

APA CITATION:

Kilickaya, F. (2017). Peer assessment of group members in tertiary contexts. In M.Sowa & J. Krajka (Eds.), *Innovations in languages for specific purposes - Present challenges and future promises* (pp. 329-343). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Ferit Kilickaya

Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Burdur, Turkey

Peer assessment of group members in tertiary contexts

Abstract: The current chapter aimed at investigating language students' perceptions of peer assessment of the group members' contribution to group work. The research context of the study included the department of foreign language education at a state university in Burdur, Turkey. The participants were 35 students enrolled at the third-year class entitled "Teaching Language Skills I", aiming at helping students further their understanding of the theories and principles on which various language teaching methods are based. The data were collected through the semi-structured interviews conducted with the participants, who were asked to assess their group members based on the rating scale determined by the researcher. The overall findings from this small study support the use of self- and peer assessment in group work in tertiary contexts. However, the results also indicated that friendship bias and lack of training/experience played an important role in how the participants rated their group members.

Keywords: self-assessment, peer assessment, group work, tertiary contexts

1. Introduction

Assessment of learning objectives efficiently and effectively is considered highly important in any field of education. Gareis and Grant (2015) state that when the instruments of classroom assessment such as quizzes and tests are aligned to the classroom topics and activities, they can provide valid and reliable evidence on student learning, encourage students to learn as well as act as an important source of feedback for both teachers and students to monitor learning and teaching practices. Gareis and Grant list the main merits of assessment as follows: "to garner information about the nature and degree of student learning; to make near-term instructional decisions; to make long-term decisions about curriculum, instruction, and assessment; to communicate the nature and/or degree of learning to others (typically through a grade); to provide feedback to students in order to progress their own learning" (Gareis and Grant 2015: 145). Based on these main merits, with formative assessment, it is possible to improve students' success when learners are encouraged to perceive "a gap between the present and the desired state of knowledge, understanding, or skill and the learner takes action to close the gap and

meet the targeted level” (Katz and Gottlieb 2013: 4). Student assessment, therefore, is unavoidable since it is useful to ensure quality instruction (Webber and Scott 2016) in the classroom where assessment practices are mostly conducted by the teacher (Atjonen 2014). These assessment practices include formal or informal observations, classroom tests, interactions, self- and peer assessment, portfolios, and performance evaluations (Purpura 2016).

Out of these assessment practices, peer assessment receives much more attention, especially in English for Academic Purposes tertiary contexts. According to Kane and Lawler (1978: 555), “peer assessment is the process of having the members of a group judge the extent to which each of their fellow group members has exhibited specified traits, behaviors, or achievements.” Encouraging students to work in groups and assess each other helps them learn how to cooperate with others, which is also important in both educational and other contexts. Cooperation provides several benefits to learners in educational settings such as constructing knowledge through interaction and sharing this knowledge with other members to achieve the common goals. When students work in groups and cooperate with one another, assessing the outcome of group work requires judging the collective efforts (Race 2001; Boud, Cohen and Sampson 1999).

Despite these potential benefits of peer assessment, assessment of individual contributions in the group work activities appears to be the main concern for teachers willing to incorporate group work activities in educational settings. More specifically, assessing each student’s contribution to a group and grading this contribution becomes a demanding task for teachers.

Therefore, the current study aimed at identifying the language students’ perceptions of peer-assessment of the group members enrolled at the department of foreign language education in a Turkish state university.

2. Literature review

Several studies have investigated the role of self- and peer assessment in a variety of contexts. For example, Nortcliffe (2012) studied whether students would assess themselves and their peers through formative and summative assessment in a curriculum module entitled ‘Web-design and development.’ The participants of the study included the students of computer networking. The results indicated that the students valued the feedback provided by their peers as well as considered self- and group work assessment a fair method of assessment.

In a quasi-experimental study, Tamjid and Birjandi (2011) incorporated self- and peer assessment into the feedback provided to the learners. Fifty-nine intermediate students of EFL at Islamic Azad University of Tabriz participated in this study.

The results revealed that learners' learning and autonomy were enhanced through self- and peer assessment.

In another study (Falchikov 1993), learners assessed the process of cooperation in the group work project. The process was evaluated by learners in the groups, while the product of the group was traditionally marked by the lecturer. Based on the results, it was concluded that self- and peer assessment of the collective efforts in the group work appeared to be an effective way and a viable solution to the evaluation of group work.

Another study (Conway, Kember, Siva and Wu 1993) indicated that the assessment of peers' contribution to group work was well accepted by students. However, it was also noted that peer assessment should be considered in a lesser portion by the lecturer while assigning the final grade. The study conducted by Stefani (1994) presented peer- and self assessment procedures to first-year undergraduate students. These procedures were conducted while the participants were writing reports of laboratory practical projects. The results of this study indicated that peer- and self-assessment, when the assignments were clearly defined and monitored, led to realistic perceptions on both their own abilities and their peers' achievements.

Falchikov (1995) studied peer evaluation of thirteen students in the human developmental psychology course. The participants of the study evaluated their peers' work based on a marking scheme provided by the lecturer of the course. The results indicated several benefits of peer assessment such as enhancing critical abilities and learning. However, it was noted that some participants did not find it appropriate to grade their peers' work, especially in groups where the members were quite familiar with one another.

Freeman (1995) conducted a peer assessment experiment with 210 senior students in an undergraduate business class. The participants themselves formed their groups to complete two tasks and were supposed to evaluate group work oral presentations using a 22-point guide considering content and presentation, contributing to 25% of a participant's overall grade in the course. The marks given by the groups were compared with those of a lecturer that rated the presentations. The results indicated that the evaluations provided by the groups were similar to those of the lecturer.

The study conducted by Stanier (1997) also confirms the evaluations based on the questionnaire that the students felt they benefited from peer assessment in a second-year undergraduate module offered for Interdisciplinary Studies in Environmental and Applied Sciences.

In another study conducted by Gatfield (1999), students' satisfaction with group work projects and peer assessment was analyzed. The participants of the

study included the students enrolled at International Marketing Management class. The findings revealed high levels of student satisfaction with group work projects and peer assessment.

The studies reviewed so far have focused on assessment of individual work carried out through group projects. However, peer assessment of group members regarding their contribution to group work has been the focus of many other studies as this type of assessment requires several factors to be considered.

In an action research project, Walker (2001) studied the students' perceptions of group work and peer assessment in a postgraduate teaching certificate program. The participants included one hundred fifty-six students in the psychology department. The data were collected through questionnaires on group work and peer assessment. The results indicated that the participants had positive attitudes towards group work and peer assessment although they expressed concerns regarding the workload distribution in group work activities, possibility of bias, and the lack of experience/training in assessing peers. The adoption of peer assessment practices especially in group work activities appears to be one of the major barriers in tertiary contexts since it is widely believed that peer ratings are prone to be affected by the relationships existing between the group members.

Regarding the bias, similarly, Magin (2001) studied whether the relationships between the group members would affect the students' peer assessment practices. The participants included first-year students in introductory clinical and behavioral studies. The data collected included peer assessments from 169 students in 16 groups. Although the assessments provided by group members were stated to be affected by friendships in the groups as indicated by several other studies, the results of the study indicated that the effect found was determined to be negligible, leading to account for 1% of the variance. The results confirmed the findings of another study that was conducted by Montgomery (1986).

Davies (2009) provides a review of literature on group work assessment in tertiary institutions. Among the important issues stressed by this review article is the problem of free-rider, who can be defined as a member who does not contribute to the group work activities but benefits from the accomplishments.

Another study (Elliott and Higgins 2005) explored the ways in which the inclusion of self- and peer assessment in group work would affect the overall assessment. The study involved the students who were registered nurses or midwives enrolled in a post-graduate course in Clinical Health Sciences Education. The authors developed a self- and peer assessment tool through which the participants evaluated both their own and other members' contribution to group work. The findings indicated that the tool used positively affected the student perceptions

of the fairness of assessment as well as their motivation and contribution to the group work, which was also stressed by Nordberg (2006).

Johnston and Miles (2004) studied how self- and peer assessment worked together to determine and assess the contributions of group members to group assignments. The participants were the students in an undergraduate social psychology laboratory course working on empirical projects in small groups. The findings revealed that the participants valued peer assessment tasks and assessed group members seriously on the questionnaires. However, the findings also indicated that the participants rated their own contribution to the group work higher than that of other group members.

3. The study

3.1. Purpose of the study

There are various studies researching the dynamics of peer assessment and group work activities; however, to the best knowledge of the author, there is not any study conducted on the language students' perceptions of peer assessment in the group work activities. Therefore, the purpose of the research was to identify the language students' perceptions of peer assessment of the group members enrolled at the department of foreign language education in a Turkish state university.

3.2. Research context and participants

The research context of the study included the department of foreign language education at a Turkish state university in Burdur, Turkey. The participants included 35 students, aged between 21–23, 10 being male, while the rest female, enrolled in the third-year class entitled 'Teaching Language Skills I'. The class aimed at helping students further their understanding of the theories and principles on which various language teaching methods are based. During this course, students gained basic rules to be followed for a successful presentation, a variety of ways to teach grammar, reading, and writing, and gained practice in what was presented in lectures. The class also included observations of mini model lessons and implementation of microteaching tasks by students.

3.3. Data collection and procedure

A qualitative approach to data collection was adopted in accordance with the aim of the study. The data were collected through semi-structured interviews conducted with the participants based on their ratings of the members in their group work (Appendix A). During the last four weeks of the fall semester (2015), the participants

worked in groups of 4–5 to do a 35- to 40-minute microteaching in the areas and skills covered in the course in order to practise the techniques introduced and to get used to classroom management procedures. The group members were required to submit the revised version of the lesson plan on the final day but were advised to have the lesson plan ready one week before the presentation and to seek guidance from the instructor. The group members were asked to rate other members of the group based on their contribution to the group work activities through the rating scale (Appendix A). The participants were informed that thirty percent of the average mark obtained on the peer assessment (sum of the individual scores from assessment divided by the number of the members in the group) and seventy percent of the lecturer's assessment would be taken into consideration.

The study conducted by Hanrahan and Isaacs (2001) indicated that when students practised assessing assignments with guidance provided by their lecturer they felt more experienced, avoiding the feeling that they did not have enough experience to assess their peers. Therefore, the current study included tutorial sessions on how to conduct self- and peer assessment regarding group work through hands-on experience on the rating scale. At the end of the semester, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 35 participants that agreed to participate in the interviews. The interviews were conducted in the participants' mother tongue (Turkish) in the researcher's office. The interviews lasted 10–15 minutes and were recorded using a digital recorder and transcribed verbatim, except for five participants who did not agree to that.

3.4. Data analysis

The data collected were subject to content analysis, which was first done by the researcher. The responses were coded for themes and patterns. Following the initial data analysis, the transcripts were shared with an expert in English language teaching whose publications include self-assessment studies. Regular meetings were held with this expert to ensure the credibility of the themes and patterns as well as to compare codes and patterns. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance Law was calculated to ensure the reliability of content analysis, which was found to be .81.3.

4. Findings and discussion

The themes and the illustrative selective responses have been provided in Table 1. The quotations have been selected to illustrate the most representative of the findings of the study.

Table 1. Illustrative selected responses and corresponding themes

Selected responses	Theme
With peer assessment, I had difficulty in rating the contribution of my friend, actually my best friend. I did not want to give a low score for her work.	Friendship bias
I think I was affected by the relationship that I had with my group members. For instance, I cannot get along well with one of the group members. I might have given a low score for the contribution of that student.	
I do not think that a student can be as competent as the lecturer can. I mean, lecturers have years of experience and can easily point out the weaknesses and strengths. As a result, students cannot perform as lecturers do while grading the work.	Lack of experience/ training
We had some sort of training regarding the training, but I believe that it is not enough. There should be more marking experience. I mean we should study more work and focus on the rating scale in detail so that we can feel confident enough to assess contribution as lecturers do. Otherwise, it will not be reliable or accurate.	
To some extent, it is beneficial to rate others because some of the group members did not attend the meetings and expected us to do the work for them.	Free riders
All my friends in my group tried to do their best as we were well informed that the rating scales would be taken into consideration.	From “graded” to “grader”
It was an interesting and challenging task. We, students, are used to being assessed but not assessing. We learned how difficult it was to assess others.	
It is quite difficult to assess others. I have learned how lecturers feel when they grade work. We have just graded several members in the group, but lecturers do have to grade many and while doing this, they have to be objective. That is hard work.	

4.1. Friendship bias

The responses regarding the positive and negative aspects of peer assessment clearly indicate that the great majority of the participants (n=32) suffered from friendship bias. Since the participants were allowed to select their group members, the group members happened to know each other well. Therefore, as the responses indicated, the participants were greatly affected by the social relationships with the members of the group during the assessment procedure. Since being loyal to a close friend is an important concept among Turkish students, the participants were reluctant to offer criticism or to give accurate assessment considering the contribution of the group member. Depending on how well the group members get along with, this

relationship seems to affect the assessment in a positive or negative way. In other words, it can be stated that the participants' peer assessment is subject to friendship bias and the level and the extent of friendship affects how raters judge the performance and/or contribution of the group members. One of the participants expresses this friendship bias as follows:

When I rated my group members' contribution to the group work, I think the relationship with the members affected my scoring. I mean since I know my members very well and spend time together with them outside the classroom, I could not resist giving high scores to them. We are friends, and I did not want them to do bad in the course (Interviewee ID-15, Female).

It is also due to note that some of the participants assigned low scores while rating their own contribution in the self-assessment section of the scale, while other group members rated these students' contribution very high, which is not consistent with the results of the previous study (Johnston and Miles 2004). This finding indicates that the group members rated their own contribution lower than that of other group members. These special cases were noted and addressed multiple times during the interviews. The participants were asked to account for these 'interesting' cases. While some participants expressed the view that they did not have any opinions regarding the issues, some (n= 8) claimed that they might have rated their group members' contribution high due to the good relationship with those students, which confirms the fact that in Turkish educational contexts friendship plays an important role in peer assessment. This finding is consistent with the results of the studies conducted by Walker (2001) in that students indicated concerns regarding the possibility of bias and the lack of experience in assessing peers. As the great majority of the participants expressed the view that friendship or relationships with other members of the group played an important role in their ratings, it cannot be negligible, which is contrary to the findings of the study conducted by Magin (2001).

4.2. Lack of training/experience

Another important point stressed by the participants regards the lack of experience/training in assessing the group members' contribution. Most participants (n=23) stated that they did not feel competent while rating their group members' contribution to the group work since they believed that the training provided was not enough. The participants were provided with tutorial sessions on how to assess group members using a pre-determined scoring rubric following the midterm exams; however, the responses clearly indicated that the training provided did not lead them to avoid the feeling of lack of experience to assess group members. Moreover,

as some participants (n=20) indicated, they had never assessed group members in any other courses as all the assessment was carried out by the course lecturers. This must have contributed to the feeling of lack of experience in rating their peers, which confirms the findings of the study conducted by Walker (2001). The following extract brings this issue out clearly:

The sessions where we practiced peer assessment were useful. This practice helped me during the assessment of my group members; however, I think it was not enough for me to feel confident enough to assess the group members. This was the first time that I assessed other group members. In other courses, we did group work together, but all the assessments were carried out by the lecturers. We were not involved in the assessment decisions. I mean, we did not assess others. (Interviewee ID-20, Male)

4.3. Free riders

Another common theme determined in the responses was the notion of free-riders. Free riders are the group members that benefit from the work produced without contributing to group work activities. As Davies (2009) indicates, it is an important issue that should be dealt with great care. The participants (n=21) stated that since all the group members knew that they would be evaluated by other group members regarding several issues such as how group members contributed to group work and whether they attended the group meetings, they had few problems regarding the equal contribution of the group members. The problem of free riders seems to have been resolved in this study through using peer assessment in the group work activities.

One of the participants clearly points out how peer assessment helped with the issue of free riders as follows:

Most of the time I do not want to do group work since it is not rare that some members of the group do not come to the meetings or do a little for the success of the group without no good reason. Most or all the work is done by other members, which is a great burden for them. When you inform your lecturer about this, they blame you for ratting out group members. However, in the class we did not have any problems with that. Peer assessment helped us avoid that problem since everyone was well informed that their contribution would be evaluated (Interviewee ID-09, Female).

4.4. From “graded” to “grader”

Another emergent theme in the responses is the changing role of the participants from “graded” to “grader”. In most assessment practices, teachers appear as the only grader of the work, and students are not encouraged to participate in assessment. In almost all situations, this is considered quite natural as teachers are considered

'experts' in the related area. Some participants (n=15) stressed the importance of assigning this role to students as this would also lead them to 'put themselves into others' shoes'. The following two extracts are typical examples of the change in the roles:

I find assessing my group members an interesting but at the same time difficult and challenging. It was interesting because I had the role of a teacher or an expert and I was going to assess someone else's contribution. It was challenging because I was used to being assessed but not assessing. I had difficult times while rating my group members and could not decide how to rate their contribution. I learned how difficult it was to grade students (Interviewee ID-02, Male).

Teachers have both to teach and to grade. While rating my peers' contribution, I knew how it was difficult to assess others. I had only assessed four other members. This role of grader helped me see the other side of the coin. (Interviewee ID-30, Female).

Taking the role of teachers as grader and examiner of group members' contribution to work positively affects the participants' attitudes towards their own teachers as well as assessment. It can be claimed that assessing group members changes students' perceptions of both teachers and assessment, confirming the findings of the studies conducted by Elliott and Higgins (2005).

5. Conclusions and pedagogical implications

This study investigated language students' perceptions of peer assessment of the group members enrolled at the department of foreign language education in a Turkish state university. The overall findings from this small study support the use of self- and peer assessment in group work in tertiary contexts. However, the results also indicated that friendship bias and lack of training/experience played an important role in the way the participants rated their group members. Based on the analyses conducted and the findings obtained, the following suggestions can be put forward:

- Peer assessment of group members' contribution can be a useful alternative to awarding a grade to the whole group irrespective of the individual students' contribution. This might positively affect students' perceptions of the fairness of assessment. However, in order to make peer assessment of group members work as intended, students/learners should be provided with hands-on experience in order to increase their understanding and knowledge to ensure fair judgment as well as to enable them to gain confidence (Frankland 2007).
- Peer assessment of group work activities might not be appropriate in educational contexts where members are quite familiar with one another. If peer assessment is to be conducted by the group members, it is suggested that the

ratings should be taken into consideration in grading the work but in a lesser portion in contexts where friendship bias plays an important role in rating group members' contribution.

- Practice in peer assessment of group members' contribution might increase the workload of teachers since it will require checking and collating the ratings given by the students. This workload might be a real burden for lecturer in classes where there are a huge number of students. Therefore, it might be suggested that digital or online peer assessment systems be a better alternative than paper versions.
- The rating scale that will be used in peer assessment practices might affect how peer assessment can be conducted and what kind of data will be obtained. Therefore, providing assessment criteria for the learners to assess their peers' work appears to be the key factor (Marshall 2011). Several factors such as the assigned work or project and course topics might also affect the selection of these scales. Therefore, adopting and trying various examples as well as adapting them to serve the needs of the students and lecturers in specific contexts might be necessary (see Linse, n.d., for several examples of peer assessment scales). Alternatively, learners, especially at advanced levels, can be encouraged to create their own rating criteria or rubrics to assess group members' contribution to group projects.

The study was conducted with a limited number of participants, and the analysis included only the responses provided during the interview conducted with the participants. Moreover, the rating scale used in the study included a limited number of questions. Therefore, it can be stated that the results cannot be generalized beyond similar contexts and/or participants. Further research needed to corroborate the findings should focus on different participants. Moreover, as in the current study the students themselves decided on their group members, the future students can randomly create groups by assigning group members. In this way, weak and strong students can be equally assigned to groups. Since different tools may yield different results, further studies can also compare the effects of using different peer assessment tools by obtaining data from a variety of sources. Future research can also implement the use of an additional form on which groups are required to keep group meetings, which might be used by the teacher to check group members' performance before giving the final grade.

References

- Atjonen, Päivi (2014): "Teachers' views of their assessment practice," *The Curriculum Journal* 25(2): 238–259.

- Boud, David – Ruth Cohen – Jane Sampson (1999): "Peer learning and assessment," *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 24(4): 413–426.
- Chapelle, Carol A. (ed.) (2013): *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Conway, Robert – David Kembe – Atara Siva – May Wu (1993) "Peer assessment of an individual's contribution to a group project," *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 18(1): 45–56.
- Davies, W. Martin (2009): "Groupwork as a form of assessment: Common problems and recommended solutions," *Higher Education* 58(4): 563–584.
- Elliott, Naomi – Agnes Higgins (2005): "Self and peer assessment – Does it make a difference to student group work?" *Nurse Education in Practice* 5(1): 40–48.
- Falchikov, Nancy (1993): "Group process analysis: Self and peer assessment of working together in a group," *Innovations in Education and Training International* 30(3): 275–284.
- (1995): "Peer feedback marking: Developing peer assessment," *Innovations in Education and Training International* 32(2): 175–187.
- Frankland, Steve (2007): "Peer assessment among students in a problem-based learning," in: Steve Frankland (ed.), 144–156.
- Frankland, Steve (ed.) (2007): *Enhancing teaching and learning through assessment: Driving an appropriate model*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Freeman, Mark (1995): "Peer assessment by means of group work," *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 20(3): 289–300.
- Gareis, Christopher R. – Leslie Grant (2015): *Teacher-made assessments: How to connect curriculum, instruction, and student learning*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Gatfield, Terry (1999): "Examining student satisfaction with group projects and peer assessment," *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 24(4): 365–377.
- Hanrahan, Stephanie J. – Geoff Isaacs (2001): "Assessing self- and peer-assessment: The students' views," *Higher Education Research and Development* 20(1), 53–70.
- Johnston, Lucy – Lynden Miles (2004): "Assessing contributions to group assignments," *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 29(6): 751–768.
- Kane, Jeffrey S. – Edward E. Lawler (1978): "Methods of peer assessment," *Psychological Bulletin* 85(3): 555–586.
- Katz, Anne – Margo Gottlieb (2013): "Assessment in the classroom," in: Carol A. Chapelle (ed.), 1–8.

- Linse, Angela R. n.d. "Team project evaluation examples." *Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence*. Available at http://www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu/pdf/Team_Peer_Evaluation_Examples.pdf (last access 23 October 2016).
- Magin, Douglas (2001): "Reciprocity as a source of bias in multiple peer assessment of group work," *Studies in Higher Education* 26(1): 53–63.
- Marshall, Bethan (2011): *Testing English: Formative and summative approaches to English assessment*. New York: Continuum.
- Montgomery, Barbara M. (1986): "An interactionist analysis of small group peer assessment," *Small Group Research*, 17(1): 19–37.
- Nordberg, Donald (2006): "Fairness in assessing group projects: A conceptual framework for higher education," *SSRN* 2006: 1–19. Available at [http://ssrn.com/abstract=87\(3605\)](http://ssrn.com/abstract=87(3605)): (last access 20 October 2016).
- Nortcliffe, Anne (2012): "Can students assess themselves and their peers? A five year study," *Student Engagement and Experience Journal* 1(2): 1–17.
- Purpura, James E. (2016): "Second and foreign language assessment," *The Modern Language Journal* 100(S1): 190–208.
- Race, Phil (2001): "A briefing on self, peer and group assessment," *Assessment Series* 9: 1–29. Available at https://phil-race.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/Self_peer_and_group_assessment.pdf (last access 10 October 2016).
- Shelleyann Scott – Donald E. Scott – Charles Webber (eds.) (2016): *Assessment in education: Implications for leadership*. New York: Springer.
- Stanier, Linda (1997): "Peer assessment and group work as vehicles for student empowerment: A module evaluation," *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 21(1): 95–98.
- Stefani, Lorraine A. J. (1994): "Peer, self and tutor assessment: Relative reliabilities," *Studies in Higher Education* 19(1): 69–75.
- Tamjid, Nasrin H. – Parvis Birjandi (2001): "Fostering learner autonomy through self- and peer-assessment," *International Journal of Academic Research* 3(5): 245–251.
- Walker, Ann (2001): "British psychology students' perceptions of group-work and peer assessment," *Psychology Learning and Teaching* 1(1): 28–36.
- Webber, Charles F. – Donald E. Scott (2016): "Student assessment in a civil society," in: Scott Shelleyann – Donald E. Scott – Charles Webber (eds.), 3–25.

APPENDIX A

Peer Evaluation Form for Group Work

Your name _____

Write the name of each of your group members in a separate column. For each person, indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement on the left, using a scale of 1–4 (1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=agree; 4=strongly agree). Total the numbers in each column.

Evaluation Criteria	Group member:	Group member:	Group member:	Group member:
Attends group meetings regularly and arrives on time				
Contributes meaningfully to group discussions				
Completes group assignments on time				
Prepares work in a quality manner				
Demonstrates a cooperative and supportive attitude				
Contributes significantly to the success of the project				
	TOTALS			

Feedback on team dynamics:

1. How effectively did your group work?
2. Were the behaviors of any of your team members particularly valuable or detrimental to the team? Explain.
3. What did you learn about working in a group from this project that you will carry into your next group experience?

Adapted from a peer evaluation form developed at Johns Hopkins University (October, 2006) <http://www.cmu.edu/teaching/design/teach/design/instructionalstrategies/groupprojects/tools/PeerEvaluations/PeerEval-GroupWork-form-sample1.docx>

About the author

Ferit Kılıçkaya is currently working at the Department of Foreign Language Education, Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Turkey. He received his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in English Language Teaching at Middle East Technical University in Turkey. His main areas of interests include computer assisted language learning (CALL), teacher education and technology, language teaching methodology, second language education, language testing, authoring tools, and culture and language teaching. He has published several book chapters, articles and reviews in journals such as *CALL-EJ Online*, *Educational Technology & Society*, *Teaching English with Technology*, and *Educational Studies*. He can be contacted by email at ferit.kilickaya@gmail.com.