© М. Азизи, Р. Кралик, Л. Петриковикова, Х. Ткачева

УДК 378+159+314

Сравнительное исследование влияния самооценки и обратной связи сверстников на устное исполнение студентов EFL

М. Азизи (Бабольсер, Иран), Р. Кралик (Нитра, Словакия; Казань, Россия), Л. Петриковикова (Нитра, Словакия), Х. Ткачева (Жилина, Словакия)

Проблема и цель. *Целью настоящего исследования является исследование самооценки и обратной связи сверстников как двух полезных стратегий совершенствования преподавания и обучения в языковых классах, а также оценка их влияния на устное исполнение студентов EFL.*

Методология. *Для достижения цели исследования и ответа на поставленные исследовательские вопросы было проведено квазиэкспериментальное исследование.*

Участниками исследования были две из пяти групп студентов EFL, которые были названы группой самооценки и группой обратной связи сверстников. Методы самооценки и обратной связи сверстников были включены в группу самооценки и обратной связи сверстников соответственно. Были проведены предтестовые и посттестовые сеансы; четыре сеанса специального обучения были проведены между предтестом и посттестом.

Инструментами, использованными в этом исследовании, были раскадровки и контрольные списки. Данные собирались с помощью записывающего устройства, а затем расшифровывались для дальнейшего анализа. Некоторые части данных были также проанализированы качественно.

Результаты. *Результаты настоящего исследования показали, что оба метода полезны в различных аспектах устного исполнения. Самооценка оказала значительное влияние на использование правильных безошибочных предложений, согласование подлежащего и сказуемого, выбор слов и их последовательность, а также на особенности беглости и организованности.*

Азизи Махмуд – доктор технических наук, профессор, Университет Мазандарана, провинция Мазандаран, Бабольсер, Иран.
E-mail: maziizjam@umz.ac.ir

Кралик Роман – доктор наук, профессор, PhD, Университет Константина философа в Нитре, Нитра, Словакия; Институт психологии и образования, Казанский (Приволжский) федеральный университет, Казань, Россия.
E-mail: kierkegaard@centrum.cz

Петриковикова Люция – доктор наук, PhD, Университет Константина философа в Нитре, Нитра, Словакия.
E-mail: lpetrikovicova@ukf.sk

Ткачева Хедвига – кандидат технических наук, доктор философских наук, доктор богословских наук, доцент, факультет гуманитарных наук Жилинского университета в Жилине, Словакия.
E-mail: hedwiga.tkacova@gmail.com

Заключение. В результате исследования было установлено, что обратная связь сверстников также улучшила использование безошибочных предложений и беглость исполнения, но не другие элементы. Однако между этими двумя методами не выявлено существенных различий.

Ключевые слова: самооценка; обратная связь сверстников; устное исполнение; автономия.

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1. Ahangari S. The effect of self, peer and teacher correction on the pronunciation improvement of Iranian EFL learners // Advances in Language and Literary Studies. – 2014. – Vol. 5 (1). – P. 81–89. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.5n.1p.81

2. Ahangari S., Rassekh-Alqol B., Ali Akbari Hamed L. The effect of peer assessment on oral presentation in an EFL context // International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature. – 2013. – Vol. 2 (3). – P. 45–53. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.3p.45

3. Ariafar M., Fatemipour H. The effect of self-assessment on Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill // International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature. – 2013. – Vol. 2 (4). – P. 7–13. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.4p.7

4. Benson P. Autonomy in language teaching and learning // Language Teaching. – 2006. – Vol. 40 (1). – P. 21–40. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003958

5. Birjandi P., Hadidi Tamjid N. The role of self-assessment in promoting Iranian EFL learners' motivation // English Language Teaching. – 2010. – Vol. 3 (3). – P. 211–220. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n3p211

6. Carless N.-F. L. Peer feedback: the learning element // Teaching in Higher Education. – 2007. – Vol. 11 (1). – P. 279–290. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582

7. Cheng W., Warren M. Having second thoughts: Student perceptions before and after a peer assessment exercise // Studies in Higher Education. – 1997. – Vol. 22 (2). – P. 233–239. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079712331381064

8. Chu R. Effects of teacher's corrective feedback on accuracy in the oral English of English-majors college students // Theory and Practice in Language Studies. – 2010. – Vol. 1 (5). – P. 454–459. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.5.454-459

9. Gadušová Z., Hašková A., Predanocyová L. Teachers' professional competence and their evaluation // Education and Self Development. – 2019. – Vol. 14 (3). – P. 17–24. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26907/esd14.3.02

10. Gadušová Z., Jakubovská V., Markechová D., Tirpakova A. Teacher competences development - A guarantee of sustainable high level of education and training // TEM Journal. – 2019. – Vol. 8 (3). – P. 1063–1070. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18421/TEM83-52

11. Gadušová Z., Vítečková M. Mentors' and novices' perception of teachers' professional career start in Slovakia and in the Czech Republic // Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences. – 2013. – Vol. 106. – P. 1825–1833. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.207

12. Gadušova Z., Hašková A., Szarszoi D. Teachers` competences evaluation: Case study // Science for Education Today. – 2020. – № 3. – P. 164–177. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15293/2658-6762.2003.09

13. Hašková A., Lukáčová D., Noga H. Teacher self-assessment as a part of quality management // Science for Education Today. – 2019. – Vol. 9 (2). – P. 156–169. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15293/2658-6762.1902.11

14. Jabr R. K. Introducing the skills of self-assessment and peer feedback // SiSAL Journal. – 2011. – Vol. 2 (1). – P. 26–31. URL: https://sisaljournal.org/archives/mar11/jabr/

15. Khodadady E., Khodabakhshzade H. The effect of portfolio and self-assessment on writing ability and autonomy // Journal of Language Teaching and Research. – 2012. – Vol. 3 (3). – P. 518–524. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.3.518-524

16. Khonamri F., Ahmadi F. The effect of metacognitive strategy training and raising EFL learners' metacognitive knowledge on listening performance // Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics. – 2015. – Vol. 5 (1). – P. 19–28. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v5i1.827

17. Khonamri F., Roostaee S. Does extensive reading combined with form-focused or meaning-focused activities affect lexical collocational knowledge of Iranian learners? // Theory and Practice in Language Studies. – 2014. – Vol. 4 (5). – P. 1038–1044. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.5.1038-1044

18. Liu N.-F., Carless D. Peer feedback: the learning element of peer assessment // Teaching in Higher Education. – 2006. – Vol. 11 (3). – P. 279–290. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582

19. Lundstorm K., Baker W. To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing // Journal of Second Language Writing. – 2009. – Vol. 18 (1). – P. 30–43. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002

20. Moradi M. R., Karimpour Z. The effect of peer assessment on oral presentation in an EFL context // International Education Studies. – 2012. – Vol. 5 (2). – P. 113–117. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n2p113

21. MacGarrell H. Native and non-native English speaking student teachers engage in peer feedback // Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics. – 2010. – Vol. 13 (1). – P. 71–90. URL: https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19930

22. Nedzinskaitė I., Švenčionienė D., Zavistanavičienė D. Achievements in language learning through students' self-assessment // Studies About Languages. – 2006. – No. 8. – P. 84–87. URL: https://www.kalbos.lt/zurnalai/08_numeris/12.pdf

23. Ochoa E. O. Self-assessment practices: An empowering tool in the teaching and learning EFL processes // Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal. – 2007. – No. 9. – P. 229–246. URL: http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/calj/n9/n9a12.pdf

24. Patri M. The influence of peer feedback on self- and peer-assessment of oral skills // Language Testing. – 2002. – Vol. 19 (2). – P. 109–131. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/0265532202lt224oa

25. Pavlíková M. The power of modern technologies in the fiction of Don DeLillo // Communications – Scientific Letters of the University of Zilina. – 2018. – Vol. 20 (1 A). – P. 57–60. URL: http://komunikacie.uniza.sk/index.php/communications/article/view/64/47

26. Pavlíková M., Žalec B. Boj za človekov jaz in pristnost: Kierkegaardova kritika javnosti, uveljavljenega reda, medijev in lažnega krščanstva // Bogoslovni Vestnik. – 2019. – Vol. 79 (4). – P. 1015–1026. DOI: https://doi.org/10.34291/BV2019/04/Pavlikova

27. Záhorec J., Nagyová A., Hašková A. Teachers´ attitudes to incorporation digital means in teaching process in relation to the subjects they teach // International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (IJEP). – 2019. – Vol. 9 (4). – P. 100–120. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v9i4.11064

28. Záhorec J., Hašková A., Munk M., Particular results of a research aimed at curricula design of teacher training in the area of didactic technological competences // International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (IJEP). – 2018. – Vol. 8 (4). – P. 16–31. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v8i4.8184

Mahmoud Azizi,

Professor, Doctor, PhD,

University of Mazandaran, Mazandaran Province, Babolsar, Iran.

ORCID ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6202-9154

E-mail: maziizjam@umz.ac.ir

Roman Kralik,

Professor, Doctor, PhD,

Contantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Nitra, Slovak Republic;

Institute of Psychology and Education,

Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russian Federation.

Corresponding Author

ORCID ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1929-1894

E-mail: kierkegaard@centrum.cz

Lucia Petrikovicova

PhD,

Contantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Nitra, Slovak Republic

ORCID ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3200-794X

E-mail: lpetrikovicova@ukf.sk

Hedviga Tkáčová

ThDr. Mgr. PhD, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Doctor of Theological
Sciences, Assistant Professor

Faculty of Humanities University of Zilina, Zilina, Slovak Republic.

ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3062-2284

E-mail: hedwiga.tkacova@gmail.com

A comparative study of the effects of self-assessment and peer feedback on literature students' oral production

Abstract

Introduction. The purpose of the current study is to investigate self-assessment and peer feedback as two helpful strategies for facilitating teaching and learning in language classrooms and to investigate the effects of these techniques on EFL learners' oral performance.

Materials and Methods. To achieve the purpose of the study and answer the research questions, a quasi-experimental study was conducted.

The participants of the study were two groups of five EFL learners who were called self-assessment group and peer feedback group. The self-assessment and peer feedback techniques were incorporated to the self-assessment and peer feedback group respectively. There were a pretest and posttest sessions and four sessions of treatment were between the pretest and posttest.

The instruments used in this study were storyboards and checklists. The data was collected via recording device and then it was transcribed for further analysis. Some parts of the data were also analyzed qualitatively.

Results. The findings of the present study showed that both techniques are helpful in different aspects of oral performance. Self-assessment had significant effects on the use of correct error- free clauses, subject verb agreement, word choice and tense consistency and also the features of fluency and organization.

Conclusions. Peer feedback also improved the use of error-free clauses and fluency but not the other items. But there is no significant difference between the two techniques.

Keywords
Self-assessment; Peer feedback; Oral production; Autonomy.

Introduction

Nowadays there is a great emphasis on encouraging learners to judge their own and their peers' language ability either through engaging in different meaning-focused or form-focused tasks (Khonamri&Roostaee,2014) or through strategy training (Khonamri& Ahmadi, 2015). This emphasis has led to an increased interest in the use of the self-assessment and peer feedback techniques in ESL classrooms since the late 1970s (Oskarsson 1978; von Elek 1985; Dickinson 1987; Brindley 1987). As Harris (1997)[1] states teaching should not be simply targeted at introducing learners to a foreign language, but it should be targeted at leading learners to perform well without teachers' support in different situations, i.e. learners need to be autonomous, and the skill of "self-assessment" is one way to reach autonomy and peer feedback can also be seen as another way of succeeding the challenging task of autonomy (cited in Jabr, 2011, p. 26). By putting more emphasis on learner independence and learner autonomy in recent years, the focus of assessment went through self-assessment and peer-assessment. These two types of assessment-self-assessment and peer-assessment- are said to have a significant pedagogical value (Patri, 2002, p. 109). Spiller (2012)[2] also believes that "the interest in self and peer feedback is partly driven

by changing conceptions of teaching and learning". He further adds that teacher who "holds all the power and makes all the choices" in assessment processes will "limit the potential for learner development in all of these aspects". He points to the enthusiasm of many academic teachers in retaining the full responsibility and power in the assessment process and suggests that there needs to be more thinking about assessment "in ways that align more closely with the ideals of constructivist learning and self and peer feedback can play an important role in this respect" (p. 2-3).

Here, as an example of analogy, it can be pointed out e.g. at the significance of teachers´self-assessment (Gadušová, Hašková, Predanocyová, 2019; Gadušová, Jakubovská, Markechová, Tirpakova, 2019; Hašková, Lukáčová, Noga, 2019).

With regard to the interdependence of self-assessment and peer feedback Boud et al. (1991) believe that peer contributions which include questions, comments or challenges can enhance self-assessment by prompting one to reflect on what has been done (cited in Liu and Carless, 2006, p. 281). In spite of the recognition of the significance and importance of self-assessment and peer feedback in language learning, little is known about their effects on oral production of EFL learners and little research has been done on

---

[1] Harris M. Self-assessment of language learning in formal settings. *ELT Journal,* 1997, vol. 51 (1), pp. 12–20.

[2] Spiller D. Assessment matters: Self-assessment and peer Assessment, 2012, pp. 1–18. URL: http://cei.ust.hk/files/public/assessment_matters_self-ssessment_peer_assessment.pdf URL: https://ru.scribd.com/doc/149805612/9-selfpeerassess-ment

comparing the effects of these techniques on oral performance of EFL learners. This study is an attempt to investigate differences, if any, in students' improved aspects of oral performance in the used techniques and the types and degree of the changes observed.

Background

Pierce (1999) defines assessment as a beneficial tool which shows students that they are making progress in foreign language development, and this would promote their motivation to identify their own strengths and weaknesses and increase their autonomy and independent learning skills. He asserts "learning activities upon which assessment is based have relevance and meaning for students and promote application of skills" (p. 128). Peer feedback is defined by Spiller (2012)[3] as a process in which students are involved to provide other students with feedback about the "quality of their works" (p. 10).

Related studies on self-assessment

Recently many studies have been done to show the effectiveness of self-assessment in language learning (Gardner, 1999, Blue, 1994[4], Chen, 2006[5], Harris, 1997[6], Saito, 2003[7], and Valdez Pierce, 1999[8]). For example Harris (1997) in his paper "self-assessment of language learning in formal settings" defines self-assessment as a learning strategy through which students can

monitor their progress and "relate learning to their individual needs". If students cannot see any progress in their learning, they will be demotivated. With regard to the value of self-assessment, he further continues that it helps students to be more active and focused and "better placed to assess their own progress in terms of communication" (p. 12).

O'Malley and Valdez (1996) state that self-assessment would encourage responsibility in the learners. They believe that self-assessment is a technique which promotes critical thinking and involves students directly in their process of learning. By applying self-assessment in language classrooms teacher is not the only one who is responsible for students' performance rather students participate actively in the process of assessment "to become critical and look for adequate solutions to the constraints encountered". They further add that self-assessment helps both the teacher and the learners to "become aware of students' attitudes, strengths and weaknesses" (cited in Ochoa 2007, pp. 234-235). The mentioned can be again associated with identification of strengths and weaknesses of teachers, based on their self-assessment (Gadušová, Hašková, Szárszói, 2020; Gadušová, Vítečková, 2013).

Yukomoto (2012)[9] conducts a study on 94 university students in Tokyo in an English discussion class to investigate the effect of self-

[3] Spiller D. Assessment matters: Self-assessment and peer Assessment, 2012, pp. 1–18. URL: http://cei.ust.hk/files/public/assessment_matters_self-ssessment_peer_assessment.pdf URL: https://ru.scribd.com/doc/149805612/9-selfpeerassessment

[4] Blue G. M. Self-assessment of foreign language skills: Does it work? *CLE Working Papers*, 1994, no. 3, pp. 18–35.

[5] Chen Y.-M. Self-assessment of oral performance in the EFL university classroom. *Conference on English Instruction & Assessment*, 2006, pp. 1–12. DOI: https://doi.org/140.123.13.85

[6] Harris M. Self-assessment of language learning in formal settings. *ELT Journal,* 1997, vol. 51 (1), pp. 12–20.

[7] Saito Y. The use of self-assessment in second language assessment, 2003, vol. 25 (1), pp. 7–15. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7916/salt.v3i1.1636

[8] Pierce L. V. Preparing independent learners: The role of self-assessment. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses,* 1999, vol. 38 (1), pp. 127–137.

[9] Yokomoto K. Self-assessment to improve learners' English discussion skills. *JALT2011 Conference Proceedings*, 2012, pp. 607–615. URL: https://jalt-publications.org/files/pdf-article/jalt2011-059.pdf

assessment on their English discussion skills. Students were provided with a self-check sheet after each discussion class to self-assess how they used the discussion skills they had studied. By reflecting on their first self-check they chose the criteria they wished to focus on in the second discussion. The scores of the two discussions were compared and it was found that the scores of the chosen criteria improved significantly more than the criteria they had not chosen. Students had positive reaction to use self-assessment and in interview they reported that the self-check had helped them understand the lesson objectives better and remember the skills for discussion.

Ariafar and Fatemipour (2013) conducted a study on 60 pre-intermediate EFL learners to see whether self-assessment has any effect on their speaking skill or not. They concluded that self-assessment helps participants to improve their speaking ability. By administering a self-assessment questionnaire among learners to elicit their opinions and reactions to self-assessment, the researchers concluded that participants have positive attitude toward self-assessment.

Khodadady and Khodabakhshzade (2012) conducted a study on 59 TEFL students in a writing class who were divided into control and experimental group to find out the effect of self-assessment and portfolio assessment on writing ability and autonomy. For this purpose, they administered a writing IELTS task at the beginning of the project as pre-test and at the end of the project as post-test to determine the level of the students' writing ability. A questionnaire was used to determine the students' autonomy in writing. The results of their study have shown that while the two groups had no significant difference in their writing and self-regulation abilities at the beginning of the course, the experimental group scored significantly higher than the control group on the writing task at the end of the course and also gained higher self-regulation ability as a result of writing portfolios and self-assessment.

Bahmani (2014) [10] conducts a study in which she seeks to investigate the effects of self-assessment on oral skill of Iranian EFL learners. The results of her study indicate that self-assessment has positive effects in improving learners' oral skill. Participants in the self-assessment group were given self-assessment rubrics specifically designed for the speaking assignment task. They rated themselves analytically by answering 5 questions in their self-assessment rubrics which related to their pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency task, and grammar of their speaking. The results of the study showed that there was a gradual improvement in participants' speaking skill during thirty sessions of treatment.

Nedzinskaitė et al. (2006) conduct a study to prove students can become more active to judge their performance in developing their skills in the process of language learning through their self-assessment essays. They conclude that students' self-assessment results are a useful tool for helping them to focus on their own performance. The analysis was concerned with students' opinions and ideas about reflection of their own learning. The results also show that students' self-confidence during speaking activities was developed and their pronunciation was improved significantly as a result of learning hard and preparing for discussion regularly. As a result they improve speaking ability by preparing and presenting reports.

Liang (2006) also concluded that self-assessment makes learners aware of their learning goals and needs, thus improves their motivation

[10] Bahmani F. The washback effects of self-assessment, analytic, and holstic scoring on the speaking skills of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Language*

Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 2014, vol. 3 (1), pp. 339–355.

and goal orientation (cited in Birjandi and Tamjid, 2006, p. 212). Gardner (2000)[11] also believes that self-assessment assists learners in monitoring their individualized progress. Monitoring process helps learners to know how they are doing in their learning. Self-assessment is also effective in increasing motivation. Doing a successful job leads to increased confidence. When self-assessment demonstrates success, learners' motivation will be enhanced. He further adds that self-assessment also provides learners with "personalized feedback" on the usefulness of their learning strategies, specific learning methods and materials. By these feedbacks learners can evaluate their approach to learning.

Related studies on peer feedback

With regard to the effects of peer feedback on students' motivation and reflection, Verkade and Richardson (2013) conducted a study the results of which showed that peer-assessment leads students to be more engaged and feel a sense of responsibility, and many reported that they have more reflection on their own speaking.

Liang Hsu (2012) examined the difference of oral presentations with or without intervention of peer evaluation in a mechanical design class and concluded that students' participation in oral presentation will be improved by peer evaluation.

Ahangari et al. (2013) conduct a study on 52 students of Azad and State universities of Tabriz the purpose of which was to examine the effect of peer assessment on oral presentation of Iranian English nonmajor students. The peer assessment was incorporated into the experimental group's course to explore whether and to what extent their oral presentation skills may enhance. The results of their study show that when assessment criteria are definitely established, peer assessment

empowers students to evaluate the performance of their peers in a manner comparable to those of the teachers. The findings also show that there was a significant difference between the ratings the students obtained before and after the treatment, suggesting that peer assessment had a significantly positive effect on oral presentation of students receiving the treatment.

Lundstrom and Baker (2009) investigate the effectiveness of peer editing on the editor's own writing in an ESL context. This study also examined the effectiveness of peer-editing on the group that received feedback from their peers but did not give any peer-editing. They explored the effectiveness of peer-editing on editors own writing accuracy and found that the editors made significant gains in their writing accuracy.

Gracias and Garcia (2013) reported that there are different variables in a specific course on which the value of student assessment will depend. They further continued that providing students with a comprehensive rubric, will result in just a certain correlation between student' ratings and professor's ratings, therefore it may not be enough to trust peer assignment alone.

Paul et al. (2013) focused on the students' attitudes towards both being assessed by and assessing other students' work. They concluded that students showed a positive attitude towards peer-assessment but they were concerned with their ability to evaluate peers.

Methods
Research methods
Participants

The participants of the current study were selected from English literature majors in the University of Mazandaran taking their oral reproduction of short stories course who were

---

[11] Gardner D. Self-assessment for autonomous language learners. *Links & Letters,* 2000, vol. 7, pp. 49–60. URL: http://ddd.uab.es/pub/lal/11337397n7p49.pdf

passing their fourth semester. The range of their age was about 20 to 24 years old. They were both male and female. They were divided into groups of five. Two groups of students in this course were randomly selected as the participants of the study. One group acted as the first experimental group and the other as the second experimental group. Students in the first experimental group which was named as the self-assessment group were familiarized with the self-assessment technique and those who were in the second experimental called as peer feedback group were familiarized with peer feedback technique.

Materials

In order to achieve the objectives of the current study, some instruments were utilized by the researcher. The instruments are as follow:

1. **Oral Presentation Evaluation Checklist**

There was a checklist named as "Oral Presentation Evaluation Checklist"-provided by the teacher- to inform students of the criteria of a good oral presentation. It had five sections: delivery, content, organization, presentation aids and resources. The checklist provided students with some tips in different sections of a proper oral presentation, e.g. what kind of language and body language should be used to have the maximum amount of delivery, how to deliver the content properly, how to organize one's speech, what kind of presentation aids is needed and which resources to use.

2. **Peer feedback checklist**

Every session, in each group two students had to select a story and present it to their group mates. After presentation, they received feedback from their group mates and then they had to re-present the story in another group. The participants of the other group had a checklist which involved several features of a good oral presentation. So, they ranked the student who presented according to those features. The

ranking was done by marking one of these words very good, good, not bad and bad for each feature. Then the checklist was given to the student to see in which parts s/he is weak or strong.

3. **Recording devices**

Students were supposed to use recording devices to record their voice for the purpose of self-assessment in self-assessment group. In order to do that, they use their cellphones to record their voices. They had to listen to the recordings for several times at home and reflect on themselves. Then they had to write a report of their performance as a self-assessment report. Having those reports, they could monitor themselves and see the area of strengths and weaknesses in themselves and try to compensate for those weaknesses. They could also see the progress or change in their performance if any. The researcher also, recorded their voices in order to transcribe and analyze.

4. **Storyboards**

As the study was seeking the influence of self-assessment and peer feedback on learners' oral performance, there was a need to make the learners produce language orally at the beginning and the end of the semester to investigate the changes, if any. For this purpose, storyboards were provided for the students to use as pretest and posttest instrument. In the pretest session, each learner in self-assessment and peer-feedback group were given the selected picture series. They were given sufficient time to think about it, make a story and present the story for the researcher individually. (Pavlikova, 2018; Pavlikova, Zalec 2019). While they were presenting, their voices were recorded and no aids or clues was provided for them. In the posttest session, the same procedures were done.

Procedures

The participants in the self-assessment group were provided with a checklist in which different elements of a good oral presentation

were included and they marked the checklist and identified the strengths and weaknesses of their performance, after presenting the stories to the group. Every session one student in the group was supposed to choose a short story, read it and summarize it and prepare herself to present it to the group. Students were free in choosing the stories and the way of presenting it. During the presentation, they recorded their voices in order to listen it at home and reflect on it. They were supposed to monitor themselves and write down their comments about themselves and give it to the teacher. The participants in the peer feedback group almost do the same procedures, but they didn't record their voices. After each presentation in the peer feedback group, the participants received feedback from their peers in the group and they were told to pay attention to those feedbacks for next presentations.

At the beginning of the project a pretest was conducted for the learners to measure their fundamental level of proficiency in oral production in both groups. For the purpose of conducting pretest, picture series were given to the participants in order to have a record of their production. There were given enough time to think about the storyboard and produce the story. After they got ready for presenting the story, they went to a room in which just the researcher was waiting for them. They were invited individually and presented the story from the pictures. And the researcher recorded their voices.

At the end of the project a posttest was conducted, the procedures of which were the same as the pretest's procedures.

After all the data was recorded the researcher began to transcribe the data for micro-analysis. The data was transcribed meticulously. After the transcription, the transcribed data was divided into clauses and these clauses were read several times by the researcher and a second rater to find the recurring errors in the participants'

speech in each clause. Three kinds of errors were identified as the most recurring errors in all students' speech. Those recurring errors were subject-verb agreement errors, tense inconsistencies and word choice problems. Chu (2010) in his work refers to accuracy, complexity and fluency as three important parts of oral speaking and continues "every teacher should keep balance of the three parts". So the linguistic accuracy (grammatical and syntactic accuracy) and fluency are examined in this study. For measuring linguistic accuracy, the three common errors in students' speech were taken into account (subject-verb agreement, tense consistency and word choice) and at the end the percentage of error-free clauses were also calculated. The higher the percentage the more accurate the language is. So the total numbers of subjects and verbs, verb tenses and words happened in the speech were counted. After that the numbers of these features that happened correctly were counted and they were divided by the total to find out the accuracy percentage for each feature:

The number of a feature that happened correctly in the speech × 100 = accuracy percentage

The total number of the same feature that happened in the speech

In order to measure and analyze the fluency in participants' oral presentation, two criteria were considered for fluency: organization and fluency. For measuring fluency, a speaking rubric evaluation checklist was provided in which different levels of fluency and organization were classified, and for each level a specific score was considered. The range of scores was from zero (below proficient) to five (exceeds expectations). The researcher listened to the collected data and scored the two features according to the predetermined checklist. Then a colleague, as a second rater, does the same task and scored the fluency of participants' oral production. The

means of the two sets of scores were calculated for each participant and then the descriptive statistics and paired sample t-test were used for further analyzing the data and find the results.

Furthermore, for analyzing the data qualitatively the data on the checklist and students' self-assessment reports were used. The data on the checklist also helped the researcher to find how much learners have improved in fluency

in their own ideas by receiving self-assessment technique.

Results

To investigate the impact of self-assessment on oral performance based on the collected data, first the descriptive statistics of the data in both pretest and posttest were obtained.

Table 1

descriptive statistics of the first experimental group (self-assessment) in terms of accuracy in pretest

	Mean	Std.	Min	Max
EFC	55.54	16.21	43.38	83.33
SVA	84.35	8.75	75.23	95.00
TC	62.91	19.08	43.94	90.00
WC	97.20	.52	96.66	97.95

Table 2

descriptive statistics of the first experimental group (self-assessment) in terms of accuracy in post test

	Mean	Std.	Min	Max
EFC	87.78	6.57	76.66	93.33
SVA	90.62	8.54	80.00	100.00
TC	94.14	5.93	86.95	100.00
WC	99.12	.71	98.07	100.00

Comparing the statistics of pre and posttest, it can be seen that all linguistic features showed increase from pre- to posttest. Table 3 displays the result of paired samples t-test on all linguistic features.

Table 3

Paired samples t-test comparing the accuracy of linguistic features from pre to posttest of the first experimental group (self-assessment)

	T	df	p-value
EFC	3.276	4	.031
SVA	9.145	4	.001
TC	5.051	4	.007
WC	5.416	4	.006

As can be seen in Table 3 in the first feature, Error free clause, a significant difference (p=0.031) was observed between the two testing sessions. This means that self-assessment group made significant improvement in Error free clause.

Considering the three other features, the comparison of pre- and posttest scores of self-assessment group in these features also showed a significant difference which indicates the effectiveness of the related treatment.

The following tables show the descriptive statistics of the fluency features of the first experimental group in pretest and posttest respectively.

Table 4

descriptive statistics of the fluency features of the first experimental group in pretest

	Mean	Std.	Min	Max
Fluency	3.30	.67	2.50	4.00
Organization	2.80	.84	2.00	4.00

Table 5

descriptive statistics of the fluency features of the first experimental group in posttest

	Mean	Std.	Min	Max
Fluency	4.50	.35	4.00	5.00
Organization	3.90	.89	3.00	5.00

Comparing the statistics of pre and posttest, it can be observed that the mean of Fluency is shifted from 3.30 to 4.50 in the self-assessment group. The minimum and maximum scores of Fluency shifted from 2.5 and 4.00 to 4.00 and 5.00 respectively.

Table 6

**Paired samples t-test comparing the fluency features from pre to posttest
of the first experimental group (self-assessment)**

	T	df	p-value
Fluency	4.000	4	.016
Organization	11.000	4	.000

As it is clear from the above table in both items there is a significant difference before and after the treatment because the P-value in both of them is smaller than 0.05 (in Fluency 0.016 and in Organization 0.000) which shows that there was progress in these items from the pretest to the posttest. Therefore, based on the above results, it can be concluded that self-assessment has a

positive effect on the fluency of students' oral production.

In addition, the qualitative analysis of the students' self-assessment report also reveals that it was a helpful technique for them to monitor themselves and reflect on their own work.

For example, S3 in her self-assessment report mentioned her weak and strong points by writing down:

"I seem to think that the manner of speaking were not effective and did not convey feelings enough. I had a few pauses that make the audience to be disturbed. The sentence structures were almost correct but there were a few inconsistencies of using present tense or past tense. These were because of not practicing enough. About voice and pacing, the speed was a little fast, so it could not be easily followed by the audience. The volume and modulation was not very well. By improving the modulation and making the volume higher, the presentation will be more effective and it causes the audience to be involved with the presentation. But totally, it was understandable and simple".

From this note it can be understood the checklist made the student aware of the different aspects of oral skill and it also helped her to monitor herself consciously.

They have written some notes and comments about their performance in the presentation according to the oral presentation evaluation checklist given to them. Some of those notes are as follows:

S1: *"I tried my best at using meaningful gestures I think.*

I may have some grammatical error.

I tried my best at maintaining a good eye-contact.

I used simple words not just for audience but for my own sake.

It (the presentation) didn't have any new information".

S2: *"at first it (voice) was monotone but I tried to have ups and downs.*

I didn't use any transitions between main points.

My presentation was very informative.

My story didn't have hard words.

I prepared three questions and I think audience could get what's going on.

I saw one or two words (on note) to remember".

S3: *"I don't look at my notes so much.*

My rate of speech was a little fast.

I distract a little during telling the story.

I didn't support the main points.

My vocabulary was simple".

S4: *"sometimes I looked at my notes to not loos (lose) the line.*

I had some mistakes in using standard grammar.

I really was well informed on my topic.

I organized ideas somehow in a meaningful way I think".

S5:*"I used filter words (uh, ah, like,..) two times.*

I think my pronunciation was clear and easy to understand.

I didn't use any attention-getting device.

I didn't use any supportive details".

As it is evident in the above extracts, learners in self-assessment group monitor themselves and reflect on their work. In their comments as it is seen, they pointed to both their weakness and strength points. It means self-assessment led them to pay attention more carefully to their works and may be it could help them to compensate for the weakness points in further oral presentations.

To investigate the impact of peer feedback on oral performance based on the collected data, first the descriptive statistics of the data in both pretest and posttest were obtained which are presented in the following tables:

Table 7

**descriptive statistics of the second experimental group (peer-feedback)
in terms of accuracy in pretest**

	Mean	Std.	Min	Max
EFC	65.07	23.64	45.45	92.30
SVA	93.78	9.08	80.00	100.00
TC	75.00	25.31	41.66	100.00
WC	98.56	1.57	96.04	100.00

Table 8

**descriptive statistics of the second experimental group (peer-feedback)
in terms of accuracy in posttest**

	Mean	Std.	Min	Max
EFC	76.17	19.45	57.14	100.00
SVA	93.05	9.94	78.57	100.00
TC	82.86	15.70	69.56	100.00
WC	99.70	.42	99.20	100.00

The above tables show that in the posttest the mean of EFC is increased from 65.07 to 76.17 in the peer feedback group. The minimum and maximum score of EFC was 57.14 and 100 in peer feedback group. The mean of SVA is shifted from 93.78 to 93.05 in the peer feedback group. The minimum and maximum score of SVA was 78.57 and 100.00 in peer feedback group. The mean of TC is increased from 75.00 to 82.86 in the peer feedback group. The minimum and maximum score of TC was 69.56 and 100.00 in peer feedback group. The mean of WC is improved from 98.56 to 99.70 in the peer feedback group. The minimum and maximum score of WC was 99.20 and 100.00 in peer feedback group.

Table 9

**Paired samples t-test comparing the accuracy of linguistic features from pre to
posttest of the second experimental group (peer-feedback)**
Paired Samples Test

	t	df	p-value
EFC			.021
SVA			.802
TC			.273
WC			.151

The statistics presented in table 9 show that there is significance difference in EFC before and after the treatment in the peer feedback group because the P-value is 0.021 which is smaller than 0.05. But in other items in this group there is no significant difference because the P-value is greater than 0.05 in all of them (in SVA 0.802, in TC 0.273, in WC 0.151).

Therefore, it can be inferred that the implemented treatment (peer feedback) was just effective in improving the error free clauses in the students' oral performance, however was unable to improve the other features.

Considering the impact of peer feedback on the students' fluency in terms of the fluency and organization items both in pre and posttest, the descriptive statistics and then the paired sample tests were again calculated. The statistics are given in the following tables:

Table 10

descriptive statistics of the fluency features of the second experimental group (peer-feedback) in pretest

	Mean	Std.	Min	Max
Fluency	3.30	.67	2.50	4.00
Organization	2.80	.84	2.00	4.00

Table 11

descriptive statistics of the fluency features of the second experimental group (peer feedback) in posttest

	Mean	Std.	Min	Max
Fluency	4.50	.35	4.00	5.00
Organization	3.90	.89	3.00	5.00

The mean of Fluency is shifted from 3.60 to 4.80 in the peer feedback group. The minimum and maximum score of Fluency was 4.00 and 5.00 in peer feedback group. The mean of Organization is improved from 3.60 to 4.40 in the peer feedback group. The minimum and maximum score of Organization was 3.00 and 5.00 in peer feedback group. A paired sample test was conducted in order to find out whether the peer feedback treatment is effective on the fluency of the students' oral performance or not.

Table 12

Paired samples t-test comparing the fluency features from pre to posttest of the second experimental group (peer feedback)

	T	df	p-value
Fluency	6.000	4	.004
Organization	2.138	4	.099

As it can be seen, the related treatment was just effective on the fluency item since the P-value is 0.004 which is smaller than 0.05. However in organization item, no significant difference were observed (P-value is 0.099 which is greater than 0.05).

In order to find if there is any significant difference in the two techniques, the post test results of the two groups were compared. Therefore a t-test for equality of means of both groups in posttests was conducted. The following table shows the related statistics:

Table 13

T-test for Equality of Means in post test

	T	df	p-value
EFC	-1.264	4.902	.263
SVA	.414	8	.690
TC	-1.503	5.117	.192
WC	1.559	8	.158
Fluency	1.177	8	.273
Organization	.884	8	.403

The results gained from the independent t-test shows that there is no significant difference in any of the selected items in the two groups because the P-value in all of them is greater than 0.05. It means that there were no significant differences in the two types of employed treatment. In other words it could be said that the effectiveness of both of them on accuracy and fluency are almost the same.

Discussion

The analysis of data obtained from the self-assessment group of this study suggested that self-assessment had an effective role on the accuracy of the learners' production in particular subject verb agreement, word choice, tense choice and error-free clauses and in terms of fluency and organization, this technique was shown to be beneficial. These findings are in accordance with the study conducted by Ariafar and Fatemipour (2013) since they also examined the impact of self-assessment on oral performance and they concluded that self-assessment helps participants to improve their speaking ability. Therefore similar to the current study, they reported the positive effect of this technique on oral production of the students.

As the focus of the current study was on the efficacy of self-assessment on EFL learners' oral production skill, two features were considered for oral performance, accuracy and fluency. it is founded from the results that there was a significant difference between the pretest and posttest results. It meant this treatment had positive effects on students' oral production and through this treatment learners improved their oral skill. These results also, are in line with the results of another study conducted by Yokomoto

(2012)[12], the purpose was to investigate the effect of self-assessment on their English discussion skills. The results of the study showed that the scores of the chosen criteria improved significantly from the first discussion to the second one. The self-check sheets also showed that students had positive reaction to use self-assessment and in interview they reported that the self-check had helped them understand the lesson objectives better and remember the skills for discussion.

The results of the study also are in accordance with Bahmani (2014)[13] who in her study investigated the effects of self-assessment on oral skills. She investigated the effects of self-assessment on participants' pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency task, and grammar of their speaking. She concluded that self-assessment has positive effects on improving oral skill of EFL learners.

As it is evident from the self-assessment comments which students wrote, learners became aware of their weaknesses and strengths. So, it could be said that through this technique, learners could monitor their own performance and comment on their own production, i.e. they became aware of their own performance. By noticing their own comments, they could find that in which areas they were proficient enough and which areas needed more work. This finding is in line with Harris (1997)[14] who in his paper defines self-assessment as a learning strategy through which students can monitor their progress and "relate learning to their individual needs". He further adds that the progress which students see

during self-assessment would motivate them in learning. He argues that self-assessment helps students to be more active and focused and "better placed to assess their own progress in terms of communication" (p. 12). This is like self-assessment of teachers in context of their further education needs and motivation to further professional development (Záhorec, Nagyová, Hašková, 2019; Záhorec, Hašková, Munk, 2018)

Liang (2006) also concluded that self-assessment makes learners aware of their learning goals and needs, thus improves their motivation and goal orientation. This conclusion is in line with the results of the qualitative analysis of this study which showed that the checklist made the student aware of the different aspects of oral skill and it also helped them to monitor themselves consciously. This monitoring made the learners aware of their performance and their needs. So, by knowing their needs, they would know in which areas they need more practice. So, it could be said that by self-assessment learners could set the goals for further presentations i.e. they would focus the areas that needs more attention and dedicate more time to the weaknesses.

Having looked at learners" self-assessment reports, it was found that learners noticed both negative and positive points in their production and they commented on their own performance. So, it could said that noticing the positive points would increase self-confidence in learners, and noticing the negative points would help them in finding the areas for more practice and also suitable methods and materials for their learning. It is in accordance with Gardner's argumentation

[12] Yokomoto K. Self-assessment to improve learners' English discussion skills. *JALT2011 Conference Proceedings*, 2012, pp. 607–615. URL: https://jalt-publications.org/files/pdf-article/jalt2011-059.pdf

[13] Bahmani F. The washback effects of self-assessment, analytic, and holstic scoring on the speaking skills of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Language*

Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 2014, vol. 3 (1), pp. 339–355.

[14] Harris M. Self-assessment of language learning in formal settings. *ELT Journal,* 1997, vol. 51 (1), pp. 12–20.

(2000) [15] who believes that self-assessment is effective in increasing motivation. Doing a successful job leads to increased confidence. He asserts that by self-assessment learners would be aware of their success. So, their motivation will be enhanced. He further adds that self-assessment also provides learners with "personalized feedback" on the usefulness of their learning strategies, specific learning methods and materials. By these feedbacks learners can evaluate their approach to learning.

Regarding the peer feedback technique, the current study found that it has a positive effect on the accuracy of the students' oral presentation in particular on their correct use of error free clauses. This finding is in line with the research conducted by Liang Hsu (2012). Similarly, he examined the difference of oral presentations with or without intervention of peer evaluation in a mechanical design class and concluded that students' oral presentation was improved by peer evaluation.

The results of the study related to peer feedback are also in accordance with Ahangari et al. (2013). They tried to examine the effect of peer assessment on oral presentation of Iranian English nonmajor students. The peer assessment was incorporated into the experimental group's course to explore whether and to what extent their oral presentation skills may enhance. The findings of their study showed that there was a significant difference between the ratings the students obtained before and after the treatment, suggesting that peer assessment had a significantly positive effect on oral presentation of students receiving the treatment.

The results of the study show that the learners in peer feedback group had improved in one item of accuracy i.e. EFC, but not the other items (SVA, TC and WC). They had improved also in fluency, but not organization. There were not significant changes in all examined aspects of accuracy and fluency of oral production in peer feedback group in this study. This is in line with Butt-Bethlendy's (2013) [16] study in which she gained similar results. One of the possibilities that she referred to in not achieving a complete positive result and which may be applicable to the present study as well is that it was perhaps due to the fact that this was the first time they had encountered this method and therefore had limited understanding of the concept, or confidence in their own and their partners' abilities. She suggests that the most successful way of using the peer feedback seems to be a joint one given by both the students and the teacher.

As research has indicated, it is largely believed that personal feelings are very much involved in learners' assessments (Dickinson 1987; as cited in Lim, 2007)[17], and learners may not have the linguistic competence to assess their peers (Miller and Ng 1996; as cited in Lim, 2007).

With regard to the effect of peer feedback, Lundstrom and Baker (2009) conduct a study in which they investigate the effectiveness of peer editing on the editor's own writing in an ESL context. This study also examined the effectiveness of peer-editing on the group that received feedback from their peers but did not give any peer-editing. They also explored the effectiveness of peer-editing on editors own writing accuracy and found that the editors made significant gains in their writing accuracy.

---

[15] Gardner D. Self-assessment for autonomous language learners. *Links & Letters,* 2000, vol. 7, pp. 49–60. URL: http://ddd.uab.es/pub/lal/11337397n7p49.pdf

[16] Butt- Bethlendy K. Developing fluency, accuracy and complexity in oral production through corrective peer feedback. *A course assignment*, *Sheffield Hallam University,* 2013.

[17] Lim H. A Study of Self- and Peer-Assessment of Learners' Oral Proficiency. *CamLing*, 2007, pp. 169–176. URL: http://tesolal.columbia.edu/

Salehi and Daryabar (2014)[18] in their paper compared self-assessment, peer assessment and teacher assessment. They concluded that Self- and peer assessment are to some extent similar to teacher assessment but they will not ever be as accurate as teacher assessment (p. 10).

Conclusions

In this study, the effectiveness of self-assessment and peer feedback on the accuracy and fluency of L2 oral performance of EFL students was investigated. It was shown that both techniques made students' progress in their accuracy of L2 oral production from the pretest to the posttest. Therefore, both techniques seem to be important and useful techniques in EFL contexts, and teachers can incorporate it in their classrooms. However, teachers should decide in advance on what features of oral production their students are going to focus on, and provide feedback, since all linguistic aspects may not be affected by provision of feedback through peer feedback as it was shown in the current study it was observed that some features were not influenced by the technique of peer feedback. Also, to gain better results, it is recommended that teachers train students in these techniques so that they could use them effectively. It is hoped that this thesis could have clarified the concepts of self-assessment and peer feedback as two practical and effective approaches for teachers to employ them in their teaching programs.

Implication

The current study adds to the existing body of research on the role of self-assessment and also peer feedback in EFL contexts, especially on oral production. In this way, this study has some important implications for both teachers and learners. The findings of this study suggest that the self-assessment and peer feedback techniques are valuable and effective assets that teachers can employ in English classes. Due to the lack of time, teachers cannot provide feedback to all students' oral performance. Therefore, giving students time and opportunity to critically listen to their classmates and then provide them with feedbacks can also make them more critical of their own performance especially during their self-assessment procedures, and also can lead them to be more responsible presenters. Although Iranian foreign language learners may prefer teacher-fronted activities, teachers are required to create more opportunities for the students to take the responsibility of giving feedback to their peers.

Authorities and policy makers of the Education Department should be encouraged to incorporate peer feedback in their general policies, teaching principles, and strategies of their organizations.

Teacher trainers should take the results of this research and other similar studies on peer feedback to their teacher training classes, familiarize teacher students with the principles of peer feedback on oral performance.

Self-assessment can also provide the opportunity for students to capture and analyze their own speech, which under normal circumstances is hard to recall. They can also get the chance to review their spoken output and to self-correct before getting feedback in the form of peer- or tutor-correction. Interested teachers may also use self-assessment as a tool to encourage students to take greater responsibility for their own learning that finally leads to deeper learning.

---

[18] Salehi M., Daryabar B. Self- and peer assessment of oral presentations: Investigating correlations and attitudes. *English for Specific Purposes World,* 2014*,* vol. 15 (42), pp. 1–12.

REFERENCES

1. Ahangari S. The effect of self, peer and teacher correction on the pronunciation improvement of Iranian EFL learners. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 2014, vol. 5 (1), pp. 81–89. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.5n.1p.81

2. Ahangari S., Rassekh-Alqol B., Ali Akbari Hamed L. The effect of peer assessment on oral presentation in an EFL context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 2013, vol. 2 (3), pp. 45–53. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.3p.45

3. Ariafar M., Fatemipour H. The effect of self-assessment on Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature,* 2013, vol. 2 (4), pp. 7–13. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.4p.7

4. Benson P. Autonomy in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 2006, vol. 40 (1), pp. 21–40. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003958

5. Birjandi P., Hadidi Tamjid N. The role of self-assessment in promoting Iranian EFL learners' motivation. *English Language Teaching*, 2010, vol. 3 (3), pp. 211–220. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n3p211

6. Carless N.-F. L. Peer feedback: the learning element. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 2007, vol. 11 (1), pp. 279–290. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582

7. Cheng W., Warren M. Having second thoughts: Student perceptions before and after a peer assessment exercise. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1997, vol. 22 (2), pp. 233–239. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079712331381064

8. Chu R. Effects of teacher's corrective feedback on accuracy in the oral English of English-majors college students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2010, vol. 1 (5), pp. 454–459. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.5.454-459

9. Gadušová Z., Hašková A., Predanocyová L. Teachers' professional competence and their evaluation. *Education and Self Development*, 2019, vol. 14 (3), pp. 17–24. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26907/esd14.3.02

10. Gadušová Z., Jakubovská V., Markechová D., Tirpakova A. Teacher competences development - A guarantee of sustainable high level of education and training. *TEM Journal*, 2019, vol. 8 (3), pp. 1063–1070. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18421/TEM83-52

11. Gadušová Z., Vítečková M. Mentors' and novices' perception of teachers' professional career start in Slovakia and in the Czech Republic. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 2013, vol. 106, pp. 1825–1833. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.207

12. Gadušova Z., Hašková A., Szarszoi D. Teachers` competences evaluation: Case study [In English]. *Science for Education Today*, 2020, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 164–177. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15293/2658-6762.2003.09

13. Hašková A., Lukáčová D., Noga H. Teacher self-assessment as a part of quality management. *Science for Education Today*, 2019, vol. 9 (2), pp. 156–169. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15293/2658-6762.1902.11

14. Jabr R. K. Introducing the skills of self-assessment and peer feedback. *SiSAL Journal,* 2011, vol. 2 (1), pp. 26–31. URL: https://sisaljournal.org/archives/mar11/jabr/

15. Khodadady E., Khodabakhshzade H. The effect of portfolio and self-assessment on writing ability and autonomy. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research,* 2012, vol. 3 (3), pp. 518–524. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.3.518-524

16. Khonamri F., Ahmadi F. The effect of metacognitive strategy training and raising EFL learners' metacognitive knowledge on listening performance. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2015, vol. 5 (1), pp. 19–28. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v5i1.827

17. Khonamri F., Roostaee S. Does extensive reading combined with form-focused or meaning-focused activities affect lexical collocational knowledge of Iranian learners? *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2014, vol. 4 (5), pp. 1038–1044. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.5.1038-1044

18. Liu N.-F., Carless D. Peer feedback: the learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 2006, vol. 11 (3), pp. 279–290. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582

19. Lundstorm K., Baker W. To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2009, vol. 18 (1), pp. 30–43. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002

20. Moradi M. R., Karimpour Z. The effect of peer assessment on oral presentation in an EFL context. *International Education Studies,* 2012, vol. 5 (2), pp. 113–117. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n2p113

21. MacGarrell H. Native and non-native English speaking student teachers engage in peer feedback. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2010, vol. 13 (1), pp. 71–90. URL: https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19930

22. Nedzinskaitė I., Švenčionienė D., Zavistanavičienė D. Achievements in language learning through students' self-assessment. *Studies About Languages,* 2006, no. 8, pp. 84–87. URL: https://www.kalbos.lt/zurnalai/08_numeris/12.pdf

23. Ochoa E. O. Self-assessment practices: An empowering tool in the teaching and learning EFL processes. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 2007, no. 9, pp. 229–246. URL: http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/calj/n9/n9a12.pdf

24. Patri M. The influence of peer feedback on self- and peer-assessment of oral skills. *Language Testing*, 2002, vol. 19 (2), pp. 109–131. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/0265532202lt224oa

25. Pavlíková M. The power of modern technologies in the fiction of Don DeLillo. *Communications – Scientific Letters of the University of Zilina*, 2018, vol. 20 (1A), pp. 57–60. URL: http://komunikacie.uniza.sk/index.php/communications/article/view/64/47

26. Pavlíková M., Žalec B. Struggle for the human self and authenticity: kierkegaard's critique of the public, established order, media, and false christianity. *Bogoslovni Vestnik*, 2019, vol. 79 (4), pp. 1015–1026. DOI: https://doi.org/10.34291/BV2019/04/Pavlikova

27. Záhorec J., Nagyová A., Hašková A. Teachers´ attitudes to incorporation digital means in teaching process in relation to the subjects they teach. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (IJEP)*, 2019, vol. 9 (4), pp. 100–120. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v9i4.11064

28. Záhorec J., Hašková A., Munk M., Particular results of a research aimed at curricula design of teacher training in the area of didactic technological competences. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (IJEP)*, 2018, vol. 8 (4), pp. 16–31. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v8i4.8184