian EFL students' writing skills: ability, problems, and reasons in writing comparison-and-contrast essays. *DINAMIKA ILMU*, 57–73. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506>
- Vattøy, K.-D., & Smith, K. (2019). Students' perceptions of teachers' feedback practice in teaching English as a foreign language. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 260–268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.06.024>
- Wahyuni, D., Oktavia, W., & Marlina, L. (2019). Writing anxiety among Indonesian EFL college students: Levels, causes, and coping strategies. *Lingua Cultura*, 13(1), 67–74. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v13i1.5239>
- Wang, Y., & Xie, Q. (2022). Diagnosing EFL undergraduates' discourse competence in academic writing. *Assessing Writing*, 53, 100641. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2022.100641>
- Westmacott, A. (2017). Direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback: Student perceptions. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 22(1), 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n01a02>
- Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Rowntree, J., & Parker, M. (2017). "It'd be useful, but I wouldn't use it": Barriers to university students' feedback-seeking and receptiveness. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(11), 2026–2041. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1130032>
- Xiang, X., Yuan, R., & Yu, B. (2022). Implementing assessment as learning in the L2 writing classroom: A Chinese case. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(5), 727–741. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1965539>
- Xiaomeng, Z., & Ravindran, L. (2023). Using Teacher-Student Collaborative Assessment to Develop Chinese EFL Learners' Writing. *Journal of Language and Communication*, 10(1), 79–100. <https://doi.org/10.47836/jlc.10.01.05>
- Xie, Y., & Lv, X. (2022). Effects of Content Support and Planning Instruction on Discourse Connection in EFL Argumentative Writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 912311. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.912311>
- Yang, L. F., Liu, Y., & Xu, Z. (2022). Examining the effects of self-regulated learning-based teacher feedback on English-as-a-foreign-language learners' self-regulated writing strategies and writing performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1027266. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1027266>
- Yu, S. (2019). Learning from giving peer feedback on postgraduate theses: Voices from Master's students in the Macau EFL context. *Assessing Writing*, 40, 42–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2019.03.004>
- Yu, S., & Liu, C. (2021). Improving student feedback literacy in academic writing: An evidence-based framework. *Assessing Writing*, 48, 100525. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100525>
- Zhan, Y. (2022). Developing and validating a student feedback literacy scale. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(7), 1087–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.2001430>

- Zhang, Y., Li, M., Chieh, Y. T., & Han, S. (2022). On a path to becoming more self-regulated: Reflective journals' impact on Chinese English as a foreign language students' self-regulated writing strategy use. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 1042031. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1042031>
- Zhou, S. A., & Hiver, P. (2022). The effect of self-regulated writing strategies on students' L2 writing engagement and disengagement behaviors. *System, 106*, 102768. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102768>