

Peer Review in Improving Students' Perception Argumentative Essay: The Effectives from Students' Perceptive

Febby Annisa Yasmin¹, Nurasiah Anggini², Rizki Putri Jasmine Siahaan

State Islamic University of North Sumatera

Febbyasmin7@gmail.com, nurasiahanggini@gmail.com, jasminerizkiputri@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Peer review is a well-known technique for raising students' writing standards. By evaluating the peer-review process, this study goes beyond its initial focus on results. This study specifically focuses on the timing of peer review, a highly organized feedback form, and student writers' changes following peer review. According to the research, these techniques assist students provide formative input to their classmates, drive them to start writing earlier in the semester, and motivate them to significantly edit their drafts before turning in their final papers. This study highlights how crucial it is to evaluate the peer-reviewing procedure. This conclusion was obtained after examining students' replies on a questionnaire that included closed option (multiple choice) questions as well as open-ended comments on the same three aspects of the impact of peer review: critical thinking, collaborative work, and composition quality. This study is based on Vygotsky's sociocultural approach and supports and broadens earlier research on the subject by providing a more in-depth and comprehensive viewpoint. Participants who have utilized this methodology comment on its advantages and/or disadvantages.

Keywords : Argumentative Essay, Peer Review, Students Perception.

INTRODUCTION

Once I asked my students in writing class. What language skill do you think more difficult to learn? Many of students answered; the difficult one among the skills is writing. Why do you think so? Because it needs some steps to do and take the time to have deep comprehension when we want to deliver our ideas in order to have a good writing. And also

it is hard for us to find ideas to be chosen as one of our topics. This fact is true. The researcher experienced it for two years in teaching writing skill especially in writing an argumentative essay. Actually, the writer has tried to reduce the boredom, but it takes times to do. Every writing task should be corrected and given back to the students, time consuming of course, and also lecturer's task is overload. Unfortunately, the

result of the students' argumentative writing is still unsatisfied. Students' writing ability, especially in an argumentative essay, is very needed by students before they develop their ability to write scientific writing. This step is very crucial for them to know early how to organize a good argumentative essay. They have to know the systematical writing of an essay by developing their ideas from facts. Then they give their analysis on the facts. Furthermore, the students elaborate their ideas into parts of the essay: introduction; content; and conclusion. Unfortunately, most students still cannot develop their ability in writing an argumentative essay. They have difficulties to find the ideas, how to develop the ideas, and how to use the language free of grammatical mistakes.

To overcome those problems, the researcher wants to find a way that is convenient to the students and good for the lecturer, too. In this research, peer feedback was applied. Peer feedback is assisted by the theory of writing process that is associated with various drafting, substantial alteration, and pair work (1) and with theory of synergetic learning that takes learning as a social activity taking place through communication (2). It also equals to the opinion of Rochelle and Teasley stating that collaborative learning is a "mutual engagement of participants in a coordinated effort to solve the problem together" (3). When students discuss with their friends they feel free and are not stress. As it was stated by Atay and Kurt that there are effects on adopting peer feedback in class such as providing diversity, sharing opinions, and increasing one's confidence as well.

Therefore, Jahin (2012) highlighted the need for teachers to create a sense of community within the EFL classroom during writing activities to provide sufficient opportunity to cooperate in groups or pairs so that they can overcome their anxiety in doing writing assignments. Theoretically, Jahin (2012) explained that the concept of peer review is in line with Vygotsky's (1978) theory

which deemed social interaction an essential element for cognitive learning and accorded great importance to language in human thought development. In the case of the practice among university students, Jahin (2012) reported some previous studies revealing various positive effects of peer-reviewing not only on the writing aspects such as the writing process and the writer's product (Lundstrom and Baker, 2009), new ideas and vocabulary enrichment (Jahin, 2012), and improvement on the content and organization (Mangelsdorf's, 1992), but also on the psychological aspects such as students' confidence (Mittan, 1989), less burden (Kurt and Atay's, 2007), and a sense of audience (Mittan, 1989). Other studies also underlined more benefits of the implementation of peer feedback, instead of teacher feedback, such as enhancing learners' focus on meaning, autonomy, cooperation, interaction critical reading, analysis skills, and involvement in helping each other (Tsui and Ng, 2000, in Zhang, 2008), and Jeremy Harmer, 2007 in Sultana, 2009).

Truscott (1996 in Zhang, 2008) said it will be much effective if the students are actively involved in recognizing their own and also their peers' mistakes so that they can make more comprehensive and grammatically well-accepted writing. As highlighted by Chang (2016), peer feedback activities equally help student writers and student reviewers in vocabulary enrichment, good sentence, logical organization, new perspectives, and self-introspection. Moreover, Tseng (2010, p.24-25) mentions that critics from peers challenge them to explain why they write in that particular way and be aware of presenting facts or arguments logically. Discussion or even debate with peers offers a bargaining situation because there is less threat (Rollinson, 2005, cited in Sultana, 2009). The students may not feel inferior to argue because they think that they have the same level of language competence and knowledge. Paul Rollinson (2005, in Sultana, 2009) adds that peer feedback makes learning more student-centered and more supportive.

Furthermore, some studies have revealed that peer feedback had a positive impact on writing skills (AlJamal, 2009, in Farrah, 2012), helped students have standards of good writing, and qualified them to be thinkers and writers as well (Yang, 2006, in Farrah, 2012). Besides, the teachers would not have to spend so much time responding to each essay repeatedly.

Peer review (peer review) can be defined as a testing and review activity carried out by equal colleagues to obtain adequate assurance that the audit organization being reviewed has complied with the quality control system and the implementation of audit activities is in accordance with applicable auditing standards.

The peer review process is needed because the quality of the article must be maintained for its originality, then to find out what the findings are, detect fraud or plagiarism, which are part of the peer review that is carried out. The peer review process is a way to ensure the quality and credibility of academic publications.

PEER REVIEW PROCESS

Manuscripts will be reviewed by reviewers in accordance with their field of expertise and corrected by “blind review” each manuscript will be reviewed by at least two reviewer she review process will consider novelties, objectivity, methods, scientific analysis, conclusions and references. The review of the manuscript was carried out several times until it was declared fit for print by the Reviewers & Editors Each manuscript is reviewed a maximum of 4 weeks after the reviewer receives an email.

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAY

There have been some ideas of argumentative essay proposed by some experts. Harmer (2004a) state that argumentative essay is one type of the essays with the purpose to convince readers by appealing readers’ logic and emotions. Convincing needs proves and arguments (Coffin, et al., 2003) to prove a particular point, demonstrate understanding, and show a perspective, a position or stance on something. Without strong proves and arguments, argumentative essay cannot meet its purpose, that is, to convince.

Arguments used to convince need students’ deep understanding and analysis on one particular topic. Therefore, this essay, according to Coffin et al., (2003) is the most common labeled type of the essays in higher education for four reasons. The first one is that it expects students’ interpretation about a topic. The second one is that it requires students to seek for evidence for their arguments. The third one is that to arrive at an argument, students need to think across disciplines. The last one is that it should be persuasive. It is clear that the students’ interpretation, evidence for arguments, ideas synthesized from across disciplines, and persuasion are highly demanded at university level as university students need to actualize their understanding of subjects studies.

Displaying ideas in argumentative essays is organized in one of three ways. First, exposition, with the purpose to put forward a point of view, uses arguments and evidence to support the writer’s position. Second, discussion, with the purpose to argue the case for two or more points of view, starts with a controversial issue. The two or more perspectives forms of the issue are explored by reaching a position stated in the concluding paragraph. Last, challenge, with the purpose to argue against a point of view or argument,

contains a series of rebuttal arguments and supporting evidence before putting forward the writer's overall arguments (Coffin et al., 2003). In brief, an argumentative essay can be organized in one of the three ways; exposition, discussion, or challenge to show students' interpretation on one subject or an issue.

Those three types are organized into at least three paragraphs consisting of introduction, body, and conclusion. Harmer (2004) identifies the introductory paragraph, the body, and the concluding paragraph as the organization of the argumentative essay. The introductory paragraph shows the object of analysis, the background to the thesis statement, and the thesis statement. The body consists of some arguments and evidence to support the arguments. The conclusion can be arrived by retracing the steps, restating the thesis statement, and suggesting some points to make the arguments stronger.

In conclusion, since an argumentative essay is the most widely used at university level, understanding its organization and its process is necessary. The argumentative essay organization includes the introductory paragraph with a thesis statement, the body to support the thesis statement, and the concluding paragraph. This argumentative essay organization is used as the indicators in framework for argumentative essay test. The argumentative essay, which has three types, should meet some criteria- introductory paragraph, supporting reasons and arguments, evidence and examples, mechanic of writing, knowledge and understanding, and concluding paragraph. The process of the argumentative essay consists of prewriting, drafting with the revision of draft on development, organization, and elaboration of ideas, reflection, and editing on proofread. Within those processes, peer review is done in drafting and in editing on proofreading. Briefly, understanding the organization and the process of the argumentative essay aims at producing a good argumentative essay.

PEER REVIEW

Some writers and researchers use different terms for peer review. It names peer response, peer suggestion, peer revision, peer comment and peer evaluation (Ong & Zhang, 2010). The terms for the student who reviews are the peer student ((Ferris, 2007), the reviewer (Coffin et al., 2003) and the peer reviewer (Coffin et al., 2003). The terms for the student who writes the paper are the author (Coffin et al., 2003), the student writer (Harmer, 2004b); (Coffin et al., 2003)). Based on those different terms, the peer reviewer, for the student who reviews, and the student writer, for the student who writes, are used in this research.

The importance of peer review in writing has been studied by some researchers. Cowan (2004) observed that the involvement of peer in evaluation helped to reduce the students' mistakes in the anthropology written exercise. Ferris (2007) found that students agreed to apply peer preview on the first draft (vocabulary choice, organization, writing style, and ideas) and the final one (spelling, punctuation, and grammar). These studies students' mistakes on the mechanics of language can be minimalized by conducting peer review activity.

In relation to the importance of peer review in writing, other researchers have done some studies to find out the effect of peer review on students' writing achievement. A study by Topping, Smith, Swanson (2000) to students of Psychology indicated that peer review had positive and negative effects. The positive effect was that it was effective in improving the quality of the students' academic writing, while a time consuming was the negative one. A study by (Min, 2005) to 18 Taiwanese students found that peer review affected self-monitoring and confidence as readers and reduced the percentage of students' surface level mistakes – noun, verb, punctuation, word form, and preposition.

Peer review is the students' feedback to other students' writing by responding and

correcting (Coffin et al., 2003) and (Harmer, 2004b). In responding, students do not only say the weak points, but also the strong ones. These could be done by giving the statements of compliment (for the strong points) and questions (for the weak points). "I enjoy reading your work, especially your solution to the problems" is an example for the strong points and "Why did you start with the story about the bus late? You could have begun, instead, with the problem of public transport in general" is an example for the weak point. In correcting, students indicate other students' mistakes by using symbols in syntax (word order), concord (grammatical agreement between subjects and verbs), collocation (words which live together) or word choices. Chisholm (2006) suggests that correcting should come later as focusing too early mechanical aspects of writing detracts attention from rethinking and restructuring. In sum, responding and correcting in peer review facilitates students to give feedback to others' writing in the form of discussion rather than in the form of judgment.

The students' discussion in peer review promotes confidence in students' ability in writing. The confidence will be achieved as the students learn from the work of others. The students, then, can interpret and compare their own writing based on the review of others (Coffin et al., 2003). In other words, students can learn by reviewing each other's writing to improve their own writing.

The review is usefully done in drafting and re-drafting ((Harmer, 2004b); (Dian, 2006); (Russell, 2006)). In drafting or in the first draft, peer review is on vocabulary choice, organization, writing style, and ideas. In re-drafting, word order, concord, collocation, spelling, punctuation, and grammar are reviewed. In short, the peer review is conducted while the students' writings are under development.

The responses in peer review could be in written and spoken (Chisholm, 2006). Written responses allow the peer reviewer to create appropriate responses and the student

writer to refer to them back after the review session. Spoken responses stimulate more ideas and collaboration. Furthermore, Coffin et al., (2003) specify that responses given to student writer's first and second drafts may take the form of oral or written comments for revision. In short, two forms of responses in peer review are written and spoken to make a warm response.

Peer review in writing has some advantages. It provides an opportunity for the students to experience cooperative learning (Chisholm, 2006). According to Christison (2002), cooperative learning can certainly be done due to uniqueness of the brain. He further states that teachers can address this uniqueness by allowing students to work with peers to assess their own works. Furthermore, in cooperative learning, the students share and defend ideas to one another and are motivated to increase the learning of others (Ghaith, 2002). This sharing and defending ideas leads to cooperation to arrive at one idea, at correction, and at improvement the students' own writing. In brief, peer review in writing allows students to experience the peer cooperation for the improvement of their own writing.

Moreover, peer review is a stress-reduced activity. Students may check, discuss, and evaluate their work with peer students without being afraid of the grade from teachers (Yang, Badger, & Yu, 2006). In such activities, students are free to share and defend their ideas for the improvement of their writing. If the students make many mistakes, for example, the mistakes will not influence their grade. Briefly, peer review is an enjoyable activity.

Peer review also helps students be self-reviewer by correcting friends' grammatical mistakes. Some grammatical mistakes, for example, word forms, diction, spelling, functional position of words, punctuation, and conjunctions, are some common mistakes made by many students and are easily found and are corrected by peer students (Diab, 2006). Such mistakes make readers difficult to get the idea of the students' overall writing (Richard, 2002).

The students, therefore, have to learn to reduce them through peer review. Learning to reduce the grammatical mistakes in peer review can be done by finding and correcting friends' mistakes. Finding and correcting peer' work is just like finding and correcting the students' own mistakes. This idea is in line with the idea stated by (Bruce, Shanti and Rafoth, 2004) who state that peer review helps students become proficient-self editors. In conclusion, the aim of peer review in writing lies in helping students to be self- reviewer.

STUDENTS REVIEW

Student Review is the feedback given by the student in commenting, responding, and correcting to student' writing (Coffin et al., 2003); Harmer, 2004; (Burgess, Sally & Head, 2005). This aims at suggesting ways for students to improve their writing. To achieve this aim, teachers spend much time and energy in providing feedback to students' writings.

Comments on students' essay can be in some words describing the quality of the students' essay such as very well, quite well, OK, not very well, and badly (Burgess, Sally & Head, 2005). However, Coffin et al., (2003) who question the usefulness of such comments argue that they turn out students into confusion by two reasons. First, students do not recognize what they have done exactly relating to such comments. Second, Students do not know how to make sense such comment for the future essay.

Responding students' essay is strongly suggested in oral form. One way is by using face-to-face discussion (Coffin et al., 2003). However, Burgess, & Head (2005) argue that it is a time consuming. Teachers are sometime uneasy spending much time talking with one student, while others are working individually in silence. The other way is one way-to whole class interaction as suggested by Burgess & Head (2005). After reading all of the students' essays, the teacher tells the strong and weak

points that most students have made on vocabulary choice, organization, writing style, and ideas. The teacher then gives suggestions to the weak points.

Unlike in responding, in correcting, the teacher concerns much on the mechanics of the language which can be done in seven ways. First, selective correction focuses on correcting certain aspects. In other words, not all mistakes are corrected. Second, using marking scale means giving marks 10, for example, for each category chosen (such as grammar, vocabulary, coherence, or cohesion). Third, correction symbols such as s for spelling mistakes, and wo for a mistake in word order are used to encourage students to think about what the mistakes are, so that they can correct them themselves. Fourth, reformulation is a way of showing to write more correctly. Instead of asking them to find the mistakes and correct them, the teacher writes the correct ones. Fifth, asking students to refer to a dictionary or a grammar book they have is also useful. If, for example, the student writes I am not interested with sailing, the teacher can suggest that the student consult grammar book see page 20. Sixth, face-to-face interaction can be done by teachers if it is impossible to understand exactly what has been written. Last, remedial teaching is done when many students make the same mistakes. Among seven of kinds of corrections, marking is frequently used in a large class (Harmer, 2004b).

To achieve an effective teacher review, Martin (2006) states the effective ways in which EFL writing teachers can help students to be better writers. One is by helping students get rid of negative attitudes towards writing through the freewriting process. Another is by giving them feasible writing assignment and complete with specific instruction. Still another is by giving specific feedback and correction written and oral. The other is by giving patience and care. In short, those four ways need to be considered by teachers to help students to be better writers.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this experimental research, Google Form was used. A Google Form was given to the students of this research. The sample of this research, 11 students in experimental group and 20 students in class, were selected by cluster random sampling.

The purpose of this study is to find out the advantages of using presentations as a learning model in writing classes. A qualitative descriptive approach is used in this research. Quantitative method is a type of data that can be measured or calculated directly, in the form of information or explanation expressed in numbers or numbers. Research designed to study conditions in the form of research reports is known as descriptive research. In contrast to experiments, the qualitative research approach focuses on situations found in the real world. Google form is used as a research instrument by researchers. Google forms are used by students

to collect data. The researcher distributed the Google form by asking several questions related to the research questions. The participants in this study were students from class IV TBI 1 semester at the State Islamic University of North Sumatra.

The data were collected through the students' argumentative essay writing tests, made by the researcher, administered twice, and scored by different reviewers, from google form of different treatment. Each of the students was asked to write an argumentative essay from each topic consisting of one introductory paragraph, not more three paragraphs in the body, one concluding paragraph, and references.

RESULTS AND FINDING

Table 1: The students' scores of pretest of experimental class (5B) & controlled class (5C)

Question	Agree	Normal	Disagree
By giving peer review, you could detect a problem in writing	4	5	2
I found difficult in giving peer review on my friend argumentative essay	5	6	0
Can peer review results develop your creativity in writing essay	3	7	1
Does peer review result play an important role in argumentative essay you write	7	0	4
Your opinion, is giving peer review a good thing for writing ability	11	0	0

As it was can be seen from the scores of pretest in the table, it can be clarified that the

mean score of the agreement in the experimental class was 70%, while in the disagreement class was 30%. And from the scores of both classes, it means that there was a difference between the students' achievement of scores in the pretest (experimental class and controlled class), the controlled class got the higher mean score than the class.

After showing the comparison of students' pretest and post-test scores, the following table shows the gained score among those two classes. The gained score can be seen from the improvement Essays clearly with justified arguments and reasoning. Therefore, using argumentative peer feedback, students were able to assess their peers' essays based on predesigned argumentation criteria, not on their personal perspective.

Students in the guided condition outperformed students in the unscripted condition for most dependent variables. The detailed instruction on how to provide high-quality argumentative peer feedback and also how to write argumentative essays allowed students in the guided condition to engage in higher cognitive processing such as argumentation, justification and clarification resulting in higher quality argumentative feedback and essay (Noroozi & Mulder, 2017; Valero Haro et al., 2019b). However, students in the guided condition were not as successful as students in the scripted condition. The reason may be that, although students in the guided condition learned how to provide argumentative feedback and how to write argumentative essay, they were not prompted in the feedback phase to provide a high-quality feedback equal to scripted condition. Scientific literature suggest that although students may possess knowledge on argumen- tation, they are not always able to put their knowledge in practice during the learning processes (see Noroozi et al., 2018).

Furthermore, all students seemed to be happy with regard to the use of online peer feedback environment in this study. This is in line with previous studies that emphasise the

positive effects of online peer feedback environments on students' motivation and satisfaction with the learning experiences (Noroozi & Mulder, 2017). Overall, students perceived that working on various parts of the module was easy, clear and understandable. Also, they reported that navigating through the EduTech was easy and had no technical problem. Students appreciated the instructional supports embedded in the EduTech that helped them write a well-structured and sound argumentative essay and gain domain-specific knowledge. Overall, user-friendliness design supported with clear guidance led to a high mean score of students' appreciation of the EduTech. The opinions of students in the scripted and guided conditions were more positive than students in the unscripted condition regard- ing domain-general and domain-specific learning outcomes. The plausible explanation is that students in the scripted and guided conditions felt that with such support they are in the right direction towards engaging in high-quality peer feedback processes compared to students in the unscripted condition who were left on their own without additional support.

We used an existing course in a real educational setting with a high level of ecological validity and its own dynamics. Such authentic setting also put some constraints on the possibilities to experiment such as sample size and the gender. In this study, only 52 students enrolled for the course and all of them were female. Scientific research shows that males might perform differently than females in terms of their argumentative learning processes and outcomes (see Noroozi, Hatami, Biemans, van Ginkel, & Bayat, 2019; Noroozi et al., 2012). Further research under more stringent conditions regarding a larger sample size with mix groups of students in terms of gender is needed to test the extent to which the results of this study can be generalised.

We only used quantitative data analysis and measurements to investigate the effects of online peer feedback on the quality of

argumentative peer feedback, essay writing and learning. However, we acknowledge that qualitative analysis would also add values to the findings of this study. Therefore, we suggest that future research employ qualitative data analysis to avoid reductionist approach and to truly explore how students' feedback quality, essay writing and learning can be improved using different online peer feedback designs.

CONCLUSION

The majority of published content on the subject of peer review is concentrated on significantly different features compared to this research paper because attention is typically placed on the scholars' perspective on this topic, whose views center on just one of the points covered in this research project. However, the goal of this inquiry was to uncover what students thought about collaborative learning, critical thinking, and improvement in composition quality.

Students have become competent to respond to the comments received from peer review feedback to construct a more reader-friendly essay. On the other side, the students' thinking becomes more critical and analytical when they review their peers' drafts. They also did not make the errors that their contemporaries did. Therefore, the writing process should include self-evaluation as well as providing and receiving feedback. However, when students lack the expertise to effectively assess their work and skill to provide excellent feedback, the role of the teacher as a facilitator is required.

Peer review enables students to learn from one another and develop their writing skills over time. On students' argumentative essays, peer evaluation was more useful than teacher review. Peer criticism is one of the most effective

strategies for students to enhance their essay writing, and it should be taken into consideration. Many language teachers and student writers may agree that peer review that enables students to reply and correct each other's written work makes sense.

Along with this discovery, other discoveries included the fact that while some theories in this study were supported, some weren't. The ideas were applicable to peer review's advantages, which included self-review and collaborative learning. Out of the four issues, only two were present at the outset of this research—the inability to express oneself without the approval of others and the reliance on the teacher. Lack of attention to peer review activity was still a concern. This study did not uncover the second issue, which is a lack of willingness to collaborate with others. By teaching students what to look for, letting them know the evaluation criteria, grouping, and having clear procedures, those benefits were attained. Thus, in addition to learning to recognize weaknesses, students are also taught how to recognize strengths.

Based on the findings of the study, a few recommendations are suggested for future studies. More extensive results will be obtained with a longer study period and a larger sample of pupils. Self-evaluation should be employed when writing individual essays so that students can evaluate their writing process on an individual basis and determine how they did at various stages. Essay topics should be properly picked and relevant to students' experiences so that they can relate to them. This study's self-assessment is appropriate for an argumentative essay. For other types of essays, future researchers might create a comparable in-depth self-assessment checklist.

REFERENSI

- Andrews, R. (1995). *Teaching and learning argument*. London, UK: Cassell
- Andrews, R. (2010). *Argumentation in higher education. Improving practice through theory and Research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Andriessen, J. (2006). Arguing to learn. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences* (pp. 443-460). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bacha, N. (2010). Teaching the academic argument in a university EFL environment. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9, 229-241.
- Chen, Y. C., & Tsai, C. C. (2009). An educational research course facilitated by online peer assessment. *Innovations in Education and Teaching international*, 46, 105-117.
- Corgan, R., Hammer, V, Margolies, M., & Crossley, C. (2004). Making your online course successful. *Business Education Forum*, 58, 51-53.
- Dillenbourg, P. (2002). Over-scripting CSCL. In P. A. Kirschner (Ed.), *Three worlds of CSCL: Can we Support CSCL?* (pp. 61-91). Heerlen: Open University of the Netherlands.
- Gielen, M., & De Wever, B. (2015). Scripting the role of assessor and assessee in peer assessment in a wiki environment: Impact on peer feedback quality and product improvement. *Computers & Education*, 88, 370-386.
- Huisman, B., Saab, N. Van Driel, J., & van den Broek, P. (2018). Peer feedback on academic writing Undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43, 955-968.
- Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching*, 4, 33-54.
- Jurkowski, S. (2018). Do question prompts support students in working with peer feedback? *International Journal of Educational Research*, 92, 1-9.
- Kellogg, R. T., & Whiteford, A. P. (2009). Training advanced writing skills: The case for deliberate practice. *Educational Psychologist*, 44, 250-266.
- Lin, S., Liu, E., & Yuan, S. (2001). Web-based peer assessment: Feedback for students with various thinking styles. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 17, 420-432.
- Mei, W. S. (2006). Creating a contrastive rhetorical stance: Investigating the strategy of problematization in students' argumentation. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, 37, 3.
- Muncie, J. (2000). Using written feedback in EFL composition classes. *ELT Journal*, 54, 47-53.
- Noroozi, O. (2018). Considering students epistemic beliefs to facilitate their argumentative discourse and attitudinal change with a digital dialogue game. *Innovations in Education and Teaching international*, 55, 357-365.
- Noroozi, O., Biemans, H., & Mulder, M. (2016). Relations between scripted online peer feedback processes and quality of written argumentative essay. *The internet and Higher Education*, 37, 20-31.
- Noroozi, O., Biemans, H. J. A., Busstra, M. C. Mulder, M., & Chizari, M. (2011). Differences in Learning processes between successful and less successful students in computer supported Collaborative learning in the field of human nutrition and health. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27, 309-318.
- Noroozi, O., & Hatami, J. (2019). The effects of online peer feedback and epistemic beliefs on students' argumentation-based learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 56, 548-557.
- Noroozi, O. Hatami,

J., Biemans, H. I A., van Ginkel, S., & Bayat, A. (2019). Students' online

Argumentative peer feedback, essay writing, and content learning: Does gender matter? Interactive Learning Environments. (in press).
Doi: 10.1080/10494820.2018.1543200
Noroozi, O., Kirschner, P. A., Biemans, H. J. A., & Mulder, M. (2018), Promoting argumentation competence: Extending from first to second order scaffolding through adaptive fading.

Educational Psychology Review, 30, 153-176.
Noroozi, O., & Mulder, M. (2017). Design and evaluation of a digital module with guided peer feedback for student learning biotechnology and molecular life sciences, attitudinal change, and satisfaction, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education, 45, 31-39.

Noroozi, O., Teasley, S. D., Biemans, H. J. A., Weinberger, A., & Mulder, M. (2013). Facilitating learning in multidisciplinary groups with transactive CSCL scripts, International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 8(2), 189-223
Noroozi, O., Weinberger, A., Biemans, H. J., Mulder, M., & Chizar, M. (2012). Argumentation-based computer supported collaborative learning (ABCSCCL): A synthesis of 15 years of research.

Educational Research Review, 7, 79-106.

Saito, H. & Fujita, T. (2004). Characteristics and user acceptance of peer rating in EFL writing classrooms. Language Teaching Research, 8, 31-54.
Schneer, D. (2014). Rethinking the argumentative essay, TESOL Journal, 5, 619-653,
Topping, K. J. (2009), Peer assessment. Theory into Practice, 48, 20-27.

Toulmin, S. (1958). The uses of argument. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.