

Optimizing Students' Engagement through Implementing Peer-assessment Practice in Iranian Public High School: An Action Research

Seyyed Hossein Sanaeifar

English Department, Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr Branch, Qaemshahr, Iran

Seyyed Bagher Mirshojaee

Department of English, Shiraz University, Iran

Abstract—This study aimed to find the solution for students' lack of engagement in classroom. The researchers used peer-assessment (PA) practice in classroom based on small group collaboration. 21 male high school students took part in this research. They were in Grade 10th and had been studied physics and mathematics course in 15th Khordad public high school in Sari, Mazandaran, Iran. To conduct this research, three instruments were used including teacher-made test, students' engagement questionnaire, and peer-evaluation observation checklist. The researchers implemented PA practice in their classroom in which participants were divided into seven groups each had three members with different proficiency levels. These groups' members were supposed to practice PA on their exams. Also, the students were asked to answer students' engagement questionnaire in order to put their idea about PA practice and the teacher observed all the groups' members and filled the peer-evaluation observation checklist based on students' interactions and participation. The analyses of data showed that, exposing student to the PA significantly enhanced students' classroom engagement and improves their English course scores.

Index Terms—students' engagement, peer-assessment practice, peer-evaluation, participation, and small group collaboration

I. INTRODUCTION

In any formal educational setting, most of the learning activities take place in a classroom. Classroom is a built-in environment where formal learning process takes place in it. It is an important context where both students and instructor come into contact to share information in their quest for knowledge. For the instructor, classroom time is a golden opportunity to meet face to face with the students, delivering the teaching material effectively with the aim to ensure that students can learn what is being taught. On the other hand, the students are expected to be presence on time and participate actively to absorb, seek, and apply the skill and knowledge shared in the classroom. These complementing engagements between lecturer and students generates conducive classroom environment. Effective learning process occurred when both instructor and student interact effectively and actively participate in doing learning activities (Mohd, Noor & Maizatul, 2012).

To contribute an effective learning in higher education, it is essential to provide a dialogue between students and teachers. Learners benefit from teacher's discussion (dialogue between teacher and students) more than an information transmission by their teachers. Although this sort of activity in large classes is difficult to be arranged, teachers can manage small group to discuss about their performances in the class. However, peer dialogue enhances students learning effectiveness. Peer discussion encourages students to revise and negotiate language parts and helps them to provide tactics with their peers on their performances critically. So, negotiation between cohorts is necessary to get involved in self-regulated actions where they accept their peer's critic more easily rather than the teacher (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006).

In a classroom, learners' participation is necessary for the progress of instruction. Students' participation is not confined only in form of physical presence, but it means their mental presence too. In the class, their interactions should make them interested to work attentively. They need to listen to the teacher and should be able to give a good and suitable response if it necessary (Abebe & Deneke, 2015). Engaging students in the learning process increases their attention and focus on their work. Also, it motivates them to practice higher-level critical thinking skills and promotes meaningful learning experiences. Poorly managed participation leads them to be more frustrated and confused. So, managing the students' engagement in the classroom is regarded as the vital role for language teachers. It enables teachers and students to exchange and discuss their ideas, knowledge, thoughts, and facilitates the negotiation of the meanings.

Poor classroom participation detracts students' language learning achievement. According to Jalongo, Tweist, Gerlack and Skoner (1998), having higher level of participation in the classroom helps students to perform better in

their learning job including the matter of assessment such as tests, homework, and examinations. Also, it enables them to master the course objectives. Mustapha, Rahman and Yunus (2010) claim that, students who are actively participating in the classroom practice are expected to get better results.

Peer-assessment (PA) is believed to enable learners to develop their abilities and skills that denied in a teacher-centered learning environment. In other words, it provides the opportunity to take responsibility for analyzing, monitoring, and evaluating their learning assignments (Cheng & Warren, 2005). PA is an interactive type of assessment that keeps learners in touch with their teachers to achieve the learning goals. In fact, teachers are not the only assessors and no longer play the central role as a single assessor (Ko, Liu & Wachira, 2015). PA can provide the ground for students' involvement in classroom practice and should be considered as an effective solution for students' lack of engagement in classroom events.

II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

PA has been defined as an arrangement in which individuals consider the amount, level, value, worth, quality, or success of the products or outcomes of their peer's learning of peers (Topping, 1998 as cited in Luxton-Reilly, 2009). PA is an interactive process that a group of individuals grade their peers' work. It may or may not involve an agreed criterion among teachers and students (Falchikov, 1995 as cited in Peng, 2010). Also, PA could be defined as a process where individuals mutually rate their peers' learning activities. In peer-assessment, learners grade the work or performance of their peers using relevant and negotiated criteria. In peer-feedback, students engage in reflective criticism of the work or performance of others using previously identified criteria and supply feedback to them. In peer-learning, learners learn with and from each other, normally within the same class or cohort (Wen & Tsai, 2006 as cited in Railean, 2020).

The practice of PA has been recognized as having possibly enormous benefits in terms of learning gains, and it is increasingly being used in higher education to involve students in an active way in the assessment process (Race, Brown & Smith, 2005 as cited in White, 2009). PA is a valuable tool of assessment for learning procedure. It promotes learning when learners take the roles of teachers and examiners for each other, and they find it easier to make sense of assessment criteria if they examine their peer's work rather than theirs (Black & Wiliam, 1998 as cited in White, 2009).

PA is an educational arrangement where students judge a peer's performance quantitatively and qualitatively which stimulates them to reflect, discuss and collaborate (Strijbos & Sluijsmans, 2010 as cited in Ko et al., 2015). Such an assessment method is usually associated with group work in which students wish to separate the assessment of individual contributions from the assessment of the groups' final products (Peng, 2010). Peer-learning and assessment are quite effective in terms of developing students' critical thinking, communication, lifelong learning and collaborative skills (Nilson, 2003). The process of PA ought to involve students in grading activity and enables them to give feedback on their peer's work and gives them tolerance for being judged for the quality of the appraisals they made (Davies, 2006 as cited in Peng, 2010).

PA includes processes which require students to provide either feedback or grades (or both) to their peers on a product, process, or performance, based on the criteria of excellence for that product or event which students may have been involved in determining (Falchikov, 2007 as cited in Glyn, Dona & Kathleen, 2011). PA aims on learning students from each other and they can master their learning objectives confidently (Careless, 2009). PA increases students learning by engaging them to reflect and judge their cohorts thinking skills. Thus, it can generate a sustainable progression, and it promotes a deep correlation between learners. (Lynch, McNamara & Seery, 2012).

Vickerman (2009) notes that PA provides advantages to teachers and students. It utilizes the tutoring mechanism which devotes development of rating and judgment of cohorts. Peer-evaluation encourages learners to be more authentic towards academic life and their study in the university. It gives them an insight of experiences while assessing or judging their peer's performances. In a process of PA groups of cohort rate their peers' performance and it empowers their metacognitive learning. Mostly, learners like peer activities as they compare their works with their peers and sometimes they cannot tolerate their peer's criticism when they have lack of self-confidence. Learners need to be anonymous while rating their peer's work because they usually feel uncomfortable to judge their peer's performances in face-to-face manner (Wen, Tsai & Chang, 2006).

Four distinctive types of students' behavior are identified in their classroom i.e. *full integration*, *participation in the circumstances*, *marginal interaction*, and *silence observation* (Liu, 2001 as cited in Mohd, et al., 2012). In full integration, students engage actively in the class discussion. In this form of behavior, they know what they want to say and what they should not say and their participation in class is usually spontaneous and occurs naturally (Zain-al-Abidin, 2007 as cited in Mohd et al., 2012). Participation in the circumstances occurs when students influenced by factors such as socio-cultural, cognitive, affective, linguistic, or environmental elements of learning and these often lead to participating in activities and interacting with other students and instructor become less active and speak only at appropriate time. In marginal interaction, students act more as listeners and speak rarely in the classroom. Unlike the students who actively participate in the classroom discussions, this category of students prefers to listen and take notes than involved in the classroom discussion. Lastly, in silent observation, students tend to avoid oral participation in the classroom. They receive materials delivered in the classroom by taking notes using various strategies such as tape-recording or writing.

According to Mohd et al. (2012), an important factor that motivates the students to participate actively in the classroom is the teacher's teaching skill. Teacher's teaching skill in form of support, understanding, approachability, friendliness through positive nonverbal behavior, giving smiles and nodded for admitting the students' answers have constructive effect on their participation. It brings activeness and open-minded contribution to their participation quality (Fassinger, 2000; Dallimore, Hertenstein & Platt, 2004).

III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

According to Aneteneh (2014), students' participation is one of the essential elements in implementing active learning in the classroom. It enables students to participate actively in the teaching and learning process (activities, tasks, classroom discourses, and negotiation of meanings) and helps them to learn more effectively. But at 15th Khordad public high school grade 10th students didn't actively participate in English lessons. Surprisingly, when the students were given some activities to be done in a group, they didn't do it; instead, they waited for a help from their teacher. This deactivated them and mostly they waited for their teacher's support and guidance rather than try to do their assignment autonomously (Aneteneh, 2014). Therefore, the main reasons which initiated the teacher to conduct this action research were to:

- indicate the means how to make students an active participant during the English language lesson.
- show how the teacher formulates strategies to make students active participants during the English language lesson.
- using good strategies in teaching learning process help students to participate actively in the lesson.
- initiate the students to participate in different activities to learn more from their mistakes.
- introduce that students get more chance to correct themselves when they participate.
- gather necessary information from the students which make them the passive participants.
- to get the immediate solution for the problem of less participation during an English lesson (Aneteneh, 2014).

A. *Exploring Potential Reasons for Low Classroom Engagement*

According to Qing-he (2016) the main reasons for students' unwillingness to participation in classroom learning are as follow:

1. Lacking Sense of Participation

First of all, the students show low level of enthusiasm in participating in classroom activities, and their attention is focused on recording and memorizing the transmitted knowledge. Second, the students do not have a clear learning objective, short of interest and devotion and are unwilling to conduct communication with teachers and classmates. Third, the students are used to passive learning and dependence, holding the concept that teachers are always correct and the contents are undoubtedly truths. Therefore, they would rather follow and not challenge (Qing-he, 2016).

2. Shortage of Adequate Confidence

Some potential causes of the silence in class include: students' shyness, afraid of offering wrong answers, unfamiliarity with the forms of group discussions, and little confidence in expressing their ideas. The underlying cause is the shortage of confidence, which is the extent to which a person is sure of his personal ability, importance, success and value and it is judgment of the personal value and maintenance of personal image and a subjective experience expressed to others through language and other public conducts (Wu, 1998 as cited in Qing-he, 2016).

3. The Influence of the Traditional Teaching Model

The traditional educational concept holds that, teaching is a process focused on the acquisition and conveying of indirect knowledge and learning is reading of textbooks. This concept lays emphasis on product instead of the process, on reasoning not emotion, on identity but not individuality. As a result, the teacher occupies the absolute right of speech and his questioning takes place of the students' thinking, without doubting, innovation, and activeness (Williams, 2000 as cited in Qing-he, 2016). Although students may have good command of book knowledge, they do not have the abilities in independent thinking, critical thinking, and innovative thinking and can hardly carry out independent work on completion of the studies. Most of the students have been used to "duck feeding" style of education and believe that, learning is to learn and memorize new knowledge and they are accustomed to answer the questions with pre-determined answers (Qing-he, 2016).

4. Influence of Teacher's Authority

Traditionally, teachers are regarded as the authority and the knowledge resource. The traditional belief is that, everything they teach is the absolute truth, which puts the students in a totally passive position in the process of learning, receiving the teaching, without any thinking of their own (Qing-he, 2016). The current examination system further makes the students believe that, as long as what they learn is identical with the teaching and contents of the textbooks, they will get high scores and, on contrary, if their answers are not in line with the standard answers, even if their views are innovative, it is in vain. Therefore, teachers are seen as the sole dominant in classroom and students are regarded as the guests of the teaching activities (Xia, 2003 as cited in Qing-he, 2016).

5. Influence of Teaching Method

The traditional classroom teaching places emphasis on receiving, memorizing, and mechanical training knowledge. Taking the form of teaching-learning puts the focus of the student's attention on listening, memorizing, reciting,

exercising, and repetition of knowledge. Thus, very few students acquire knowledge and attain development through activities and practice of their own. Students seldom have the opportunity to express themselves on their understanding. The traditional classroom teaching stresses the cognitive objective but ignores the potential abilities and innate activeness and development (Qing-he, 2016).

6. Lack of Teachers' Guidance

First, the classroom teaching is still restricted in the traditional model of transmission and receiving without making use of the innovative methods of elicitation, interaction, and case studies to guide and excite the interest and eagerness of the students for participating in questioning, answering, and discussion. Second, teachers are not giving adequate attention to and emphasis on encouraging the students in participating in classroom learning, with the teaching activities inadequately designed, contents dull, and time unguaranteed for questioning, reporting, discussion, and communication. Third, teachers are not actually implementing the principle of student-centeredness and the view of humanity orientation, not even allowing the students to doubt and discuss about what they say in class (Qing-he, 2016).

7. Misplacement of Teaching Relations

From the point of view of teaching, with the development of science and technology, teachers are eager to teach the achievements of their learning and studies to the students, but without realizing that students' receiving level is not adequate as understanding the new achievements. Teachers are engaged in studying and using various teaching methods and approaches and transferring the knowledge regulated by the teaching syllabuses and objectives to the students, but the students are not so much concerned. Students do not have command of learning methods, less prepared for receiving new knowledge. Away from the guidance of methods and readiness for autonomous learning, they cannot see the achievements of learning, and what makes it worse, is their eagerness for quick success and instant benefits result in boredom in learning. The separation between teaching and learning makes it hard to produce the effect of classroom teaching community pointing teaching and learning to two different directions (Qing-he, 2016).

B. Research Questions

Regarding these mentioned problems, the researchers want to find the solution for students' lack of engagement in the classroom. For this end, the researchers used PA practice in the classroom based on small group's collaboration. Regarding the purpose of this research, the following research questions were formulated:

RQ1: Does implementing peer-assessment promote students' participation in classroom practice?

RQ2: Does implementing peer-assessment practice have statistically significant effect on promoting students' English scores?

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

21 male high school students took part in this research. They were in Grade 10th and studied physics and mathematics course in 15th Khordad public high school in Sari, Mazandaran, Iran.

B. Instruments

To conduct this study, following three instruments were used:

1. Teacher-made English Test: this test was designed by the researchers based on Grade 10th public high school course book i.e. Vision 1 with 33 items in different parts included spelling, filling blank space, matching lines, multiple choices, grammar, and reading comprehension. This test was used as an instrument in this research which submitted to students to work collaboratively (small group) based on PA practice. This test score was allocated to all members of each group and used as criteria for students' scores development or decline, in data analyses part.

2. Students' Engagement Questionnaire: this questionnaire was designed by the researchers with 10 items in Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree) in students' first language (Persian). This questionnaire was used for determining students' feelings and beliefs about research treatment.

3. Peer-Evaluation Observation Checklist: this observation checklist was developed by the researchers in order to determine students' peer-evaluation practice in the classroom. It composed of 6 levels included quality of work, problem solving skills, teamwork, initiative, communication, and time management in Likert scale (unsatisfactory to exceptional).

C. Action Procedure

The researchers found out in their classroom that, the level of students' engagement in classroom events (discussion, activities, tasks, and discourses) is not satisfactory and the classroom culture is not an active one. For solving this gap, the researchers wanted to investigate, whether implementing PA in the classroom had promoting effect on students' engagement or not? Also, the researchers sought to find out the effect of practicing PA in the classroom on students' English course scores' development.

For this end, the researchers implemented PA practice in his classroom in which 21 students were divided into seven groups each had three members based on their proficiency level from high proficient to low proficient. These groups' members supposed to practice PA on their exams in which the exam paper submitted to each group and students were

free to discuss and evaluate their answer to test's items. They checked their answers to items and selected the best answer to write on the paper and then they submitted their paper to the teacher. The teacher rated the paper and put the paper score for each member of individual group. For ensuring all the members' participation in PA practice, the teacher randomly asked some questions on their paper from some random members. The teacher administered three exams for three consecutive sessions.

In addition, after final session, the students were asked to answer students' engagement questionnaire in order to put their ideas about PA practice. During each session, the teacher observed all the students and filled the peer-evaluation observation checklist based on their interactions and participation. Also, the teacher compared students' mid-term scores with their average scores of these three tests to find out, whether implementing PA had statistically significant effect on promoting students' English course scores or not? The data analyses were done in SPSS software.

V. RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

A. Analysis of the First Research Question

The first research question of this study was as follow:

RQ1: *Does implementing peer-assessment promote students' participation in classroom practice?*

Based on information and data gathered from students' engagement questionnaire and peer-evaluation observation checklist, it revealed that, PA practice promoted students' classroom engagement significantly. Large numbers of students considered PA practice as an effective and interesting job to do, based on their answer to the questionnaire. Also, they showed high level of self-confidence and self-reliance attitude too. More than 80% of them preferred to continue this practice on their rest of class sessions. In addition, more than 90% commented that they felt lower amounts of anxiety through their PA practice.

The results of peer-evaluation observation checklist showed that they developed cooperative relationships, recognized and accepted others' contributions, and offered appreciation and support on each other's works. Also, it revealed that they had clear willingness to take their works' responsibilities, express their ideas more freely both verbally and in writing, maintain regular contact with their peers, and schedule and manage their time more effectively to meet deadlines.

B. Analysis of the Second Research Question

The second research question of this study was as follow:

RQ2: *Does implementing peer-assessment practice have statistically significant effect on promoting students' English scores?*

For answering this research question first, the descriptive statistics for mid-term and PA average scores is presented in following table.

TABLE 1
THE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR MID-TERM AND PA AVERAGE SCORES

	N	Range	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Variance
Mid-term	21	9	10	19	14.81	2.316	5.362
PA Average	21	5	15	20	18.05	1.465	2.148
Valid N (listwise)	21						

As can be seen Table 1, mid-term and PA average means are **14.81** and **18.05**, respectively. It showed that the means were increased after receiving PA practice. Next, the normality test (Shapiro-Wilk Test) of mid-term and PA average scores is presented in following table.

TABLE 2
SHAPIRO-WILK TEST OF NORMALITY FOR MID-TERM AND PA AVERAGE SCORES

	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Mid-term	.977	21	.871
PA Average	.929	21	.131

As can be seen in Table 2, the Sig values of mid-term and PA average scores are **0.871** and **0.131**, respectively and more than **0.05** ($0.871 > 0.05$ and $0.131 > 0.05$). Thus, for comparing two sets of score's means, parametric test (Paired Sample T-Test) was used. Next, the inferential statistics for mid-term and PA average scores is presented in table 3.

TABLE 3
THE INFERENTIAL STATISTICS FOR MID-TERM AND PA AVERAGE MEANS COMPARISON

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	SD	SEM	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Mid-term PA Average	-3.238	2.965	.647	-4.588	-1.889	-5.005	20	.000

As Table 3 shows, the obtained Sig value is **0.000** and less than **0.05** ($0.000 < 0.05$) thus it means that Sig value for mid-term and PA average means is statistically significant. So, the difference between mid-term and PA average means is statistically meaningful. Thus, for answering the research second question, it can be said that, the implementing of PA practice significantly promoted students' English course scores.

VI. DISCUSSION

The analyses of data showed that, exposing student to the PA significantly enhanced students' classroom engagement. One possible reason for this finding is maybe that, PA has an interactive nature in which peers are mutually engaged in the process of negotiation meaning, sharing knowledge, and transferring ideas. These mutual interactions between peers enable students to accept and feel themselves as valuable and worthy individuals in the learning process. This feeling promotes their self-worth, self-acceptance, self-confidence, and self-esteem respectively. This fact is clearly mentioned by Lynch, et al. (2012) who believed that, PA increases students learning by engaging them to reflect and judge their cohorts thinking skills. Thus, it can generate a sustainable progression and it promotes a deep commitment between learners. Also, this finding is in consistency with Nilson (2003) idea about PA which is asserted that, peer learning and assessment are quite effective in terms of developing students' critical thinking, communication, lifelong learning, and collaborative skills.

Other finding of this study was that, implementing of PA practice significantly promoted students' English course scores. The possible reason for this finding could be that, PA provides a friendly and stress-free atmosphere for students which is reduces their anxiety level respectively. With decline in their anxiety level, students can perform more effectively in their assigned tasks and classroom activities or on their exams. On the other hand, in PA practice, students are free to express and discuss their ideas and opinions. It can enhance their self-esteem and signify their self-image and helps them to show their complete capacity and potentiality on their exams. As Careless (2009) believed, PA aims on learning students from each other and they can master their learning objectives confidently. Black and Wiliam (1998) nicely commented on PA capability to engage and enhance students' judging role in the classroom which makes PA as a valuable assessment tool for learning because student learning promoted as they take the role of teacher and examiner for each other, and students find it easier to make sense of assessment criteria if they examine the work of other students alongside theirs (White, 2009). Thus, it makes them determined to go beyond their current level of performances towards more successful level of learning.

VII. CONCLUSION

This action research was conducted as a solution for the lack of engagement problem in Iranian EFL public high school context. There were some main reasons for this lack of participation including *lacking sense of participation, shortage of adequate confidence, the influence of the traditional teaching model, influence of teacher's authority, influence of teaching method, lack of teachers' guidance, and misplacement of teaching relations*. Regarding these mentioned problems, the researchers wanted to find the solution for students' lack of engagement in the classroom. For this end, the researchers used PA practice in the classroom based on small group's collaboration.

This study revealed that, implementing PA in the classroom significantly improved students' classroom engagement. Large numbers of students considered PA practice as an effective and interesting job to do, based on their answer to the questionnaire. They developed cooperative relationships, recognized and accepted others' contributions, and offered appreciation and support on each other's work. Also, this study showed that, implementing of PA practice significantly promoted students' English course scores.

The findings of this study can help language learners, language teachers, language program developers, and language curriculum planners to provide the better learning situations and programs for language learners. By considering the potential of PA practice in enhancing students' self-esteem and language achievements, language teachers can promote their teaching practice. Also, PA produces the collaborative atmosphere for language learners to construct more interactive and involving language classroom.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abebe, D. T., & Deneke, D. G. T. (2015). Causes of students' limited participation in EFL classroom: Ethiopian public universities in focus. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology*, 6(1), 74-89.

- [2] Aneteneh, A. M. (2014). Student's classroom participation in English language teaching: The case of Gozamen general secondary school in grade 10A. *Socrates*, 2(2), 204-217.
- [3] Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 5(1), 7-74.
- [4] Carless, D. (2009). Trust, distrust and their impact on assessment reform. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(1), 79-89.
- [5] Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (2005). Peer assessment of language proficiency. *Language Testing*, 22, 93-121.
- [6] Dallimore, E. J., Hertenstein, J. H., & Platt, M. B. (2004). Classroom participation and discussion effectiveness: Student-generated strategies. *Communication Education*, 53, 103-115.
- [7] Davies, P. (2006). Peer assessment: Judging the quality of students' work by comments rather than marks. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 43(1), 69-82.
- [8] Falchikov, N. (1995). Peer feedback marking: Developing peer assessment. *Innovations in Education and Training International*, 32(2), 175-187.
- [9] Falchikov, N. (2007). The place of peers in learning and assessment. In D. Boud & N. Falchikov (Eds.), *Rethinking assessment in higher education: Learning for the longer term* (pp. 128-143). London: Routledge.
- [10] Fassinger, P. A. (2000). How classes influence students' participation in college classrooms. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 35, 38-47.
- [11] Glyn, T., Dona, M., & Kathleen, P. (2011). Using self- and peer-assessment to enhance students' future-learning in higher education. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 8(1), 1-17.
- [12] Jalongo, M., Twist, M., Gerlack, G., & Skoner, D. (1998). *The college learner*. New Jersey: Merrill.
- [13] Ko, S., Liu, X., & Wachira, P. (2015). *Assessment in online and blended learning environments*. USA: Information Age Publishing, Incorporated.
- [14] Liu, J. (2001). *Asian students' classroom communication patterns in U.S. universities: An emic perspective*. U.S.A: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- [15] Luxton-Reilly, A. (2009). A systematic review of tools that support peer assessment. *Computer Science Education*, 19(4), 209-232.
- [16] Lynch, R., McNamara, P. M., & Seery, N. (2012). Promoting deep learning in a teacher education program through self and peer-assessment and feedback. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(2), 179-197.
- [17] Mohd, Y. A., Noor, R. A., & Maizatul, H. M. (2012). Student's participation in classroom: What motivates them to speak up? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 51, 516-522.
- [18] Mustapha, S., Rahman, N., & Yunus, M. (2010). Factors influencing classroom participation: A case study of Malaysian undergraduate students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1079-1084.
- [19] Nicol, J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218.
- [20] Nilson, L. B. (2003). Improving student peer feedback. *College Teaching*, 51(1), 34-38.
- [21] Peng, J. (2010). Peer assessment in an EFL context: Attitudes and correlations. In Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Second Language Research Forum, ed. Matthew T. Prior et al., 89-107. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- [22] Qing-he, S. (2016). Improve students' participation to establish an effective classroom. *US-China Education Review A*, 6(6), 371-379.
- [23] Race, P., Brown, S., & Smith, B. (2005). *500 tips on assessment*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- [24] Railean, E. A. (2020). *Assessment, testing, and measurement strategies in global higher education*. Pennsylvania: Hershey.
- [25] Srijbos, J. W., & Sluijsmans, D. (2010). Unravelling peer assessment: Methodological, functional, and conceptual developments. *Learning and Instruction*, 20(4), 265-269.
- [26] Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276.
- [27] Vickerman, Ph. (2009). Student perspectives on formative peer assessment: An attempt to deepen learning? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(2), 221-230.
- [28] Wen, L., & Tsai, Ch. (2006). University students' perceptions of and attitudes toward peer-assessment. *Higher Education*, 51, 27-44.
- [29] Wen, M., Tsai, Ch., & Chang, Ch. (2006). Attitudes towards peer assessment: A comparison of the perspectives of pre-service and in-service teachers. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 43(1), 83-92.
- [30] White, E (2009). Student perspectives of peer assessment for learning in a public speaking course. *Asian EFL Journal*, 33, 1-55.
- [31] Williams, D. J. (2000). *Postmodern course development*. Beijing: Educational Science Press.
- [32] Wu, K. N. (1998). *Educational sociology*. Beijing: People's Education Press.
- [33] Xia, J. M. (2003). *Theories and practice of foreign language teaching course design*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Educational Press.
- [34] Zain-al-Abidin, S. (2007). *An investigation into first year Engineering students' oral classroom participation: A case study*. (Unpublished degree dissertation). Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.

Seyyed Hossein Sanaeifar has MA of TEFL. He is Ph.D. candidate of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr, Iran. He has been teaching English language for about 7 years. He published some articles and presented some articles in national conferences in Iran. His areas of interest are reading comprehension, vocabulary and idiom learning, and language assessment and testing.

Seyyed Bagher Mirshojaee currently works at the Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, Shiraz University. He does research in Teaching Methods, Language Education and Educational Assessment.