

Author Responses

Paper Title: Newly-innovated E-portfolio to Promote Dynamic Collective Evaluation on Students' Extramural English Activities (Revised: Investigating the Impacts of the New Architectures of An LMS on Online Participation and Language Production through Dynamic-Collective Evaluation)

Reviewer Comments*	Actions Taken
Reviewer #1	
The paper seems to have provided a detailed conceptual/theoretical framework for the study. Moreover, the literature review is also detailed and considers relevant research in the field.	I made it more succinct yet still represent the whole idea of the web app development. This is to make reading easier and to shorten this part, for it has occupied too many pages of the paper and to give space to the discussion.
However, the methodology, results, and discussion sections really need to be improved. I suggest the author(s) provide details on how the study was conducted in details in the methodology.	I have made a substantial addition and changes to the method. This part now is composed of a complete methodology and discussed in a quite concise way. This research used the online content analysis tool (CAT) and NVivo 12 for its content analysis of the text artefacts and data from the FGDs. The parallel convergent mixed method of Creswell (2014) was used to guide the analysis.
More importantly, there is almost no discussion of the results. There is only a summary of what is obtained.	I have put a much longer discussion about results of the quantitative and qualitative data analysis.
The paper seems to have spent a lot of pages for the introduction and the literature review, but fails to provide sound argument, analysis, and implications for research.	The introduction was has been short yet concise already and it still maintains the core background information. Further argument pertaining to the findings has been completely provided. Further research implications such as how colleges of English have to start considering to formally recognize students' online participation and activities that were reported to be difficult to assess (Chapelle & Sauro, 2017:18). A composite learning model of Benson & Volter (1997) that has not been attended before, should be of the attention of the schools, colleges, and educational authorities.

Reviewer #2	
<p><Reviewer 2> This article presents an interesting well-designed application. However, whether the application warrants being called an e-portfolio is unclear since the way it is used does not match many of the criteria of e-portfolios. In its current form, the article shows the application to be a well-designed learning management system rather than an e-portfolio. Part of the reason why I perceive the application to be an LMS rather than a portfolio may be because of the limited data analyzed. These mismatches between the literature on portfolios and the use of the application imply that the application is functioning as an LMS rather than a portfolio (I acknowledge that it appears to be a well-designed LMS).</p> <p>This issue might have been ameliorated through the presentation of in-depth data concerning the application's use, but the only data presented concerns quantities of student production.</p>	<p>I completely agree that this technology is an LMS. What I was trying to report here is that part of the architecture of this technology carries the functionalities of an e-portfolio such as storing, organizing, displaying, and assessing learners' learning evidence but probably my explanation was not clear enough. In this regard, I have changed the core perspectives of the app that I wrote in the theoretical views. I would assume that there is not yet found an LMS that carries the features of an e-portfolio. I was trying to create a web app that can be accessed from any gadgets that can accommodate all kinds of platforms of media to be recognized (appreciated) and to guarantee viewers, readers, and even evaluators. This is consonant with what has been reported in several studies about e-learning that students are usually proud if their works receive viewers, appreciation, and corrective feedback.</p>
<p>In this study, the application was used to manage submission and evaluation of student writing. Students were required to write essays (and self-reflections) and evaluate their peers' essays with the goal of acquiring the number of credits required to pass a course. In the literature on e-portfolios, however, we find:</p> <p>- "comprehensive picture of all that students can do", "a learner's collection of different kinds of learning processes", "personal ... collection of demonstrations, resources, and accomplishments for a variety of contexts and periods", "students can confidently determine what and when to write". In this study, however, students are required to write</p>	<p>Essentially, this web app was developed by me to appreciate students' extramural English use assuming that English beyond classroom (Benson & Reinders, 2011); extramural English use (Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2016); learning in the beyond constructivism through navigating and reflecting (Brown, 2006); and output and interaction (Zhang, 2009) are essential. But then, I was trying to use it in classes to find out if this model can also be employed to encourage students to carry out extramural English activities (not directly related to classroom instruction) to be then recognized as on type of learning that will be systemically awarded credit points. To some extent, not all activities are mandatory. Peer evaluation is not mandatory only that</p>

<p>a series of essays of a certain expected length – this is not a personal collection of a variety of output.</p> <p>- “real-life communication output”, “authentic and meaningful language use”.</p> <p>Essays of the kind required in this study are highly inauthentic.</p> <p>- “self-triggered language practice”, “increased motivation”. However, students are “required to continually feed the system”, so there is little evidence of intrinsic motivation.</p>	<p>the system will provide recognition to those who are actively participating. One of the functions of the systemic recognition is that it can solve the problem with assessing (rating or recognizing) students’ online participation. There are two ways used for this purpose: automatic credit awards and flashing names on the landing page of the app (www.pcsystem.web.id).</p> <p>As for the required articles, indeed, the students were required to supply the system with some short essays; they were provided with some prompts and they were free to write what they want to write. However, the retrieved artefacts for the analysis was only those that belong to the “corpus” of peer evaluation, not the essays.</p>
<p>- “students interact ... by questioning, proposing, arguing, agreeing and reflecting”. In this study, the interaction appears to be a one-way evaluation of peers’ essays.</p>	<p>My apology. I am so sure that my explanation in the previous document was not sufficiently clear. In fact, the system also allowed the student feeder to provide responses to every evaluative comment as many times as the wanted to write with the uploaded text as the basis of interaction.</p> <p>As for the final credit awarding, it is true that it was provided by the teacher. However, the student himself was always welcomed not to agree with the score through a “petition mechanism (round)” that the student has to write reasons for the petition with a minimal number of words (set flexibly, digitally). This is the systemic architecture of the app to increase language production.</p> <p>And the analysis in this paper focuses on the evaluative interaction and what impacts it can induce.</p>
<p>Currently, the data just shows that students produce texts beyond the requirements, but provides no evidence about the quality of these texts. Yet, claims are made about, for instance, critical thinking skills without any qualitative analysis of the peer evaluation texts.</p>	<p>Much richer data has been provided. In fact, the system readily allows the researcher to retrieve as part or whole: the articles only, the peer evaluation only, the self evaluation only. or the whole data as one unity. It also allows me to recall the data using names and even dates. To prove that the quantitative data around the artefacts is accounted for, another type of data from the FGDs with the students was collected. The two were analysed for the contents using the online CAT and NVivo 12. CAT was use to analysed long utterances</p>

	in the FGD transcripts and NVivo 12 was used to code the incremental development of the content words of verbs and adjectives in the artifacts.
More careful editing is needed. For example, in the abstract “as many as 25 students”, “essays to be ... petitioned”, “set voluntary”. The phrase “newly-innovated” in the title is also strange.	All necessary changes have been carefully made, including the title.

Reviewers’ comments should be copied from the original ones.

mail.google.com/mail/au/1/#search/call+ej/OgriHrnqPjdBLLdHxIgPWSGRbwI5qkhq

Gmail

call ej


9 dari 13

The latest revision Kotak Masuk x

B Bambang Agus Darwanto agusdarwanto.2017 -agusdarwanto.2017@student.uny.ac.id- kepada NOZAWA x
Sel, 14 Jul 2020 19:58 ☆ ↶ ⋮

Dear Nozawa,
Here is the latest manuscript with revisions based on the latest reviewers' feedback.
Best regards,
AD

Satu lampiran • Dipindai dengan Gmail ⓘ



N NOZAWA KAZUNORI
Dear Agus, Sorry not to reply sooner. Thanks for your file. Well received. Please accept my apology for mistaking the right file. I will use it for the publicat
Kam, 16 Jul 2020 14:04 ☆

B Bambang Agus Darwanto agusdarwanto.2017 -agusdarwanto.2017@student.uny.ac.id- kepada NOZAWA x
Kam, 16 Jul 2020 16:31 ☆ ↶ ⋮

Author_Response...docx 19517405 UJER.docx Removed Acceptance Letter...jpg Removed Reviewer Comme...docx Removed Reviewer Comme...docx SmallSeoTools-Pla...pdf Removed Show all x

87°F Cloudy 4:19 PM 1/12/2023