

**KAJIAN KES PENTAKSIRAN KOLABORATIF GURU-MURID (TSCA) DALAM
PENULISAN AKADEMIK BAHASA INGGERIS DI BILIK DARJAH**

***A CASE STUDY OF TEACHER-STUDENT COLLABORATIVE ASSESSMENT (TSCA)
IN ACADEMIC ENGLISH WRITING CLASSROOMS***

**Wan Qin
Bihan Jiang**

Faculty of Education, Huaibei Institute of Technology,
Anhui, China

Corresponding Email: wwwrerb@163.com

Article history:

Received : 25 November 2023

Accepted : 20 December 2023

Published : 31 December 2023

ABSTRAK

Menilai prestasi produktif murid adalah sukar kerana tugas yang membebankan yang diberikan oleh bilangan kelas yang besar kepada guru. Teknik penilaian baharu yang dikenali sebagai penilaian kolaboratif guru-murid (TSCA) telah dibangunkan pada tahun 2016. Guru selalunya menjadi penilai tunggal dalam sistem penilaian tradisional, yang mungkin memberi kesan buruk kepada penglibatan pelajar, keupayaan menilai diri mereka dan secara keseluruhan. hasil pembelajaran. Untuk mengkaji bagaimana TSCA boleh dilaksanakan dengan berkesan dan berkaedah di dalam bilik darjah dan cara pelajar menganggap TSCA, kajian semasa menggunakan satu kelas utuh sebagai satu kes. Implikasi kajian ini meluas kepada kedua-dua pendidik dan penggubal dasar pendidikan, menyediakan bukti untuk penyepaduan amalan penilaian koperasi dalam bilik darjah penulisan Bahasa Inggeris akademik. Dengan menekankan pengagihan tanggungjawab penilaian yang seimbang antara guru dan pelajar, pendekatan ini berpotensi untuk memupuk pelajar bahasa yang menyeluruh yang menjadi peserta aktif dalam perjalanan pembelajaran mereka sendiri.

Kata kunci: Penilaian kolaboratif guru-pelajar, Penulisan Bahasa Inggeris Akademik, Pendidikan

ABSTRACT

Evaluating pupils' productive performance is difficult due to the burdensome task that huge class numbers place on teachers. A new technique of assessment known as teacher-student collaborative assessment (TSCA) was developed in 2016. The teacher is frequently the sole evaluator in traditional evaluation systems, which may have an adverse effect on students' engagement, ability to evaluate

themselves, and overall learning outcomes. In order to examine how TSCA could be implemented effectively and methodically in the classroom and how students perceived TSCA, the current study used one intact class as a case. The implications of this study extend to both educators and educational policymakers, providing evidence for the integration of cooperative evaluation practices in academic English writing classrooms. By emphasizing a balanced distribution of evaluation responsibilities between teachers and students, this approach has the potential to nurture well-rounded language learners who are active participants in their own learning journey.

Keywords: *Teacher-student collaborative assessment, Academic English writing, Education*

Introduction

Given that writing involves revision, feedback in EFL writing is particularly valuable. The process by which students comprehend information from many sources and apply it to their work or learning is currently termed as feedback. Accordingly, studies encourage switching from the outdated paradigm of teacher-centered transmission with traditional teacher feedback to the more contemporary paradigm of student-centered process with cutting-edge methods, such as peer feedback. However, summative evaluation is still widely used in China, where there are typically a lot of EFL students enrolled in a single class. However, grades alone cannot inspire students to think deeply about revision. Additionally, Chinese EFL teachers typically created more form-focused feedback, where students only fixed the linguistic mistakes of their compositions, in the rare instances where professors provided feedback.

In the context of China where English is considered a foreign language, educators often doubt the ability of EFL learners to provide valuable input, given the prevalent belief in the authority of teachers influenced by Confucian Heritage Context (CHC). Consequently, most Chinese EFL students continue to rely solely on teacher feedback to evaluate their performance, showing reluctance towards peer feedback. Despite the advantages of peer feedback, its utilization in Chinese EFL education remains infrequent. Recognizing this scarcity, Wen (2016) introduced teacher-student collaborative assessment (TSCA) as an innovative evaluation approach, offering an alternative means to assess writing and speaking tasks. The primary goal of TSCA is to enhance EFL learning through collaborative efforts.

The development of pupils' critical thinking, communication abilities, and academic prowess depends heavily on academic English writing. In the past, teachers have mostly served as the judges of students' written work, offering comments and determining grades. However, this method frequently restricts students' interest, stifles their originality, and impedes the growth of their capacity for independent learning. While TSCA emphasizes cooperation, active engagement, and shared responsibility between instructors and students throughout the assessment process, it represents a paradigm shift.

Co-creation is a key component of the TSCA technique. As participants in the evaluation process, teachers and students overcome the traditional hierarchy and promote a sense of ownership over the educational process. The TSCA framework's cornerstone, collaborative assessment workshops, allow teachers and students to jointly analyze assignments, pinpoint their strengths and faults, and jointly come up with improvement plans. This method helps students better comprehend evaluation criteria while also enabling them to develop into reflective learners who are able to evaluate their own work critically.

By creating a cooperative community of teachers and peers, TSCA can be beneficial as a prospective classroom evaluation to enhance both the quality of peer feedback and EFL performance simultaneously. However, there are very few empirical research in this field. As a result, the current quasi-experimental study uses TSCA in a large class to determine its impacts on the effectiveness of

*A Case Study of Teacher-Student Collaborative Assessment (TSCA)
In Academic English Writing Classrooms
Wan Qin, Bihan Jiang*

EFL students' feedback remarks and writing in EFL. This could give teachers practical experience, particularly in a big class setting typical of other EFL teaching environments. It offers proof of how instruction affects receiving practiced peer feedback.

Literature review

Academic English writing teaching in universities

College English instructors have long been responsible for teaching foundational courses, yet they often lack a precise understanding of the instructional process and objectives of Academic English (EAP) writing. Typically, in their teaching approach, they rely heavily on conventional methods, delivering vocabulary, structure, and skills all at once to students, culminating in the assignment of short essays. This pedagogical approach tends to prioritize teaching over active learning, leaving students in a passive learning position. They lack continuous opportunities for reflection and practice, making it challenging to identify their own weaknesses, and their enthusiasm tends to wane. According to You (2004), owing to the absence of formal academic English writing training, only half of the 147 students surveyed could employ the appropriate academic English writing style.

College English instructors face significant teaching loads, research pressures, and other administrative tasks, compounded by large class sizes, making it difficult to provide timely guidance and evaluation for student papers and compositions. Additionally, teacher evaluation serves as a means of communication and interaction between educators and students. However, the predominant focus on outcome assessment often sidelines process evaluation, resulting in delayed feedback. This, in turn, leads to poor communication and strained teacher-student relationships. Students remain unaware of their shortcomings, leading to overconfidence, reduced motivation, and diminished enthusiasm for learning. Timely and effective writing evaluation, on the other hand, can reignite students' interest in learning, foster autonomous learning skills, shape their academic English writing competence, and ultimately enhance their academic English writing capabilities.

In recent years, researchers have made notable strides in their studies concerning the instruction of academic English writing. Han Jinlong (2001) underscored the effectiveness of the process- subject teaching approach in English writing instruction, demonstrating its potential to enhance students' writing proficiency to a certain degree. Xiong Shuhui et al.'s findings in 2012 revealed that classroom design can empower students to explore research inquiries and experience the process of generating new knowledge, thereby aiding them in acquiring academic language skills. Building upon these research findings, it is evident that while domestic academic English writing instruction has achieved some progress, further exploration and reform are imperative to forge new avenues for improvement, ultimately enhancing professionals' capacity for international academic discourse.

Teacher-student Collaborative Assessment (TSCA)

Vygotsky suggested that working with more experienced peers or seniors could help learners reach their full potential. As a result, both peers and teachers could scaffold learning. Peer feedback is defined as a collaborative activity in which students work in pairs or small groups to read, critique, and offer oral and/or written feedback on peers' writing with the goal of assisting one another in short-term writing improvement and long-term development of stronger writing competence through mutual scaffolding. However, past research discovered that peer input led to inaccurate, superficial comments regarding grammar or vocabulary, resulting to the phenomenon known as "the blind leading the blind."

Some Chinese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) educators may feel apprehensive about relinquishing their authoritative role. Consequently, it is not uncommon for certain studies to incorporate teacher comments alongside peer feedback (Sun & Wang, 2022) or to provide teacher feedback on students' revised work based on peer feedback (Wang, 2014). This is done to ensure the effectiveness of peer feedback in promoting positive learning outcomes. Nevertheless, it may be impractical for EFL writing instructors with large class sizes and heavy workloads to consistently engage in such practices following peer feedback sessions.

It is important to emphasize that the integration of peer feedback does not entail the exclusion of teachers; rather, it shifts the teacher's role from being the primary feedback provider to a facilitator of feedback processes. Yu and Liu (2021) have introduced a model that combines writing instruction

with feedback tasks, aiming to enhance the quality of peer feedback in writing.

They have highlighted the necessity of combining both knowledge and individual initiative in the review process to help participants gain a deeper understanding, assess, and effectively manage their revisions or new writing efforts. In order to better support students in achieving this objective, they suggest utilizing technology enhancements and fostering collaboration between teacher feedback and peer feedback. Wen (2016) introduced Teacher-student collaborative assessment (TSCA), which is tailored to the specific context of Chinese EFL learners. TSCA outlines explicit learning objectives and well-defined teaching procedures, fostering collaboration between students and teachers within a learning community. TSCA is situated in the final phase of the teaching process within the POA theory, primarily focusing on evaluating the tasks completed by students outside of the classroom. This approach offers a fresh perspective on integrating teaching and learning evaluation.

This assessment approach merges both product-oriented and process-oriented assessment methods, with its primary objective being to address the issues of low efficiency and limited effectiveness in providing feedback on students' output in EFL learning. TSCA promotes a collaborative effort between teachers and students. In this approach, teachers guide students in offering constructive peer feedback, enabling them to assist their peers in their learning process (Sun, 2020). TSCA encompasses three key phases: pre-class preparation, in-class execution, and post-class activities. TSCA does not simply overlap teacher and student evaluations. Rather, teachers identify representative samples before class for detailed assessment and then collaborate with students to assess these samples during the class, fostering a fusion of learning and evaluation (Sun, 2020).

Three steps make up TSCA: pre-class planning, in-class execution, and post-class activities. In order to allow students to integrate learning and evaluation, teachers instead choose typical samples before class for careful approval, and then work with students to evaluate typical examples during class (Sun, 2020).

Research questions

- 1) How can TSCA be carried out in the academic English writing classroom?
- 2) Is it effective?
- 3) What are students' perceptions of TSCA?

Method

Context and Participants

As previously indicated, mainland Chinese university English teachers used the teacher-only method to evaluate writing. However, when there are 80 or even 140 students in a class, grading written assignments from students becomes a real burden and a nuisance. For professors, keeping up with grading and providing comments in such sizable courses has become an impossible task. To address the difficulties experienced by Chinese teachers, TSCA is created to build on the qualities of these other evaluations (see Table 1 for a comparison of TSCA and other assessment styles).

Table 1

Type	Who & How	When	What
Teacher	Teacher assesses and marks each individual draft.	After class	Quality of the written work
Self	Students revise their own writing.	Mainly after class, but can also be done in class	Quality of the written work
Peer	Students revise their peers' writing.	Mainly after class, but can also be done in class	Quality of the written work
TSCA	Students and teacher work on the selected sample in class. Students revise their own or peers' draft or resort to the computer software after class.	In class + after class	Teaching objectives + quality of the written

In contrast to other assessment methods (refer to Table 1), TSCA possesses three distinct characteristics, as outlined by Wen (2016). The first distinguishing feature of TSCA is the collaborative nature between students and teachers. It is not a mere amalgamation of teacher assessment, self-assessment, peer assessment, and machine assessment; rather, it represents a cooperative evaluation process wherein the teacher selects a sample of students' typical written work for a specific task, which is subsequently evaluated jointly by both students and the teacher during class.

Secondly, within TSCA, both teachers and students assess not only the quality of the work but also the attainment of learning outcomes. TSCA goes beyond merely assessing students' language products; it encompasses an examination of whether students have successfully achieved the objectives of the unit they have studied. This form of assessment places significant emphasis on evaluating how well students have met the learning objectives, rather than solely focusing on the quality of the produced work.

Another distinctive aspect of TSCA is the incorporation of multiple assessments. Following in-class TSCA, students gain a better understanding of assessment techniques, which serves as a foundation for them to engage in effective self-assessment or peer assessment after the class. Subsequently, the revised version can be evaluated using an automated scoring system, allowing students to view their scores and access general comments. Furthermore, they can maintain records of their progress.

The fourth-grade students majoring in English are the teaching subjects for the assessment design case provided in this paper, which is used in the Academic English Writing course. English is not the teacher's first language. 38 students, ages 21 to 22, who are native Chinese speakers (8 men and 30 women). English proficiency is average among all pupils. None of the pupils had any prior TSCA experience.

This course, which is required for English majors, will help students write academic English more effectively so they can handle writing their graduation theses. The class meets once a week for eight weeks during the semester and lasts 90 minutes. Students have a particular foundation in English writing and have completed comprehensive English, Advanced English, English writing, and other courses prior to enrolling in this course. Prior to instruction, the author examined the instructional materials in their entirety, planned lessons with the other teachers on the research team, and developed comprehensive lesson plans and teaching sequences.

Nesi and Gardner (2012) use the British Academic English Corpus to show that there is a significant difference between the sorts of academic assignments given in lower grades and upper grades in British higher education, with essays being the most typical type of assignment given in lower classes. Additionally, Charles & Pecorari (2016) noted that undergraduates should concentrate on

developing their essay and research report writing skills. The study mentioned above suggests that teaching academic writing should begin with instruction in essay writing.

The writing task investigated in this study aligns with the overall writing objective and encompasses four specific sub-goals. After assigning the writing task, the author guides students through an in-class discussion regarding the thesis and outline of their writing. This discussion serves as support for shaping the content and structural aspects of the writing task, emphasizing the importance of precise semantic expression during task completion. Following the class, students write their essays and submit electronic manuscripts a day prior to the next class. The initial drafts of these four essays serve as the basis for evaluation.

The instructor reviews all student compositions, determines the focal points for evaluation and corrects representative samples. The TSCA cycle initiates with the submission of these initial drafts and concludes with the submission of revised versions. TSCA activities take place once the students' first draft compositions have been collected. The duration of each in-class TSCA session varies from 20 to 40 minutes, contingent upon the specific assessment focus and the overall course schedule. TSCA comprised three distinct stages: pre-class preparation, in-class assessment, and post-class revision, as detailed by Wen (2016b). The pre-class phase involved the teacher selecting and grading a representative set of student-written works to be collectively evaluated during the class. Students worked in groups of four to discuss and improve the selected work under the teacher's guidance, combining assessment with instruction. The post-class phase was dedicated to individual revision, marking the completion of a TSCA cycle. Post-class revisions were particularly significant, as they allowed students to consolidate their learning through self- assessment or peer assessment, guided by the principles established during the in-class phase. Afterward, an automated scoring system was used to provide students with scores, general feedback, and a record of their progress.

Writing Task 4 encompasses the primary content of the first three compositions. Consequently, students are instructed to consider the evaluation criteria of the first three compositions when addressing the requirements of Writing Task 4. Each assignment is directly linked to the content covered in the class discussions and does not necessitate additional expansion. While students are not explicitly tasked with revising their drafts, they have an opportunity to revise the first three pieces of written work within the final composition, which consolidates all three prior submissions. For a more detailed breakdown, please refer to Table 2.

Table 2

Assignment	Class Content
1	Describe the case (Background of the narrative)
2	Explain reasons (Lexical variation)
3	Throw out a suggestion (Topic sentence)
4	Give results (Communicative appropriateness)

Data Collection

Observations in the classroom, teaching portfolios, semi-structured interviews, and reflective journals were utilized to record the TSCA's implementation as well as the opinions of the students and teachers. By combining these, it was hoped to present a more complete picture of TSCA than could be obtained by using just one method. Students' written work (first draft and amended version), interview recordings, and journals written by the teacher and students were among the types of information that were gathered in the form of video and audio recordings of the class (teacher instructions and student discussions).

The TSCA sessions were first audio-recorded and video-recorded during classroom observations. Using their personal smartphones, students recorded the group conversations. In order to gauge how successfully the students were participating in the TSCA, the teacher observed the class while instructing, looked at the videos, and listened to the audios after class. Second, two semi-

structured interviews in Chinese were conducted in the first semester and recorded following the TSCA cycles. These interviews were created to elicit information from the students on their participation in the TSCA in class and their subsequent revision. Eight students were purposely chosen for interviews after the first writing assignment based on their revisions: three came from the "well-revised" group, three from the "ill-revised" group, and two from the "mediocre-revised" group. The second interview was held once the second writing assignment was turned in. Six students—not the six who took part in the initial interview—were picked at random and subjected to individual interviews for roughly 10 minutes each.

The interviewees had the chance to consider a number of TSCA-related issues, including whether they could spot the issue in the chosen sample, their correction, and their assessment of the TSCA. Students were given the assurance that their answers would not affect their final grade and that the teacher would only use the interviews to diagnose and improve her teaching. Lastly, students produced reflections (in Chinese) about their writing, TSCA, and revision from four perspectives after each cycle: general evaluation, gains, issues, and suggestions. Based on the students' student IDs, the diaries were labeled as student 1, 2, 3, etc. The instructor also considered the effectiveness and potential issues with the TSCA practice in the classroom.

Instructional Procedures

Preparation Before Class

Teachers should first examine if the instructional goal has been attained and the efficacy of the promotion strategies used to reach the aim. The former relates to the accomplishment of instructional goals, whereas the latter relates to the success of promotional efforts. The teacher decides to evaluate the narrative backdrop, topic sentence, and communicative appropriateness because she determines that the communication aim has not been properly attained after reading and analyzing the student's written content. The evaluation focus is switched to lexical diversity as an extension of facilitation when it is determined that the linguistic aim has not been successfully attained.

The concept of a "communication goal" pertains to the specific communication task one aims to achieve. In the context of POA (Process-Oriented Approach), there is an emphasis on producing output in real-life situations. This real-life output scenario encompasses four key elements: the topic, the purpose, the identity, and the occasion. This type of output is rooted in genuine, practical situations, serving a specific purpose and involving actual speech communication rather than the creation of virtual text. Consequently, the success of communication is intricately linked to the appropriateness and precision of language usage. The language form should align with the context, the communication objective, and the intended audience, ensuring that both spoken and written language are suitable for the "topic situation". However, it's common for second language writers, particularly among Chinese students, to overlook the significance of relevance in communication, often lacking a strong awareness of the reader. For an extended period, students have mistakenly believed that the primary reader of their compositions is the teacher, or they have not considered the intended audience of their writing, perceiving the act of writing as merely a means to complete an assignment.

For instance, in preparing to assess writing task 1, the author discovered that despite the effectiveness of the prior promotion activities, where students not only had something to say but also used accurate words and expressed themselves fluently, the common issue was that the length of describing the case's background was too long, and the case process was not highlighted, which led to the communication goal of "describing the case" not being successfully attained. The theme sentence in the body paragraph of the rescue proposal frequently has ambiguous wording, which makes it difficult to clearly explain the main idea and prevents Task 3's purpose of "putting forward suggestions to encourage rescue" from being effectively accomplished.

Language goals encompass the acquisition of vocabulary, phrases, grammar, and other linguistic elements required to successfully complete communicative tasks. The attainment of these language goals is also a central aspect of teacher assessment. For instance, when evaluating students'

compositions for Task 2, common issues may include the use of monotonous and unengaging language, such as excessive reliance on words like "people," "help," "indifferent," "emergencies," and so on. If words like "bystander," "witness," "offer assistance," "lend a hand," "apathetic," and "incident," which were taught in class, are not utilized, it indicates that the language goal has not been effectively met. Hence, the emphasis in the second assessment, namely "lexical diversity," is closely tied to the achievement of language goals. Connecting evaluation with these language objectives serves a dual purpose: it raises students' awareness of their linguistic limitations and encourages them to incorporate newly acquired vocabulary into their writing, ultimately facilitating the attainment of their language goals.

Implementation in class

1) Find the problem

Following the teacher's presentation of the sample, students embark on an initial attempt to identify any issues. At this juncture, two scenarios may unfold: (1) the student identifies the problem and proceeds to the next stage, or (2) the student fails to identify the problem. Typically, the latter scenario is more prevalent, as the difficulty of evaluating the target is slightly beyond the student's current cognitive level.

To illustrate this second situation, the author employs the evaluation of the first output task as an example. Initially, the students highlighted the strengths of the sample, noting that "the author leads the reader into the scene" and "the opening paragraph is concise, providing a stark contrast with the subsequent instances." However, when it becomes evident that the student has missed the core issue, the teacher draws attention to the underlined and bold sections, prompting the student to contemplate their primary roles. Subsequently, the students recognize that the underlined portion serves as the background for the case, while the bold section describes the case itself. This realization quickly leads them to acknowledge certain problems with this arrangement: the case's background is excessively lengthy, the case's progression lacks emphasis, and the desired output objective is not effectively accomplished.

2) Explanation of teacher

The teacher uses a combination of "comment" and "talk" when the students become aware of the problems in the sample to help the students climb a ladder and solve the problems in the sample. While "talk" concentrates on "how to write" and "why," "comment" focuses on "what went wrong" and "how to correct." The "how to" and "why" sections can really be combined to serve as a transition from locating sample problems to fixing them.

As an illustration, during the explanation phase of the third evaluation, which focused on the topic sentence, the teacher emphasized that a topic sentence should encompass both the theme and the central idea of the paragraph. All other sentences within the paragraph should revolve around these core elements. Subsequently, the teacher introduced a 2-minute micro-lesson video explaining the technique for constructing an effective topic sentence.

Students then attempted to revise a sample topic sentence. After their initial attempts, the teacher pointed out that the main idea in the topic sentence was not clearly articulated. Collaboratively, the teacher and students revised it to read as follows: "The government can pass a law to protect those helpers in emergencies." In this revised version, the underlined section serves as the topic of the paragraph, signifying how the government promotes assistance, while the bold part represents the central idea—the development of the paragraph, which entails the introduction of laws

to safeguard rescuers. Ultimately, the teacher reminded the students to check whether their paragraphs included a topic sentence, whether the central idea within the topic sentence was well-defined, and whether this central idea effectively "shapes" the entire paragraph.

After-school revision

Post-class self-assessment and peer assessment take place under the guidance of teachers. When assigning post-class revision tasks, teachers provide students with clear instructions regarding the revision process and the specific requirements, ensuring that students have a well-defined understanding of the task's steps and focus. Students go through a three-step revision process. Each revision iteration involves peer mediation, with assistance from others situated within the zone of proximal development. The initial self-assessment aligns with the class's evaluation criteria, with students systematically assessing their work according to the evaluation checklist before re-reading the text. In the second self-assessment phase, students engage in face-to-face discussions to negotiate the meaning based on the revision suggestions provided by their peers. Subsequently, they make amendments in accordance with their partner's suggestions. The third and final self-evaluation entails modifications based on the recommendations generated by an automatic scoring system.

As an illustration, during the revision phase that follows the fourth evaluation, students first assess and rewrite based on Draft 1, then save the paper as Draft 2; The work was then saved as Draft 3 after undergoing a second round of self-review and revision in response to peer feedback. For instance, during the self-evaluation phase, students realized that the two questions in the opening paragraph did not serve the purpose of writing online comments. They deleted them and then rewrote the opening paragraph of the article, casting the readers as other forum participants and positioning them to express their opinions in a way that is friendly and sympathetic to David.

Students always anticipate favorable feedback from teachers in multi-draft writing, especially after submitting the final copy. The teacher should now take full advantage of the students' upbeat emotional states and reward those who do the assignment on time and well. This will maximize the influence of the incentive. Recommending high caliber work is possible at any point in the grading process, not just after the student has turned in a new draft. After a first draft's in-class evaluation, the demonstration can be improved again. For instance, the instructor gave the students a revision exercise and suggested they read three draft essays. The promotion acts as a motivational tool for the referees as well as a model for other students.

Discussion

The Effectiveness of TSCA

The final task encompassed everything from the first three tasks. The improvement made by the pupils are evident when comparing the final output with their rough draft. The writing of student 12 has likewise shown similar changes. He updated his topic sentences by including more facts to make them clearer after the second and third TSCAs on lexical variety and how to build effective topic sentences. His initial promise to "be the first one" was not very specific. He changed it, though, following TSCA, to "to be the first to offer assistance," which was much clearer. It is important to note that he used "offer assistance" and "lend a hand" instead of repeatedly using the word "help" in the same paragraph.

Student 20's revision of task 4 serves as an example of how students have improved as writers. Students eventually understood the need for and "strategy" behind a summary of the previous paragraph's content before moving on to direct the reader's attention to what to look for next in order to make their arguments flow. Paragraphs 2 and 3 were two "unrelated" paragraphs in the original manuscript. By introducing a subordinate clause preceded by the word "although," the error was fixed in the updated text by connecting the major ideas of the previous paragraph to those of the next one. It is important

to note that the automated grading system noted when the student published the revision online that "The author achieved fluency by means of some simple cohesive devices."

Students' Perceptions

In their thoughts, all the students praised TSCA and concurred that it was a useful technique for identifying areas for improvement in their writing. They claimed that TSCA had given them a fresh perspective on "self-assessment" and "self-revision" and that they had benefited much from it. By the end of the first semester, students had become aware of their writing's flaws and issues. They were aware of their own mistakes, and it is just this understanding that is necessary for advancement. Twenty students, or 52%, specifically stated that they were aware of "common problems that were frequently overlooked before":

...I am aware of these issues following TSCA. I always reviewed it over before submitting it to be sure I did not make any of the problems the teacher had pointed out. (Student 8)

Data from the students' initial interviews showed the opposite, as follows:

I don't write in revisions very much. The majority of the time, I would turn it in without reading it a second time, just like my fellow classmates did. (Student 12)

By the end of the semester, this "no-revision" approach had been changed to "multiple-revision" practice. Eight students (21%) spoke about the value of revision:

...There is no room for me to get any better at revising my writing. After completing four TSCAs, I realized that rewriting can improve writing skills and that strong writing results from regular editing. (Student 6)

Redrafting and identifying writing flaws are essential for improving learning. Problems are recognized and corrected, which results in improvement. After an average of 4 modifications, 20 students (83%) submitted their updated manuscript to the online automated grading tool. TSCA is helpful for writing revision, according to all of the students' reports after a year of classroom practice. Students noted their gains from the class discussion and the teacher's guidance in addition to their awareness and the shift in their habits.

One-third of the class stated in their reflection that talking with their classmates was very helpful. Students learn about other points of view and perspectives throughout the group discussion, which in turn inspires them to come up with new ideas. For instance, pupil number four thought:

The classroom discussion, in my opinion, is also quite productive. Everybody has a different perspective. I have expanded my own ideas as a result of the dialogue.

Student 14 echoed:

I learned how to order my sentences and even the entire section by talking about my writing with my students, especially the ones who are better writers than I am. I learned how they connect their ideas to form a logical argument, which is a huge benefit to me.

TSCA facilitated a lively and engaging learning environment. Students could consider whether or not their own ideas were sound after hearing their peers' revisions. Additionally, as more students became comfortable with the processes and goals of evaluation, they began to be motivated by their

peers and transformed from "listeners" to "participants." The dynamics of the classroom were altered since everyone acted as "scaffolds" for one another.

The teacher's guidance is one of the key components of TSCA. The teacher ensured the success of TSCA by choosing a focus, choosing representative samples, helping the students recognize the flaws in the sample, and encouraging teamwork. In their reflections, 18 pupils emphasized the significance of the teacher.

My teacher brought up several issues with our compositions in class. I was extremely "lucky" because those issues also affected me. I felt I significantly improved after the teacher's instructions and my own revision in accordance with them. (student 7).

My teacher brought up the problem of overusing words in class, such people and help. Given that it is also a problem I have, it made a lasting impression on me. After review, I thought that my writing had significantly improved in terms of my ability to communicate my ideas. Additionally, I am now aware of the extensive context. (Student 20).

TSCA tries to lighten the strain on teachers, but it doesn't lessen their accountability (Wen, 2016b). Teachers in the TSCA are both "decision-makers" and "scaffolders." On the one hand, the teacher decides the assessment's focus based on the students' written work and skill level. Contrarily, it is the instructor who dynamically modifies the assessment's pace and content in accordance with the time constraints in the classroom and how effectively the pupils respond to it. Teachers offer the qualified support in TSCA, which is preferable to self or peer assessment.

Conclusion

The effectiveness of various types of assessment, including teacher assessment, self-assessment, peer assessment, and machine assessment, has been the subject of numerous studies to date. However, little attention has been given to how these forms can be integrated into classroom activities, let alone how to combine these forms into a single holistic assessment to maximize effectiveness. The current study proposed TSCA and executed it in a classroom environment with peer evaluation and automated scoring systems as a supplement after class to arrange and balance the various types of assessment. Its use in real or actual classrooms is supported by the precise pre-class, in-class, and post-class procedures. The theory was initially developed in the classroom, where rules and tactics for ensuring accurate evaluation were added.

In order to guarantee that assessment is done with learning in mind, this article suggested a set of rules for choosing a focus to assess and provided examples of how TSCA was applied. The first and second drafts of the most recent writing assignment demonstrated the growth of the students. One focus worked well for concentrating pupils' attention on one idea. When revising, they found it to be both simpler and more advantageous to concentrate solely on one problem. A teacher followed the steps of problem-identification and sample-revision while providing the appropriate instructions to conduct a targeted in-class assessment. This was accomplished by constantly encouraging pupils to solve the issues and come up with answers on their own. Only when it was necessary was assistance offered.

The analysis of students' reflection and interview data reveals important pedagogical implications for teachers. A thorough examination of these findings indicates that students predominantly hold positive attitudes toward TSCA (Teacher-Student Collaborative Assessment). They expressed that TSCA in the classroom provided them with valuable opportunities for discussion and idea-sharing, which in turn facilitated the revision process after class. Furthermore, students began to recognize that producing a high-quality piece of writing required multiple revisions, and they demonstrated a willingness to put in the effort to rewrite their essays more than once.

It's important to note that the learning process is not linear, and as such, teachers should not expect students to fully grasp new concepts or correct their errors through a single assessment. TSCA serves to heighten learners' awareness of their writing issues, enabling them to bear these issues in mind when undertaking subsequent writing tasks. Additionally, teachers can enhance their teaching by incorporating assessment and strengthen assessment through further instruction. By adopting this

approach, learning and improvement in writing will naturally follow.

Since TSCA is still in its early stages, a dynamic research agenda will likely take place for some time. The TSCA could use more research in three areas. First, as the current study is solely qualitative, additional empirical research with experimental design is required to investigate the relative effectiveness of TSCA. Second, a deeper theoretical development of TSCA would enhance teaching techniques. For instance, teachers frequently run into difficulties when implementing TSCA, such as how to offer expert advice. Teachers could apply TSCA more skillfully if a thorough study on the topic were conducted. Finally, given that this study only examined the effectiveness of TSCA for written work, additional research can be done to see whether TSCA would be successful when applied to oral work.

References

- Barber, C. L. (1962). Some measurable characteristics of modern scientific prose. *Contributions to English syntax and philology*, 21-43.
- Charles, M., & Pecorari, D. (2015). *Introducing English for academic purposes*. Routledge.
- Gao, Y., Zhang, F., Zhang, S., & Schunn, C. D. (2018). Effects of receiving peer feedback in english writing: a study based on Peerceptiv. *Technology Enhanced Foreign Language Education*, 180(2), 3-9.
- Han, J. (2001). English Writing Teaching: Process Style approach. *Foreign Language Field* (4), 6.
- Lee, I., Mak, P., & Burns, A. (2016). EFL teachers' attempts at feedback innovation in the writing classroom. *Language teaching research*, 20(2), 248-269.
- Nesi, H., & Gardner, S. (2012). *Genres across the disciplines: Student writing in higher education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Novakovich, J. (2016). Fostering critical thinking and reflection through blog-mediated peer feedback. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 32(1), 16-30.
- Ruegg, R. (2015). The relative effects of peer and teacher feedback on improvement in EFL students' writing ability. *Linguistics and Education*, 29, 73-82.
- Sun, S. (2020). Optimizing teacher-student collaborative assessment in the production-oriented approach: A dialectical research. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 43(3), 305-322.
- Sun, H., & Wang, M. (2022). Effects of teacher intervention and type of peer feedback on student writing revision. *Language Teaching Research*, 13621688221080507.
- Tian, L., & Li, L. (2018). Chinese EFL learners' perception of peer oral and written feedback as providers, receivers and observers. *Language Awareness*, 27(4), 312-330.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In RW Rieber & AS Carton (eds.), *The collected works of LS Vygotsky. Problems of general psychology* (pp, 1, 1987).
- Wang, W. (2014). Students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing: A longitudinal inquiry. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 80-96.

- Wen, Q. (2018). The production-oriented approach to teaching university students English in China. *Language Teaching*, 51(4), 526-540.
- Yan, M. (2014). Construction of Academic English Writing ability evaluation system in colleges and universities. *Journal of Foreign Languages* (6), 5.
- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2014). An analysis of Chinese EFL students' use of first and second language in peer feedback of L2 writing. *System*, 47, 28-38.
- Yu, S., & Liu, C. (2021). Improving student feedback literacy in academic writing: An evidence-based framework. *Assessing Writing*, 48, 100525.
- Zeng, X. (2020). Design and Application of Teacher-student Collaborative Assessment in College English Writing Class. *Journal of Southwest University of Science and Technology*, 37(2), 19-25.
- Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. *Assessing Writing*, 37, 13-24.
- Xiong, S., & Zou, W. (2012). What is English for Academic Purposes? How to teach? -- A classroom experimental study of "Academic English" for English major undergraduates. *Chinese Foreign Languages* (2), 11.