



THE EFFECTS OF INTENSIVE TRAINING SESSIONS OF PEER FEEDBACK ON ENGLISH-MAJORED STUDENTS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT

Mai Hung Dong¹ⁱ,

Nguyen Van Ut²

¹English Department,
School of Foreign Languages,
Tra Vinh University,
Vietnam

²English Department,
Faculty of Education,
Bac Lieu University,
Vietnam

Abstract:

The current study aimed to scrutinize the effect of using intensive training sessions of peer feedback in teaching writing skills to English-majored students in English as a Foreign Language. To do as, the study sample consisted of sixty students from two classes with an equivalent number of participants in both the control and experimental groups (30 students each), and their treatment was implemented for eleven weeks. The experimental group received instruction through intensive training, while the control group was taught to use traditional methods. Both groups were administered pre-tests and post-tests, and their performance was evaluated by an instructor using the rubric of IELTS writing 2 based on a 10-point scoring system stipulated in the system of Vietnam education, which consists of four main domains, namely Task Achievements, Cohesion & Coherence, Lexical Resource, and Grammatical Range & Accuracy. The results indicated that both groups improved, but the experimental group demonstrated a relatively greater improvement compared to the control group. Furthermore, the most significant number of participants in the experimental group expressed a positive perception of the application of intensive training sessions of peer feedback in enhancing their writing skills. Thus, the proposed pedagogical implications of utilizing intensive training in peer feedback for academic writing in English as a foreign language are expected to bring innovation to the teaching of writing in Tra Vinh, which is located in the Mekong Delta region of Vietnam.

ⁱ Correspondence: email maihungdong99@gmail.com

Keywords: English-majored students; intensive training; peer feedback; writing achievement

1. Introduction

In ESL/EFL teaching and learning contexts, writing is widely regarded as an essential skill. Given the significant role in this skill, numerous researchers attempted to the distinct types of perspectives in writing skills as follows: Although writing is an essential component of higher education, it is considered the most difficult skill to master as it requires both instruction and evaluation (Maghsoudi & Haririan, 2013; Uysal, 2009; Wen, 2019).

As written by Syahriani and Madya (2020), writing is widely acknowledged as a vital skill in the teaching of the English language, serving as a means of conveying messages. However, it is a complicated skill to master as it requires the writers to explore several factors, namely thoughts and ideas, and make them visible and concrete in the process of writing. In other words, under investigation of the study in Vietnam, as stated by Phuong and Nguyen (2021), EFL students perceive writing as the most difficult skill to master, so they can encounter diverse issues ranging from generating ideas to editing and revising their assignments in the writing process. However, as Rass (2015) mentions, writing can be a challenging skill for both native and non-native speakers to master. This is because the writing process requires writers to focus on several crucial elements, such as content, purpose, organization, audience, vocabulary, and mechanics. Moreover, as asserted by Pangaribuan and Manik (2018), writing is seen as a writing process to obtain the product affected by several five main elements, namely, vocabulary, grammar, organization, spelling, and punctuation. Based on their relatedness, if they are in need of proficient language in the writing process, they should prioritize paying attention to both the elements and characteristics, namely, formality, objectivity, and complexity, which could be used for the language effectively and accurately (Nasser, 2019). To deal with these challenges, several studies, therefore, have been conducted to use several approaches so as to assist students in overcoming their writing challenges, namely, genre-based approach (Purba *et al.*, 2020); systematic review (Saravanan *et al.*, 2021); portfolio (Duman and Demirel, 2015); and online paraphrasing tools (Sulistyaningrum, 2021).

In recent years, various researchers have considered peer feedback as an effective pedagogical method to give students a chance to examine alternative viewpoints and employ logical reasoning in order to have an essential for enhancing the quality of students' writing (Li *et al.*, 2020; Noroozi *et al.*, 2018; Noroozi & Hatami, 2018; Tian & Zhou, 2020). As noted by Huisman *et al.* (2018), peer feedback is considered to be an advantage for students in writing as it stimulates them to actively consider task-specific processes and criteria. The utilization of peer feedback in the ESL/EFL writing classrooms has been strongly supported by theoretical perspectives. Throughout the period from 2014 to 2019, a few prior studies into peer feedback were published as follows; as revealed

by Yamalee & Tangkiengsirisin (2019), peer feedback is essential for learners to look and study in further detailed information about their mistakes in writing skill, which rarely happen in normal classroom conditions. As maintained by Nicol *et al.* (2014), peer feedback is established to generate a mindset of processing for the students and the new concept of knowledge, which will be a personal capital to apply and adapt in finding a new learning context. As seen from these works, peer feedback is seen as a multifunctional tool used to support learners in looking at their processes and improving their work. Furthermore, the significant role of peer feedback has been recognized to be efficient in numerous situations. To gain a comprehensive understanding of the investigation into peer feedback, a wide array of previous studies revealed that the utilization of peer feedback provides evidence of positive effects of the enhancement of students' writing performance in EFL classrooms such as (Farrah, 2012; Hao & Razali, 2022; Khalil, 2018; Trang, 2022, & Trang & Anh, 2022). While the findings of previous research have shed some light on the aspects on the effect of peer feedback, comprising, self-efficacy (Cui, *et al.*, 2021; Hao & Razali, 2022; Rahimi & Fathi, 2021); engagement (Fan & Xu, 2020; Yuan & Kim, 2018), perception (Farrah, 2012; Nguyen, 2016; Suryani *et al.*, 2019; Wang, 2014), revision (Min, 2006., Pham *et al.*, 2020; Ting & Qian, 2010), and anxiety (Bolourchi & Soleimani, 2021; YastÖbaú & YastÖbaú, 2015), to our best knowledge, the examination on the effect of using intensive training sessions of peer feedback on English-Majored students in their writing achievement are largely unknown. Against this backdrop, the current of this study endeavours to clarify two primary aims as follows.

Firstly, it discovers the impact of intensive training sessions on using peer feedback that could influence the writing achievement of English-majored students, particularly in terms of criteria, namely Task Response, Coherence and Cohesion, Lexical Resource, and Grammatical Range and Accuracy.

Secondly, it aims to explore how they perceive their capability to complete the peer feedback after intensive training. Grounded on these objectives, it is considered as one of the most crucial factors in determining English proficiency in writing skills. The results of this study would offer a considerable range of benefits for EFL teachers of the English language. To be precise, they gain a deeper insight into problems in writing achievement based on a set of criteria so as to give a new teaching method leading to more effective instruction in the other academic writing courses which assists their students to hone on writing achievement. Hence, to answer the objectives of this study, the following research questions were addressed in this study:

- Q1: To what extent does peer feedback impact English-majored students' writing achievement?
- Q2: How do English-majored students perceive peer-feedback intensive training?

2. Literature review

2.1 Theoretical framework

The following section provides a clue about the theoretical framework in which the authors could be presented with distinct types of definitions, namely, peer feedback, advantages and disadvantages of peer feedback, and a literature review of studies related to the topic.

2.2 Definitions of peer feedback

The literature on peer feedback suggests various ways to enhance the quality of students' writing skills. For instance, Farrah (2012) defines "*peer feedback as involving learners in sharing their ideas and providing constructive comments to improve their writing*" (p. 182). In other words, Wiggins (2012), as cited in Plaidaren and Shah (2019), proposed that peer feedback can be defined to be able to support students gain a better understanding of how to improve their writing skills. Nevertheless, as underscored by Srichanyachon (2011), peer feedback provides opportunities for social interaction and can improve students' critical thinking, confidence, creativity, motivation, and performance on assignments. Furthermore, peer feedback is a diverse activity that involves multiple skills and enables students to identify their strengths and weaknesses, such as teamwork, analysis, writing, and editing. This diversified learning approach supports the individual learning needs of students (Vickerman, 2009). In the next part of this paper, the advantages and disadvantages of peer feedback are presented below.

2.2.1 Advantages and disadvantages of peer feedback in teaching and learning

Several studies have reported various benefits of peer feedback in teaching and learning. According to Lu and Law (2012), peer feedback is widely accepted as useful for students in developing their writing skills and receiving informative feedback, which is crucial for their active engagement in promoting feedback, giving them a voice and developing their own abilities to share their ideas. As underscored by White and Caminero (1995), learners benefit from valuable opportunities provided by offering and receiving peer feedback as they learn to communicate effectively, acknowledge different perspectives, listen carefully, think critically, and participate constructively. Moreover, peer feedback offers students a diverse range of helpful feedback sources, and the recursive process of peer feedback facilitates improvement in various areas, such as enhancing self-awareness, building confidence, increasing motivation, improving critical thinking skills, and reinforcing social skills (Farrah, 2012). Furthermore, as written by Min (2005), peer feedback quantity was enhanced by training, resulting in more relevant and valuable comments. Similarly, student engagement in peer feedback training may lead to better attitudes towards peer feedback provision, particularly if they possess similar knowledge and skills related to the given task (Alqassab *et al.*, 2018).

However, numerous studies have also highlighted negative angles of using peer feedback as follows: as mentioned by Rollinson (2005) the process of peer feedback can

be time-consuming, especially if learners are not familiar with it. This is because it involves reading, taking notes, collaborating with another reader to reach a consensus, and giving written or oral feedback, which can take a considerable amount of time. Furthermore, students may feel frustrated if they receive unhelpful feedback from their peers, which may affect their motivation and willingness to engage in the process.

According to Van Ginkel *et al.* (2017), peer feedback received the lowest score compared to peer feedback guided by both a tutor and teacher feedback. Based on these problems, It is crucial for peer feedback training to improve their writing ability (Min, 2005). What is more, in order to enhance students' confidence in peer feedback and encourage their participation, it is crucial for peer feedback training to enhance their evaluative abilities and their capacity to provide feedback at advanced levels, as suggested by Alqassab *et al.* (2018). Thus, As stated by Kuyyogsuy (2019), intensive training with peers is crucial for students to develop the skills needed to effectively assess and provide constructive feedback on their writing. Hence, peer feedback has been widely recognized as a valuable tool in promoting students' writing skills, critical thinking abilities, and social skills. Therefore, intensive training is essential in preparing students to provide and receive constructive feedback on their compositions. In the subsequent section of this paper, a literature review of studies related to the topic will be presented below.

2.3 Related studies

It would be valuable to conduct additional studies exploring the utilization of peer feedback in teaching and learning in the classroom in the educational milieu of Vietnam. As written by Trang (2022), who explored the impact of peer feedback on the writing performance in English business emails on 48 non-English majored students. According to their findings, the participants who received peer feedback performed better than those who received traditional methods. Furthermore, the majority of responses from participants in the questionnaire were positively correlated with their writing performance. Similarly, Nguyen (2016) described the use of meta-cognition to examine the peer feedback in EFL students' writing classes to augment the learners' meta-cognition of 49 English- Majored students. The findings of this study revealed that peer feedback was not being used as a formal practice in this particular setting, resulting in limited opportunities for EFL learners to improve their meta-cognition through this feedback approach. Based on the data analysis, the learners desired changes in the implementation of peer feedback in their writing classes. A subsequent study was conducted by Pham *et al.* (2022), who made an investigation into the use of training to clarify how written errors have an impact on peer feedback for high school students' paragraphs on writing performance on 64 grade-eleven students. The results of the study revealed that the most common errors committed by the students were related to grammar (such as verbs, articles, and prepositions), followed by vocabulary (word order, word choice, and word form) and mechanics (capitalization, spelling, and punctuation). The experimental group, which received peer feedback training, showed significant

improvement in reducing the written errors in the post-test. Additionally, the students in the experimental group displayed positive attitudes towards participating in peer feedback activities in the writing classroom.

To obtain a deeper understanding of the widespread utilization of peer feedback, a vast array of international studies have been conducted on peer feedback in writing performance with different types of feedback. For instance, Khalil (2018) conducted research on the influence of peer feedback on 12 EFL learners at pre-intermediate in order to discover the benefits and effects of peer feedback in enhancing writing performance. The outcomes of this study discovered that the use of peer feedback improved the writing performance of the learners, resulting in a positive attitude toward the process in EFL classrooms. The learners became more receptive towards using peer feedback, as they found it helpful in enhancing their writing performance. Moreover, another study was conducted at the university in Thai Lan, as underscored by Sirikarn (2019), who carried out mixed methods research. In so doing, the students' attitudes toward peer feedback on writing ability were explored. The findings of the students illustrated that they had a positive attitude toward using peer feedback on writing performance in four fundamental areas, namely writing process, affective strategies, critical thinking skills, and social interaction ability. Similarly, to open the scope of generalizability of the study as written by Kuyyogsuy (2019), who recruited from three border provinces in southern Thailand so as to utilize the impact of peer feedback on students' writing skills. The outcomes of his/her study illustrated that the students experienced notable improvement in their writing skills through the process of peer feedback, as evidenced by the average scores on both the pre-test and post-test. In other words, Kusumaningrum *et al.* (2019) discovered the implementation of different kinds of both small group and in-class peer feedback provisions on 55 EFL students so as to advantage students in enhancing their writing performance. The results of the study illustrated that both in-class peer feedback provision and small-group peer feedback provision led to the students' better writing performance. Furthermore, Elfiyanto and Fukazawa (2021) examined the use of written corrective feedback in three different sources in writing achievement comprising, teacher, peer, and self-feedback, which could improve students' achievement levels in their essay writing on 81 senior high school students in two countries, both Indonesia and Japanese. The findings revealed that written corrective feedback from peers effectively improved Indonesian senior high school students' writing achievement levels. In contrast, for Japanese senior high school students, teachers' written corrective feedback represented the most effective source.

As written by Yamalee and Tangkiengsirisin (2019), who scrutinized the use of integrated feedback in writing achievement and attitude toward 20 English- majored students. The results of the study illustrated that the utilization of cooperation with the integrated feedback approach assisted students in the improvement of their writing skills. Moreover, interviewing results showed that they had a positive attitude towards implementing integrated feedback in improving their writing skill.

Bolourchi and Soleimani (2021) probed into the influence of peer feedback on 48 EFL learners' writing performance and writing anxiety. The results of this study illustrated that the students who received the implementation of peer feedback for the experimental group outperformed the control group. Furthermore, the questionnaire was given to the students who received peer feedback at the end of the study. The results revealed a notable reduction in anxiety levels among the experimental group who received PF.

The subsequent study in the context of Chinese in public high schools was underscored by Hao and Razali (2022), who discovered the impact of peer feedback on teaching in the classroom so as to improve students' writing ability and self-efficacy. Under investigation of data analysis, the utilization of peer feedback positively impacts students' writing ability in three main areas follow as: content, organization, and grammar. In other words, the students had a positive attitude toward peer feedback to the enhancement of their writing self-efficacy.

Despite these emerging research trends, necessitating more empirical investigations into this topic in the context of Tra Vinh University in the southern part of the Mekong Delta region in Vietnam, where English is taught as a foreign language so as to enrich the literature of this field.

3. Methods

3.1. Research design

The study utilized a quasi-experimental research design to collect data using both qualitative and quantitative research methods. The qualitative approach involved analyzing the mean scores of writing achievement for English-majored students before (pretest) and after (posttest) receiving peer feedback in both the experimental and control groups. The pretest and post-test results were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22. Furthermore, the quantitative strategy was employed to examine the perceptions of the experimental participants on using intensive training of peer feedback to improve their writing achievement and to assess their opinions on the intensive training session instructions they received.

3.2. Participants

The investigation of this study was undertaken at Tra Vinh University in the southern part of the Mekong Delta region in Vietnam. Students enrolled in the Bachelor's Degree program in English Studies at this university are required to take courses in language skills, namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Sixty participants from two parallel intact classes of English-Majored students were recruited voluntarily. To gain a comprehensive understanding of background information on the variety of participants in each group and their gender distribution, as presented in Table 1. All of these participants were junior-level of students who had previously taken an academic writing course, "Complete IELTS Bands 4.0-5.0, Student's book", and were assumed to have

similar levels of proficiency and background knowledge. Moreover, their English proficiency level was measured to be at the B1 level according to the Common European Framework for Reference. Furthermore, the instructor of the course was a lecturer of the School of Foreign Languages at Tra Vinh University, who obtained a Master's degree in Theory and methodology of English language teaching and had two years of experience in teaching English writing and speaking at the university level. Moreover, he/she not only achieved an IELTS score of 7.0, but also had two years of experience teaching IELTS in a foreign language center in Tra Vinh City, Viet Nam.

Table 1: The background information of the two groups

Groups	The number of participants	Gender	
		Female	Male
Experimental	30	19	11
Control	30	14	16

3.3 Materials

The textbook "Complete IELTS Bands 5-6.5, Student's book" is a course book designed for students preparing to take the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) exam, which provides comprehensive preparation for the IELTS exam assesses proficiency in all four language skills, namely listening, reading, writing, and speaking. It includes 10 units, each focusing on a specific topic and skills needed for the exam, such as vocabulary, grammar, and exam strategies. The book contains various activities and exercises, including practice tests, to help students develop their language skills and improve their performance in the exam. It also includes audio files to improve listening skills and a CD-ROM with additional practice materials. The book is authored by Guy and Vanessa (2012).

3.4 Instruments

To gain the expected data for the current study, the authors used two types of instruments in the process of data collection as follows: the study utilized writing tests as the first instrument to collect data for analysis, administered as pre-test and post-test to examine the students' writing performance before and after the treatment between two groups. The tests were selected from the main course book to ensure their validity, as recommended by Guy and Vanessa (2012), and their reliability was checked using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The scoring framework used to assess students' writing achievement was adopted and modified by Wattie (n.d.) in terms of a set of criteria from the rubrics of IELTS writing task 2. Instead of using a nine-band score, an IELTS-like style, the researcher used a 10-scale scoring system outlined in Vietnam's education system. Full of standardized, detailed descriptions of each rating level are portrayed in the Appendix. The author utilized a writing test scoring rubric that included four criteria, which are outlined hereunder:

- 1) Task Achievements (25%): Addressing all parts of the question and presenting main ideas with pertinent supporting ideas.

- 2) Cohesion and coherence (25%): the organization of ideas into well-structured and comprehensible paragraphs using linking words such as hence, although, therefore.
- 3) Lexical resource (25%): the use of a wide range of vocabulary to convey intended meanings without error.
- 4) Grammatical range and accuracy (25%): the employment of a vast array of appropriate grammatical structures in imparting information.

To receive the data for the second research question, after the experimental group participants completed an at-the-end treatment of the intensive training. Then, they were given a questionnaire to ask about their attitude toward peer feedback to see how they perceived toward peer feedback after obtaining the intensive training sessions. To explain the questionnaire further, the questionnaire was adopted from a prior study (Khalil, 2018), and it consisted of 20 items that assessed the participants' attitudes towards peer feedback. All of the questions were answered by using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 ("Strongly disagree") to 5 ("Strongly agree"). The participants could select their responses from the following options: 1 for "Strongly disagree," 2 for "Disagree," 3 for "Neutral," 4 for "Agree," and 5 for "Strongly agree". In the current study, the reliability statistics of the questionnaire estimated Via Cronbach's alpha to be acceptable at 0.85, which is satisfactory.

3.5 Procedure

The following is a detailed procedure for gathering data in the teaching program, which consisted of two groups: While a traditional group received writing instruction in a conventional manner, the experimental group received intensive training in peer feedback similar to the English writing course, which underwent a 3-hour teaching session per week for a period of 11 weeks. Both classes were taught by an experienced English teacher as a researcher who spoke Vietnamese and had a master's degree in Theory and Methodology English language teaching with two years of teaching experience. The treatment process began with the first session, where the instructor, as a researcher, administered a pre-test requiring students to write an essay using guided words and phrases. The pre-test was conducted in two classes within the same week, and the purpose was explained to the students, informing them that their score would account for 20% of their in-class assessment grade. Hence, during the 45-minute pre-test, all of these participants not only were individually taken a seat to ensure assessment integrity and prevent plagiarism, but also they were totally not allowed to utilize any English materials, namely dictionaries or thesauruses and mobile phones. After the pre-test, the scripts were carefully collected and evaluated to compare with the post-test results obtained at the end of the lesson to assess participants' progress and writing abilities. In the second meeting, the experimental group's training session began with a brief introduction to the process of using peer feedback and the importance of enhancing writing abilities. The instructor explained the criteria for providing constructive feedback and modeled the process by giving an example of how to give feedback on a sample essay.

The students were then divided into pairs and given a task to provide feedback on each other's essays. The instructor monitored the process and provided guidance as needed. After the peer feedback session, the students revised their essays based on the feedback received and submitted the revised version for evaluation. The instructor provided feedback on the revised essays and discussed common mistakes and areas of improvement with the students. In contrast, the traditional group received the same amount of instruction without the peer feedback intervention. Instead, they received lectures on writing strategies, grammar, and vocabulary, as well as practicing their writing skills through in-class writing exercises. Both groups continued to receive instruction in this manner for the next 10 weeks, with weekly assessments conducted to monitor their progress. At the end of the 11th week, a post-test was administered, which was similar to the pre-test, but with different prompts and topics. The post-test scores were then compared to the pre-test scores to determine the effectiveness of the teaching program and the impact of the peer feedback intervention on the experimental group.

3.6 Data collection and analysis

In the step-by-step process, all written papers from these students were gathered for data analysis, encompassing both the pretests and post-tests from the control and experimental groups. In the next step, the researchers utilized a rubric adapted and designed by Wattie (n.d.) to evaluate the students' writing performance (Please refer to the Appendix). Subsequently, the pre-test and post-test scores of both groups were processed using SPSS software to determine the mean score for each criterion. In the stage of comparison, the data analysis, thirty pretest papers from the control group were compared with thirty pretest papers from the experimental group, and the post-test results of the control group were compared with those of the experimental group using the independent samples t-test of SPSS version 22. Next, the mean scores of the thirty pretest papers written in the experimental group were compared with those of the thirty written papers in the post-tests in the experimental group using the Paired Samples t-test. Ultimately, the mean score of the individual responses from the experimental group regarding perceptions of peer feedback was calculated using SPSS. Additionally, an internal reliability analysis for the questionnaire responses was conducted using SPSS. The analysis of these papers for both the pre-test and post-test took approximately one month to complete.

4. Results

4.1 Students' writing tests

The pre-test and post-test were administered to evaluate the writing achievement of both groups before and after the intervention. The scores, which ranged from 0 to 10 points scale concentrating on Task Response (25% of weight = 2.5 marks), Coherence & Cohesion (25% of weight = 2.5 marks), Lexical Resource (25% of weight = 2.5 marks), and

Grammatical Range & Accuracy (25% of weight = 2.5 marks), respectively, were then analyzed using SPSS version 22 to determine the participants' writing achievement.

An Independent samples T-test was undertaken to compare data analysis of writing scores of the pre-test between the control and treatment group to clarify if there is a significant difference between the scores before and after the treatment of the two groups, as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Comparison of the pre-test and post-test scores of two groups before and after the treatment

Writing tests	Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	T	Df	Sig
Pre	Control	30	5.9000	.55554	1.03	-8.119	29	.000
	Experimental	30	6.9333	.53310				
Post	Control	30	7.3000	.65784	0.75	-5.711	29	.000
	Experimental	30	8.0583	.34387				

A. Independent samples T-test

Table 3 depicts a comparison between the pre-test and post-test scores of the two groups. The pre-test mean score of the control group was notably lower (M=5.90, SD=0.55) compared to the experimental group accounting for (M=6.93, SD=0.55). Thus, the results indicated a significant difference between the two groups ($t=-8.119$, $df=29$, $p=0.00$; $p<.01$).

Following the treatment, there was a notable contrast in the post-test results of the two groups ($t=-5.71$, $df=29$, $p=0.00$; $p<.01$). The experimental group attained a mean score of 8.05 with a standard deviation of 0.34. In comparison, the control group achieved a lower mean score of 7.30 with a standard deviation of 0.65. In summary, both the control and experimental groups exhibited enhancement in their writing achievement from the pre-test to the post-test after eleven weeks. However, there was no significant difference in the level of writing performance between the two groups after the intervention.

Table 3: Comparisons of the mean scores for two groups before and after the treatment

Group	Writing tests	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	T	Df	Sig
Control	Pre-test	30	5.9000	.55554	1.40	-8.550	29	0.00
	Post-test	30	7.3000	.65784				
Experimental	Pre-test	30	6.9333	.53310	1.12	-10.985	29	0.00
	Post-test	30	8.0583	.34387				

It can be clearly seen in Table 2 that the results showed the difference in the average scores between the pre-test and post-test. The pre-test had an average score of (M=5.90; SD=0.55), while the post-test had an average score of (M=7.30); SD=0.65). The results of the t-test showed a significant difference between the two tests ($t= -8.55$, $df=29$, $p=0.00$; $p<.01$). The mean score of the post-test was higher than that of the pre-test. Therefore, it can be inferred that the control group's writing skills improved after an eleven-week intervention. While the writing achievement of the experimental group was significantly

different from the pre-test to the post-test mean score, with an average score of ($M= 6.93$; $SD=0.53$) in the pre-test, and an average score of ($M= 8.05$; $SD=0.34$) in the post-test. The results of the t-test showed a significant difference ($t=-10.98$, $Df=29$, $p=0.00$; $< p. 01$), indicating that the post-test score was significantly higher than the pre-test score. After the study, the writing achievement of the experimental group was remarkably increased. Overall, the results of the writing tests suggest that both groups showed improvement in their writing achievement, with the experimental group showing a greater improvement than the control group.

Based on the findings mentioned above, the results of the two groups show a significant improvement in their scores after the treatment. Therefore, to analyze the data in detail, the researcher used a Paired Sample T-Test to examine the improvement in each scoring criterion separately with the purpose of comparing the mean scores of four specific criteria within the experimental group and the control group before and after the treatment as shown Table 4 hereunder:

Table 4: Comparison of specific criteria of the control group before and after the treatment

Criteria	Group	N	Mean	Std. deviation	T	Df	Sig
Task Response	Pre-test	30	6.0333	.99943	-8.160	29	.000
	Post-test	30	8.1667	.91287			
Coherence & Cohesion	Pre-test	30	5.8333	.87428	-3.465	29	.002
	Post-test	30	6.7333	1.08066			
Lexical Resource	Pre-test	30	5.9333	.69149	-4.350	29	.000
	Post-test	30	6.9000	.92289			
Grammatical Range & Accuracy	Pre-test	30	5.8000	1.09545	-5.174	29	.000
	Post-test	30	7.0000	1.01710			

B. Paired samples statistics

Table 4 provides a more detailed breakdown of the results of the writing performance pre-test and post-test for the control group. The results demonstrate a significant improvement in their writing performance as assessed by four criteria: Task Response, Coherence and Cohesion, Lexical Resources, and Grammatical Range and Accuracy. The post-test scores were higher than the pre-test scores for all four criteria, and the statistical analysis showed a significant difference with p-values less than 0.01 for all criteria, with t-values ranging from -3.46 to -8.16 and degrees of freedom of 29.

The next part of the discussion will illustrate the results of the average mean scores of each criterion before and after the treatment of the experimental group. The data are displayed in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Comparison of the specific features of experimental group before and after the treatment

Criteria	Group	N	Mean	Std. deviation	T	Df	Sig
Task Response	Pre-test	30	7.2667	1.01483	-3.471	29	.002
	Post-test	30	8.1500	.78948			
Coherence & Cohesion	Pre-test	30	6.8000	1.09545	-5.517	29	.000
	Post-test	30	8.0667	.82768			
Lexical Resource	Pre-test	30	6.6000	.85501	-6.277	29	.000
	Post-test	30	8.0333	.76489			
Grammatical Range & Accuracy	Pre-test	30	7.0667	.98027	-3.942	29	.000
	Post-test	30	7.9833	.67573			

C. Paired samples statistics

Table 5 provides more detailed information on the comparison of writing pre-test and post-test outcomes for the experimental group, revealing a significant improvement in their writing abilities across four dimensions: Task Response, Coherence and Cohesion, Lexical Resources, and Grammatical Range and Accuracy. The scores achieved in the post-test exceeded those attained in the pre-test for all four categories, and statistical analysis indicated significant differences, with p-values below 0.01 and t-values ranging from -3.47 to -8.27, based on 29 degrees of freedom.

The next part will demonstrate the analysis in response to the second research question, which is related to the perceptions of individuals towards peer feedback after receiving extensive training, as portrayed in Table 6 below:

Table 6: Perception of peer feedback after obtaining intensive training

No	Statements	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std.
1	As a learning tool, peer feedback was very useful.	30	3.00	5.00	4.23	.81720
2	I learnt most from writing feedback to others.	30	2.00	5.00	3.33	.75810
3	I learnt the most from receiving peer feedback.	30	2.00	5.00	3.50	.90019
4	My peers provide me with critical feedback.	30	1.00	5.00	3.66	1.06134
5	I improved my written work as a result of the peer reviews.	30	2.00	5.00	3.63	.88992
6	The reviews helped me improve my assignments.	30	2.00	5.00	3.83	.94989
7	The peer review process was very helpful.	30	3.00	5.00	3.90	.84486
8	A peer feedback process should be introduced in every writing class.	30	3.00	5.00	3.93	.86834
9	The idea of peer feedback is a waste of time.	30	2.00	5.00	3.80	.96132
10	I feel more relaxed reading my classmates' feedback.	30	2.00	5.00	3.86	.97320
11	I prefer peer feedback to the teacher's feedback.	30	3.00	5.00	4.26	.69149
12	Peer feedback makes me learn more in a relaxed way.	30	3.00	5.00	4.00	.83045
13	Through exchanging ideas, I feel much more comfortable in the writing class.	30	3.00	5.00	3.83	.74664
14	The peer feedback process provided me with the opportunity for social interaction.	30	2.00	5.00	3.93	.86834
15	The peer feedback increased my motivation to write.	30	2.00	5.00	3.86	.86037
16	The peer feedback enhanced my critical thinking.	30	2.00	5.00	3.70	.87691
17	The peer feedback process enhanced my creativity.	30	3.00	5.00	3.83	.79148

18	The peer feedback activity improved my writing.	30	3.00	5.00	3.90	.80301
19	I like my writing to be revised by my classmates.	30	1.00	5.00	3.70	.95231
20	I feel confident when asked to make suggestions about peer's work.	30	2.00	5.00	3.56	.85836
	Valid N (listwise)	30			3.63	

As is shown by Table 6, the set of items has mean values ranging from 3.33 to 4.26, and their standard deviations range from 0.69 to 1.06, respectively. Of particular interest is that for three items namely, (1, 11, and 12), the majority of participants agreed on their responses, giving them a mean score of over 4. This is significantly higher than the mean scores for the other seventeen items, which account for just over 3. Based on our analysis of the results, it seems that the mean scores for most items were nearly reached 4 (agree).

5. Discussion

Information on analysis of all the tables comparing the writing achievement of the two groups showed a significant improvement in the mean score for both the pre-test and post-test results. However, a comparison between the pre-test and post-test scores revealed that the experimental group's writing achievement was superior to that of the control group. The results research from findings indicated that the significance of offering more extensive and constructive peer feedback can assist students in acquiring writing skills, leading to improved academic performance. Put simply, there is a need for significantly increased support to enhance the effectiveness of peer feedback. In other words, instructors could offer this support by emphasizing the value of active and meaningful intensive training of peer feedback sessions, helping students recognize the potential benefits of peer feedback in developing their academic writing abilities, and fostering autonomy in the learning process. Through autonomy, students gain a sense of ownership over their peer feedback experiences, which in turn motivates them to actively revise and improve their tests.

These results were consistent with previous research conducted by Bolourchi and Soleimani (2021), Elfiyanto and Fukazawa (2021), Hao & Razali (2022), Huismana *et al.* (2018), Khalil (2018), Kuyyogsuy (2019), Kusumaningrum *et al.* (2019), Uymaz (2019), Pham *et al.* (2022), Trang (2022), Trang & Anh (2022), and Yamalee and Tangkiengsirisin (2019), in which the implementation of peer feedback in writing tasks was discovered to improve the writing abilities of students. To illustrate, Bolourchi and Soleimani (2021) confirmed that peer feedback influences writing performance and found that the experimental group outperformed the control group due to the implementation of peer feedback. Similarly, Pham *et al.* (2022) clarified that after receiving peer feedback training, the students were able to considerably reduce the number of errors in their writing in the post-test. Furthermore, Trang (2022) revealed that participants who benefited from peer feedback achieved an overall higher mean score in the post-test. Lastly, Kusumaningrum *et al.* (2019) affirmed that both in-class peer feedback provision and small-group peer feedback provision led to better writing performance among students.

6. Questionnaire

The analysis of the questionnaire revealed that the experimental group were positively correlated with writing performance after receiving intensive training on peer feedback from their peers. The results from the survey suggested all participants expressed conviction that receiving peer feedback was extremely advantageous for honing their writing abilities and were gratified with the application of peer-feedback. Based on this evidence as shown in Table 6, the mean scores for most items nearly reached 4 (agree) of individual responses to the questionnaire, which largely substantiated this confirmed statement. These outcomes were in accordance with several prior studies, including Bolourchi and Soleimani (2021); Farrah (2012); Hao & Razali (2022); Sirikarn (2019); Suryani *et al.* (2019); and Yamalee and Tangkiengsirisin (2019), which found that the utilization of peer feedback resulted in positive attitudes towards writing. For instance, Hao & Razali (2022) demonstrated that the utilization of peer feedback in the classroom fostered a more conducive environment for enhancing students' writing self-efficacy, motivation, and confidence. As noted by Bolourchi and Soleimani (2021), who discovered the anxiety level of students in receiving peer feedback can be significantly reduced in writing, while Suryani *et al.* (2019) asserted that students using peer feedback in the writing process become less stressed.

7. Conclusion

The main aims of this study were to probe into the impact of intensive training sessions on the use of peer feedback in enhancing the writing proficiency of English-majored students, specifically in the criteria of Task Response, Coherence and Cohesion, Lexical Resource, and Grammatical Range and Accuracy. The results revealed significant improvements in the writing abilities of both the experimental and control groups. However, the experimental group, which received concentrated on intensive training sessions of using peer feedback worksheets and scoring rubrics, exhibited better post-test results compared to both the control group and their own pre-test scores. To evaluate the writing performance of the students in both groups, an essay writing scoring rubric was used, which included four principal domains: Task-Achievement, Coherence and Cohesion, Lexical Resource, and Grammatical Range and Accuracy. The experimental group obtained superior scores in each domain during the post-test, surpassing their pre-test scores. Although the control group showed improvement in comparison to their pre-test scores, the experimental group showed relatively greater improvement. Furthermore, the experimental group's perceptions of the utilization of peer feedback were evaluated, and they demonstrated a positive attitude towards incorporating peer feedback in the classroom.

The present study provides a valuable contribution to the existing literature on the topic. However, like any research, it is not without its limitations. It is important to acknowledge these limitations in order to avoid overgeneralizing the findings and to

identify areas for future research. One of the main limitations of the study is its sample size. The sample size was relatively small, which limits the generalizability of the findings. The participants were recruited from a single location and may not be representative of the broader population. This limits the external validity of the study and makes it difficult to generalize the findings to other contexts. Future research could replicate the study with a larger and more diverse sample to increase the generalizability of the findings. Another limitation of this study is that it was conducted over a relatively short period of time. The effects of the intervention may be limited to the short term and may not be sustained over time. The study did not follow up with participants to assess the long-term effects of the intervention. Future research could address this limitation by conducting longer-term studies and assessing the effects of the intervention over time. Finally, the study did not assess potential confounding variables that may have influenced the results. For example, the study did not control for factors such as participants' prior knowledge of the topic, their motivation, or their learning style. These variables could have influenced the results and may limit the validity of the findings. Future research could control these variables to better isolate the effects of the intervention.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the students at Tra Vinh University, where data were collected. We are also grateful to the journal editor, production editor, and anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions on the earlier versions of this article.

Funding statement

This work was funded by the Tra Vinh University, Vietnam.

Conflict of interest statement

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

About the Author(s)

Mai Hung Dong is an English teacher in Tra Vinh Province, Vietnam. Currently, he is pursuing his master's degree in Theory and Methodology of English Language Teaching at Tra Vinh University, Vietnam. His research interests include speaking performance and reflection.

Nguyen Van Ut is a lecturer at English department, Bac Lieu University, Vietnam. He's earning his MA in TESOL at Tra Vinh University, Vietnam. He has taught English to Vietnamese students since 2006. His research interests include teaching essay writing, syntax, and examining English education & human resources development.

References

- Alqassab, M., Strijbos, J. W., & Ufer, S. (2018). Training peer-feedback skills on geometric construction tasks: Role of domain knowledge and peer-feedback levels. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 33*(1), 11-30.
- Bolourchi, A., & Soleimani, M. (2021). The impact of peer feedback on EFL learners' writing performance and writing anxiety. *International Journal of Research in English Education, 6*(1), 1-15.
- Cui, Y., Schunn, C. D., Gai, X., Jiang, Y., & Wang, Z. (2021). Effects of trained peer vs. teacher feedback on EFL Students' writing performance, self-efficacy, and internalization of motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 1-10. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.788474
- Duman, H., & Demirel, M. (2015). The use of portfolio in English language teaching and its effects on achievement and attitude. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 191*, 2634 – 2640.
- Elfiyanto, S., & Fukazawa, S. (2021). Three written corrective feedback sources in improving Indonesian and Japanese students' writing achievement. *International Journal of Instruction, 14*(3), 433-450. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14325a>.
- Farrah, M. (2012). The impact of peer feedback on improving the writing skills among Hebron University students. *Humanities, 26*(1), 179-210.
- Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*, 365-387. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356600>
- Guy, B-H. & Vanessa, J. (2012). *Complete IELTS Bands 5 -6.5, Student's book with answers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hao, H., & Razali, A. B. (2022). The impact of peer feedback on Chinese EFL junior high school students' writing performance. *English Language Teaching, 15*(9), 9-31. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v15n9p9>.
- Huismana, B., Saaba, N., Drielb, J. V., and Broek, P. V. D. (2018). Peer feedback on academic writing: undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43*(6), 955–968. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1424318>.
- Khalil, E. (2018). The efficacy of peer feedback in Turkish EFL students' writing performance. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies, 8*(6), 920-931. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5836/2018.06.011>.
- Kuyyogsuy, S. (2019). Promoting peer feedback in developing students' English writing ability in L2 writing class. *International Education Studies, 12*(9), 76- 90. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n9p76>.
- Kusumaningrum, S. R., Cahyono, B. Y., & Prayogo, J. A. (2019). The effect of different types of peer feedback provision on EFL Students' writing performance. *International Journal of Instruction, 12*(1), 213-224. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12114a>.

- Lam, R. (2010). A peer review training workshop: Coaching students to give and evaluate peer feedback. *TESL Canada Journal*, 27(2), 114. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v27i2.1052>
- Li, H., Xiong, Y., Hunter, C. V., Guo, X., & Tywoniw, R. (2020). Does peer assessment promote student learning? A metaanalysis. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(2), 193–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1620679>.
- Lu, J., & Law, N. (2012). Online Peer Assessment: Effects of Cognitive and Affective Feedback. *Instructional Science: An International Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 40(2), 257-275. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-011-9177-2>.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preference of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 203-218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x>
- Min, H. T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System*, 33(2), 293-308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.11.003>
- Min, H. T. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(2), 118-141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.01.003>
- Nasser, S. M. (2019). Iraqi EFL students' difficulties in writing composition: An experimental study (University of Baghdad). *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(1), 178-184. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n1p178>.
- Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2014). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: A peer review perspective. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(1), 102–122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.795518>.
- Noroozi, O., & Hatami, J. (2018). The effects of online peer feedback and epistemic beliefs on students' argumentation based learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 56(5), 548–557. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2018.1431143>.
- Noroozi, O., Kirschner, P. A., Biemans, H. J., & Mulder, M. (2018). Promoting argumentation competence: Extending from first- to second-order scaffolding through adaptive fading. *Educational Psychology Review*, 30(1), 153–176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-017-9400-z>.
- Nguyen, T. H. (2016). Peer feedback practice in EFL tertiary writing classes. *English Language Teaching*, 9(6), 76-91. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n6p76>.
- Nguyen, T. T. T., & Phuong, H. Y. (2021). The impacts of collaborative writing on EFL students' paragraph writing performance. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 4(4), 177-190. DOI: 10.51386/25815946/ij sms-v4i4p115.
- Maghsoudi, M., & Haririan, J. (2013). The impact of brainstorming strategies Iranian EFL learners' writing skill regarding their social class status. *International Journal of language and Linguistics*, 1(1), 60-67. <https://doi.10.11648/j.ijll.s.20130101.20>
- Pangaribuan, T., & Manik, S. (2018). The effect of Buzz group technique and clustering technique in teaching writing at first class of SMA HKBP I Tarutung. *English Language Teaching*, 11(1), 164-178. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n1p164>.

- Pham, V. P. H., Huyen, L. H., & Nguyen, M. T. (2020). The incorporation of qualified peer feedback into writing revision. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 45-59.
- Pham, V. P. H., Le, T. C., Phan, T. H., & Nguyen, N. H. H. (2022). The effects of trained peer feedback for High School students. *World Journal of English Language*, 12(1), 27-39. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n1p27>
- Plaindaren, C., & Shah, P. M. (2019). A study on the effectiveness of written feedback in writing tasks among upper secondary school pupils. *Creative Education*, 10, 3491-3508. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2019.1013269>
- Purba, R., Thao, N. V., & Purba, A. (2020). Using Genre-Based approach to overcome students' difficulties in writing. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research*, 7(4), 464-470.
- Rass, R. (2015). Challenges face Arab students in writing well-developed paragraphs in English. *English Language Teaching*, 8(10), 49-59. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n10p49>.
- Rahimi, M., & Fathi, J. (2021). Exploring the impact of Wiki-mediated collaborative writing on EFL students' writing performance, writing self-regulation, and writing self-efficacy: a mixed methods study. *UK: Taylor & Francis*, 1-48. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2021.1888753.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci003>
- Saravanan, A., Palanisamy, L., & Aziz, A. A. (2021). Systematic review: challenges in teaching writing skills for upper secondary in ESL classrooms and suggestions to overcome them. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 6(4), 262-275.
- Sulistyaningrum, S. D. (2021). Employing online paraphrasing tools to overcome students' difficulties in paraphrasing. *Stairs: English Language Education Journal*, 2(1), 52-59.
- Sirikarn, K. (2019). Students' attitudes toward peer feedback: Paving a way for students' English writing improvement. *English Language Teaching*, 12(7), 107-119. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n7p107>.
- Suryani, R. W., Rozimela, Y., & Anwar, D. (2019). Exploring the effect of peer feedback and the students' perceptions of the feedback on students' writing skill. *International Journal of Secondary Education*, 7(4), 116-121. doi: 10.11648/j.ijsedu.20190704.14.
- Srichanyachon, N. (2011). A comparative study of three revision methods in EFL writing. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, 8(9), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v8i9.5639>.
- Syahriani, S., & Madya, S. (2020). Study of writing strategies used by English major students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, 52(3), 153-162. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpp.v52i3.18137>.

- Tian, L., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Learner engagement with automated feedback, peer feedback and teacher feedback in an online EFL writing context. *System*, 91, 102247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102247>.
- Ting, M., & Qian, Y. (2010). A case study of peer feedback in a Chinese EFL writing classroom. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33, 87-98.
- Trang, N. H. (2022). The effect of peer feedback on EFL students' writing performance. *Vietnam Journal of Education*, 6(2), 123-136. <https://doi.org/10.52296/vje.2022.185>.
- Trang, N. H., & Anh, K. H. (2022). Effect of peer feedback on paragraph writing performance among high school students. *International Journal of Instruction*, 15(2), 189-206.
- Torwong, P. (2003). *Peer Response Technique: A Proposed Model for EFL Writing* (Unpublished PhD. dissertation). Suranaree University of Technology.
- Uysal, H. H. (2009). A critical review of the IELTS writing test. *ELT Journal*, 64(3), 314–320. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp026>
- Wang, W. (2014). Students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing: A longitudinal inquiry. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 80-96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.008>.
- Van Ginkel, S., Gulikers, J., Biemans, H., & Mulder, M. (2017). Fostering oral presentation performance: Does the quality of feedback differ when provided by the teacher, peers or peers guided by tutor? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(6), 953-966. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1212984>.
- Vickerman, P. (2009). Student perspectives on formative peer assessment: An attempt to deepen learning. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(2), 221- 230.
- White, A. S., & Caminero, R. (1995). Using process writing as a learning tool in the foreign language class. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 51(2). 323-329.
- Wattie, M. (n.d.). *Ielts Writing Step By Step*. <https://www.answers.com/-Books.html>.
- Wen, X. (2019). An analysis of cultivating students' writing ability in junior middle school English teaching. *Teaching Method Innovation and Practice*, 2(7), 4-6.
- Yamalee, E., & Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2019). Effects of integrated feedback on academic writing achievement. *Arab World English Journal*, 10(3) 250-270. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no3.17>.
- YastÖbaú, G. C., & YastÖbaú, A. E. (2015). The effect of peer feedback on writing anxiety in Turkish EFL (English as a foreign language) students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 530 – 538.
- Yuan, J., & Kim C, M. (2018). The effects of autonomy support on student engagement in peer assessment. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 66(1), 25–52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-017-9538-x>.

Appendix A

Rubric worksheet is adopted and adapted from Wattie (n.d.) including four grading Writing domains, using a 10 scale scoring system stipulated in Vietnam.

Criteria	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
Task achievement/ task response	The content is wholly unrelated to the prompt.	No part of the prompt is adequately addressed, or the prompt has been misunderstood. No relevant position can be identified, and/or there is little direct response to the question/s. There are few ideas, and these may be irrelevant or insufficiently developed.	The main parts of the prompt are incompletely addressed. The format may be inappropriate in places. The writer expresses a position, but the development is not always clear. Some main ideas are put forward, but they are limited and are not sufficiently developed and/or there may be irrelevant detail. There may be some repetition.	The main parts of the prompt are appropriately addressed. A clear and developed position is presented. Main ideas are extended and supported but there may be a tendency to over-generalise or there may be a lack of focus and precision in supporting ideas/material.	The prompt is appropriately addressed and explored in depth. A clear and fully developed position is presented which directly answers the question/s. Ideas are relevant, fully extended and well supported. Any lapses in content or support are extremely rare.
Coherence and Cohesion	The writing fails to communicate any message and appears to be by a virtual non-writer	There is no apparent logical organisation. Ideas are discernible but difficult to relate to each other. There is minimal use of sequencers or cohesive devices. Those used do not necessarily indicate a logical relationship between ideas. There is difficulty in identifying referencing. Any attempts at paragraphing are unhelpful	Organisation is evident but is not wholly logical and there may be a lack of overall progression. Nevertheless, there is a sense of underlying coherence to the response. The relationship of ideas can be followed but the sentences are not fluently linked to each other. There may be limited/overuse of cohesive devices with some inaccuracy.	Information and ideas are logically organised, and there is a clear progression throughout the response. (A few lapses may occur, but these are minor.) A range of cohesive devices including reference and substitution is used flexibly but with some inaccuracies or some over/under use.	The message can be followed effortlessly. Cohesion is used in such a way that it very rarely attracts attention. Any lapses in coherence or cohesion are minimal. Paragraphing is skilfully managed.

Mai Hung Dong, Nguyen Van Ut
 THE EFFECTS OF INTENSIVE TRAINING SESSIONS OF PEER FEEDBACK
 ON ENGLISH-MAJORED STUDENTS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT

Grammatical range and accuracy	No rateable language is evident.	Sentence forms are attempted, but errors in grammar and punctuation predominate (except in memorised phrases or those taken from the input material). This prevents most meaning from coming through. Length may be insufficient to provide evidence of control of sentence forms	The range of structures is limited and rather repetitive. Although complex sentences are attempted, they tend to be faulty, and the greatest accuracy is achieved on simple sentences. Grammatical errors may be frequent and cause some difficulty for the reader. Punctuation may be faulty.	A variety of complex structures is used with some flexibility and accuracy. Grammar and punctuation are generally well controlled, and error-free sentences are frequent. A few errors in grammar may persist, but these do not impede communication.	A wide range of structures is used with full flexibility and control. Punctuation and grammar are used appropriately throughout. Minor errors are extremely rare and have minimal impact on communication.
Lexical resource or vocabulary	No resource is apparent, except for a few isolated words	The resource is inadequate (which may be due to the response being significantly under length). Possible over-dependence on input material or memorised language. Control of word choice and/or spelling is very limited, and errors predominate. These errors may severely impede meaning.	The resource is limited but minimally adequate for the task. Simple vocabulary may be used accurately but the range does not permit much variation in expression. There may be frequent lapses in the appropriacy of word choice and a lack of flexibility is apparent in frequent simplifications and/or repetitions. Errors in spelling and/or word formation may be noticeable and may cause some difficulty for the reader.	The resource is sufficient to allow some flexibility and precision. There is some ability to use less common and/or idiomatic items. An awareness of style and collocation is evident, though inappropriacies occur. There are only a few errors in spelling and/or word formation and they do not detract from overall clarity	Full flexibility and precise use are widely evident. A wide range of vocabulary is used accurately and appropriately with very natural and sophisticated control of lexical features. Minor errors in spelling and word formation are extremely rare and have minimal impact on communication.

Mai Hung Dong, Nguyen Van Ut
THE EFFECTS OF INTENSIVE TRAINING SESSIONS OF PEER FEEDBACK
ON ENGLISH-MAJORED STUDENTS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions, and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions, and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage, or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations, and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed, and used in educational, commercial, and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).