



The Comparative Effect of Self-Assessment and Peer Assessment on Reflective and Impulsive EFL Learners' Speaking Skill

Sahar Imani

*Foreign Languages Department, Islamic Azad University,
Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran.
sahar_imani@hotmail.com*

Abstract

This study aimed to compare the effect of two types of assessment, i.e., self-assessment and peer assessment, on reflective and impulsive EFL learners' speaking skill. To this end, a group of 51 (24 impulsive and 27 reflective) intermediate EFL learners were selected based on their performance on a PET (Preliminary English Test), and the Impulsiveness Sub-Scale of Eysenck's Impulsivity Inventory. They were randomly divided into two experimental groups (i.e., self-assessment and peer assessment), each containing impulsive, and reflective learners. In the self-assessment group, the assessment was based on the Speaking Self-Assessment Sheet designed by Babaii, Taghaddomi and Pashmforoosh (2015). In the peer assessment group, the assessment was based on the Peer Assessment Rating Sheet by Yamashiro and Johnson (1997). At the end of the treatment, the participants received the speaking section of another PET as a posttest. The results of two-way ANOVA revealed that (a) the assessment type and cognitive type had no significant interaction, (b) self-assessment and peer assessment had the same effect on impulsive and reflective learners' speaking skill, (c) irrespective of the assessment type, learners with different cognitive types performed differently, with the reflective learners outperforming their impulsive counterparts.

Keywords: EFL Learners; Impulsive Learners; Peer Assessment; Reflective Learners; Self-Assessment; Speaking Skill

1. Introduction

Being able to communicate successfully is the most prominent of all life skills and abilities (Richards, 2008). Speaking ability has also been regarded as a significant skill in foreign language learning and teaching (Bygate, 2002). Speaking is an ability that naturally forms the basis of numerous individuals' judgment about language learners' overall language proficiency and competence (Chuang, 2009). In addition to the importance of speaking in learning a new language, language learners typically want to recognize how much improvement and progress they actually make and what their errors and mistakes naturally are predominantly in the field of speaking (Ashraf & Mahdinezhad, 2015; Esfandiari & Tavassoli, 2019). Some forms of assessment are required to help language learners pinpoint their improvement and mistakes and make them more involved in their language learning (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010).

In this day and age, simultaneous with the new developments in education, assessment seems to be under the spotlight rooted in its profound significance in teaching and learning (Campbell & Collins, 2007; Musfirah, 2019). It is now believed that assessment can function as a technique to reinforce and improve learning in ELT programs (Ashraf & Mahdinezhad, 2015; McKay, 2006). However, if language teachers make every choice in this process, it would limit language learners' potential improvement and development (Ako, 2009).

The alternative assessment takes account of the learner as a dynamic contributor in assessment, as opposed to the inactive subject of it (Casson, 2009). More specifically, alternative assessment is considered an attempt to account for the role of learners in the assessment process and their internal factors (e.g., cognitive and personality factors) (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010). Peer assessment and self-assessment are acknowledged as two favorite and highly advised practices when working within the framework of alternative assessment (Brown & Hudson, 2012).

It is believed that the principles underpinning self-and peer assessment propose certain benefits (Brown & Hudson, 2012). Self-assessment is one of the new types of assessment that is implemented by language learners in exploring, developing, and understanding their functionality (Ma & Winke, 2019). It has been argued that self-assessment is a valuable assessment technique for language learners because of its essential role in keeping language learners interested, engaged, motivated, accountable, and self-directed (Miller, 2003).

On the other hand, peer assessment is believed to improve language learners' self-confidence, accountability, ownership sense, social abilities, and cooperative and collaborative work (Esfandiari & Tavassoli, 2019). One of the critical principles of exercising alternative assessment is appreciating learners' internal



factors and how these factors might affect learning and evaluation (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010). Such a focus on the role of internal factors in assessment seems to be parallel with the growing cognizance of the pivotal role of mental and personality factors in terms of how L2 proficiency is developed (Fahim & Zaker, 2014; Mitchell, Myles, & Marsden, 2013). Cognitive style is one of these mental factors that significantly influence EFL learners' performance and learning (Xu, 2011).

Cognitive style is defined as a person's habitual, and preferred styles of identifying, recalling, establishing, processing and demonstrating information (Dörnyei, 2005). The reflectivity-impulsivity is one of the significant dimensions of cognitive style widely acknowledged to play a crucial role in determining EFL learners' performance and language development (Ismaeel & Al Mulhim, 2021; Weisstein & Jacobson, 2009). According to Rashtchi and Keyvanfar (2010), an impulsive individual makes rapid suppositions and trusts profoundly on their guesses. In contrast, a reflective individual makes allowance for a variety of issues before making an intended conclusion, necessitating more endurance.

Despite the significance of speaking ability, cognitive styles, self-assessment, and peer assessment in EFL context, it seems that little research, if any, have examined the comparative effect of self-assessment and peer assessment on reflective and impulsive EFL learners' speaking ability. Rooted in the aforesaid premises above, and considering the significance of speaking (Bygate, 2002; Nunan, 2001; Richards, 2008), the present study aimed to study how peer and self-assessment affect impulsive and reflective EFL learners' speaking development.

2. Review of the Related Literature

Language learning process involves learning different language abilities, one of which is speaking. For most individuals, speaking is identical to knowing that specific language (Celce-Murcia, 2001). Additionally, teaching speaking skill throughout the history of language teaching has also been one of the most challenging and important tasks; however, despite this, it is occasionally ignored and overlooked (Bora, 2012).

Richards and Renandya (2002) stated that most EFL learners desire to speak English. They also define speaking in English as a multi-dimensional skill that can serve speakers to achieve many purposes in various contexts. They argue that to become a good speaker of a foreign language not only does require somebody to possess considerable syntactic and semantic knowledge, but also the learners have to know how a language is used in different social contexts. This is what makes speaking a difficult skill to acquire (Richards & Renandya, 2002).

Speaking has also been defined as a productive skill to demonstrate meaning to others (Spratt, Pulverness, & Williams, 2008).

Celce-Murcia (2001) states that speaking is typically equivalent to knowing a language. Nunan (2003) negates that teaching and learning speaking in a second language is a complex and challenging task for both educators and learners particularly in contexts in which English is taught and learned as a foreign language. Concerning the importance of speaking, Ellis (2004) states that the most common purpose in learning a language is to gain the ability to express it.

Self-assessment is related to the learners' participation in assessing their learning, especially, their achievements and the results of their learning (Birjandi, & Bolghari, 2015). Peer assessment is linked with cooperative learning (Fulcher & Davidson, 2007). The value of collaboration is highly appreciated in this technique and it causes more interaction among students. Furthermore, it is one of the alternatives that can integrate assessment and instruction. Researchers have agreed that the principles underpinning self-and peer-assessment offer certain benefits (Brown & Hudson, 2012).

Self-assessment is presented to respond to opposition to the traditional forms of assessment. This process of taking the accountability of learning and assessment, permits the student to become more self-governing (Chen, 2008) and consequently more autonomous. Self-assessment is related to the learners' participation in assessing their learning, especially their achievements and the results of their education (Birjandi & Bolghari, 2015). Self-assessment is a method used in teaching to improve the role of students in their learning. This type of assessment is generally used for formative assessment objectives to encourage the students' consideration of their learning process and results (Harris & Brown, 2013). Moreover, Harris and McCann (1994) argues that self-assessment is valuable since it is faster to ask learners openly what difficulties they have.

Richards and Schmidt (2002) define peer assessment as an "alternative assessment technique through which learners' assess one another's progress through using some checklists provided by their teachers" (p. 47). It is also an efficient type of alternative assessment technique (Richards & Schmidt, 2002). Furthermore, it is one of the alternatives that can integrate assessment and instruction (Fulcher & Davidson, 2007).

Peer assessment is thought to be one of the principal types of option evaluation. The significance of associate evaluation is highlighted in distinctive instructive learning and instructive examination. Slavin (1997) alluded to associate appraisal as one of the best and culminate achievements in informative history. Peer appraisal enhances the learning of understudies through "a feeling



of proprietorship and obligation, inspiration, and impression of the understudies' own learning" (Saito & Fujita, 2009, p. 152). Peer assessment is suggested by Shepard (2000) as one of the successful methodologies for classroom assessment.

The conceptual tempo or the dimension of reflectivity/ impulsivity is an aspect of cognitive style (Redmond & Willis, 2013). Smith (2003) defines reflective students as those over-focused, postpone decision making for what appears like incessantly, concentrate on bits of information so long that they overlook the crucial point, while impulsive students were defined as those who take jeopardies with language (Brown, 2007). Brown (2007) further maintained that an impulsive style suggests a method wherein an individual makes several various gambles based on guesses with perhaps numerous chances before an elucidation is realized. Impulsivity and reflectivity character of language learners are essential consideration for L2 learning and teaching (Brown, 2007).

Different studies have been conducted on the effect of assessment on different language skills. For instance, Ariaifar and Fatemipour (2013) inspected the effect of self-assessment on EFL students' speaking. The researchers concluded that self-assessment significantly improved EFL learners' speaking ability. In another study, Heidarian (2016) explored the potential influence of self-assessment on writing of EFL learners. It was found that self-assessment had a significant impact on writing of EFL learners. Likewise, Mazloomi and Khabiri (2018) explored the possible effect of dynamic self-assessment on EFL students' writing. The findings showed that using dynamic self-assessment significantly improved EFL students' writing skills.

Since no study has been done to investigate the comparative impact of self-assessment and peer-assessment on reflective/impulsive EFL learners' speaking skill, this study was an effort to fill this gap and accordingly formulated the following research questions:

- Q₁: Do the assessment and cognitive type significantly interact in their effects on EFL learners' speaking skill?
- Q₂: Is there any significant difference between the effect of peer assessment and self-assessment on reflective EFL learners' speaking skill?
- Q₃: Is there any significant difference between the effect of peer assessment and self-assessment on impulsive EFL learners' speaking skill?
- Q₄: Does peer assessment have a significantly different effect on reflective and impulsive EFL learners' speaking skill?

Q₅: Does self-assessment have a significantly different effect on reflective and impulsive EFL learners' speaking skill?

3. Method

3.1. Design

The design of this study is factorial design because there was one independent variable with two modalities (treatment groups): self-assessment and peer assessment. Speaking skill was regarded as the dependent variable. Besides, the cognitive style with two modalities (impulsiveness and reflectiveness) was considered a moderator variable. The age of the participants (20-34) and language proficiency (intermediate) were considered control variables.

3.2. Participants

The participants were 51 EFL learners with the age range of 20-34. They studied English as a foreign language at the intermediate level in the Ofogh Language Institute, located in Kermanshah, Iran. The participants were selected based on convenience sampling and accessibility procedure. They were randomly divided into four experimental groups: one reflective and one impulsive group received self-assessment, and the other reflective and impulsive group received peer assessment.

3.3. Instruments and Materials

3.3.1. Preliminary English Test

To check the homogeneity of the participants, the researcher applied a piloted version of the Preliminary English Test (PET). PET consists of three parts: Part 1 was allocated to reading and writing. Part two was allocated to listening, and part three was allocated to speaking. In this study, the whole package was used.

3.3.2. Impulsiveness Sub-Scale of Eysenck's Impulsivity Inventory

Eysenck's Impulsivity Inventory (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1978) consists of 54 items. In this study, the questionnaire was given to participants based on yes and no response, which means whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement. Each yes answer had one-point score. Items 5, 16 and 17 had to be reverse-scaled. In this regard, the result could vary from 0 to 19. The participants who obtained scores under ten were considered reflective, and those with a score equal to 10 and more were considered impulsive. The respondents were supposed to answer the questions in 10 minutes. The reliability of the questionnaire was 0.82 using Cronbach's alpha.



3.3.3. Instructional Materials

“Speak Out, Second Edition” ([Antonia Clare & Wilson, 2015](#)) is published by Pearson Education. This book consists of 10 units and each unit includes four lessons. In this study, the students studied units 4, 5, and 6, which were about Jobs, Solutions, and Emotions, respectively.

3.3.4. Techniques for Teaching Speaking

The lesson plan for speaking sections in the Ofogh Language Institute was based on an interactive model. For this purpose, the researcher used different techniques of teaching speaking. Techniques can best encourage students’ participation in the learning speaking process ([Kayi, 2006](#)). The researcher taught nine speaking techniques to the participants of experimental groups based on [Kayi \(2006\)](#). These techniques were: *show and tell, reporting, picture describing, drama/role play/simulation, question and answer, information gap, interviews, storytelling/story completion, and discussion*

3.3.5. The Speaking Peer Assessment Rating Sheet

To assess speaking in peer assessment groups, the rating sheet by [Yamashiro and Johnson \(1997\)](#) was used. It consisted of five parts.

The first part belonged to 'Voice Control', which contained four items.

The second part belonged to 'Body Language', which contained three items.

The third part belonged to 'Contents of Presentation', which contained three items.

The fourth part belonged to 'Effectiveness', which contained four items.

The fifth part belonged to 'Visuals', which contained one item.

The items were based on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from ‘Poor (=1)’, ‘Weak (=2)’, ‘Average (=3)’, ‘Good (=4)’ to ‘Very Good (=5)’. Therefore, the participants’ scores were ranged between 15 to 75.

3.3.6. The Speaking Self-Assessment Sheet

For the purpose of speaking self-assessment, the self-assessment sheet designed by [Babaii, Taghaddomi, and Pashmforoosh \(2015\)](#) was used. The self-assessment sheet was based on different criteria, namely, fluency, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, communicative effectiveness, topic management, confidence,

organization, strategy use, and time management. The ten aforementioned criteria were based on a 5 point Likert scale, ranging from 5 to 1. Therefore, the participants' scores varied between 10 to 50.

3.4. Procedure

3.4.1. Pre-Treatment Stage

To select homogeneous participants, the PET was administered to a group of EFL learners within the age range of 20-34. It is noteworthy that initially, the researcher asked the EFL learners to identify whether they agreed to participate in the study. That is, their informed consent was obtained. They were studying English as a foreign language at the intermediate level in Ofogh Language Institute, located in Kermanshah, Iran.

Among them, 51 homogenous EFL learners were chosen, and randomly divided into two experimental groups of self-assessment, and peer assessment. Then, they responded to the Eysenck's Impulsivity Inventory to determine their cognitive style. Based on the results, 27 EFL learners were reflective learners and 24 EFL learners were considered impulsive ones. They were divided into four experimental groups: one reflective and one impulsive group received self-assessment and the other reflective and impulsive group received peer assessment.

The four groups were instructed by the same teacher/researcher, using the same material, units 4, 5, and 6 of 'Speak Out (Second Edition, Intermediate Level)'. All experimental groups attended their classes two times a week for 12 sessions for six weeks. It is noteworthy that in this study, the PET and the Eysenck's Impulsivity Inventory were administered in the first session. In the second session, the first speaking technique was introduced to the participants of four experimental groups. So, the teacher/researcher taught nine speaking techniques to the participants.

Each session the teacher/researcher defined and described one technique in detail to the participants. After teaching and practicing the speaking technique, the same topic was assigned to four experimental groups. They were asked to talk and express their ideas regarding each topic and record their videos in their homes. In Experimental Group I the peer assessment was based on the Peer Assessment Rating Sheet designed by Yamashiro and Johnson (1997). In Experimental Group II the self-assessment was based on the Speaking Self-Assessment Sheet designed by Babaii, Taghaddomi, and Pashmforoosh (2015). The following sections clarify the step-by-step procedure being performed in each group.



3.4.2. Treatment Stage

3.4.2.1. Experimental Group I: Peer Assessment Group

In Experimental Group I the assessment was through peer assessment using the model, which consisted of seven steps as follows:

Step 1. Training for peer assessment:

For this purpose, in the first five sessions of the training/treatment, due to the participants' unfamiliarity with the speaking peer assessment, the teacher gave support to each step taken by the participants until they became more and more proficient in using the peer assessment.

Step 2. Students should record their videos:

As mentioned before, the participants were requested to talk about the predetermined topics and record their videos in their homes. Each session, the videos of 4-5 students were played and peer assessed in the classroom.

Step 3. For each speaker, a peer-assessment rating sheet was given. It was essential to explain the criteria of the rating sheet to students.

For this purpose, the teacher/researcher clearly explained the rating sheet and how the students must assess their peers using the rating sheet. The participants were instructed to fill out the rating sheets for peer assessment distributed for each speaker. In this way, each speaker got assessments from all their classmates in the classroom. It should be mentioned that the peer assessment rating sheet used in this study was designed by Yamashiro and Johnson (1997). Moreover, in the first five sessions, the teacher used the think-aloud technique and explained how she evaluated the speaker. 4-5 speaking performance samples were played twice and assessed based on the rating sheet.

Step 4. The students were divided into small groups to assess their peer's performance.

In this way, the participants provided feedback regarding the speaker's weaknesses and strengths.

Step 5. The rating sheets were then collected and given to the teacher.

Step 6. The teacher recorded the scores and determined an average score.

Step 7. At the end of the class, the rating sheets are returned to each student.

It can help the participants to develop their skills based on the comments of their peers.

3.4.2.2. Experimental Group II: Self-Assessment Group

Having provided the students with the speaking self-assessment sheet, the teacher/researcher introduced and explained the criteria against which the students were supposed to evaluate their speaking ability. At the beginning of the training/treatment, due to the participants' unfamiliarity with the speaking self-assessment, the teacher gave support to each step taken by the students until the participants became more and more proficient in self-assessment. For this purpose, in the first five sessions the teacher using the think-aloud technique explained how she self-assessed her performance. In the meantime, the students in the self-assessment group remained silent even though they had the opportunity to give comments and ask questions whenever they wanted. Next, the students in the self-assessment group were asked to listen to videos twice, self-assessed their speaking mainly based on the above-mentioned checklist, and gave themselves a score (Babaii, Taghaddomi & Pashmforoosh, 2015). The checklists were then collected and given to the teacher. The teacher records the scores. Finally, the teacher returned the checklists to students to help them develop their skills. It is worth noting that the aforementioned procedure was used initially by Babaii et al. (2015), and the researcher used their techniques in the present study. At the end of the treatment period, in the 12th session, all the groups received the PET speaking section, another version, as posttests. Then, the statistical procedures were conducted to see whether the difference between the four groups was statistically significant or not.

4. Results

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics of the four groups concerning their speaking test before the treatment.



Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of the Groups on the Speaking Test Before the Treatment

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Skewness			Kurtosis		
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Ratio	Statistic	Std. Error	Ratio
Peer-assessment-Impulsive	22	8.00	12.50	10.93	1.22	-1.10	.49	-2.24	1.23	.95	1.29
Peer-assessment-Reflective	21	8.00	14.00	10.83	2.82	.01	.50	.01	-2.09	.97	-2.15
Self-assessment-Impulsive	21	7.00	14.00	10.71	2.18	.16	.50	.32	-1.72	.97	-1.76
Self-assessment-Reflective	20	5.00	16.00	10.92	4.56	-.23	.51	-.45	-2.06	.99	-2.07
Valid N (listwise)	20										

Because of the violation of the normality, a Kruskal Wallis test was used to compare the four groups concerning their speaking test before the treatment. Tables 2 and 3 report the results.

Table 2

The Table of Ranks for the Speaking Pretest Scores of the Groups

	Group	N	Mean Rank
Speaking Pretest	Peer-assessment-Impulsive	22	41.41
	Peer-assessment-Reflective	21	41.86
	Self-assessment-Impulsive	21	41.50
	Self-assessment-Reflective	20	45.43

Table 3

Kruskal Wallis Test on Speaking of the Groups before the Treatment

	Speaking Pretest
Chi-Square	.385
Df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.943

The results revealed that there was no significant difference between the mean rank of the four groups on the speaking test before the treatment ($X^2(3) = 0.385$, $p = 0.943 > 0.05$).

Moreover, a two-way between-groups ANOVA was to be conducted to inspect the interactions. Tables 4 and 5 below indicate the results of the posttest administration for the four groups and the normality of the distributions, respectively.



Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for the Posttest Speaking Scores

		Cognitive Style	Statistic	Std. Error
Speaking Posttest	Impulsive	N	24	
		Mean	18.271	.4126
		Std. Deviation	2.0215	
		Skewness	.201	.472
		Kurtosis	-1.191	.918
	Reflective	N	27	
		Mean	18.852	.3277
		Std. Deviation	1.7030	
		Skewness	-.533	.448
		Kurtosis	.509	.872
Assessment Type				
Speaking Posttest	Peer-Assessment	N	23	
		Mean	17.957	.4025
		Std. Deviation	1.9301	
		Skewness	.327	.481
		Kurtosis	-.635	.935
	Self-Assessment	N	28	
		Mean	19.089	.3161
		Std. Deviation	1.6725	
		Skewness	-.525	.441
		Kurtosis	.111	.858

Table 5

Tests of Normality of Posttest Speaking Scores

	Assessment Type	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Speaking Posttest	Peer-Assessment	.143	23	.200	.962	23	.501
	Self-Assessment	.157	28	.074	.968	28	.518
	Cognitive Style						
Speaking Posttest	Impulsive	.152	24	.159	.939	24	.153
	Reflective	.160	27	.073	.955	27	.290

Testing the equality of error variance is another key assumption underlying the ANOVA test. To test this assumption, the result of Levene's test was inspected (Table 6).

Table 6

Levene's Test of Error Variance

F	df1	df2	Sig.
.916	3	47	.440

As Table 6 shows, the Sig. value is higher than .05. This suggests that the variance of speaking scores across the groups is equal. Accordingly, it was concluded that the homogeneity of variances assumption is met. After ensuring that the assumptions were met, the two-way between-groups ANOVA was run to answer the questions. The results are shown in Table 7:



Table 7

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	18.174 ^a	3	6.058	1.831	.154
Intercept	16794.725	1	16794.725	5075.828	.000
Assessment Type	1.971	1	1.971	.596	.444
Cognitive Style	13.885	1	13.885	4.196	.046
Cognitive Style * Assessment Type	.011	1	.011	.003	.955
Error	155.512	47	3.309		
Total	17776.750	51			
Corrected Total	173.686	50			

As reported in Table 7, the results of the two-way between-groups ANOVA test revealed that the assessment type and cognitive type had no significant interaction ($F_{(1, 47)} = 0.003, P=0.955>0.05$).

With the interaction found to be non-significant, the main effects could be drawn upon to show the significance of the impact of the independent variable (assessment type) as well as the moderator variable (cognitive type) separately. As depicted in Table 7, the effect of **assessment type** turned out to be non-significant ($F=.596, p=.444>.05$). This implies that peer assessment and self-assessment had the same positive effect on both impulsive and reflective EFL learners’ speaking skill.

For the other main effect, Table 7 also shows that **cognitive type** had a significant impact on the EFL learners’ speaking skill ($F=4.196, p=.046<.05$). This means that irrespective of the assessment type, EFL learners with different cognitive types performed differently, with the reflective learners outperforming their impulsive counterparts, as shown in Table 8 below.

Table 8

Estimated Marginal Means of Groups

Cognitive Style	Assessment Type	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Impulsive	Peer-Assessment	17.769	.505	16.754	18.784
	Self-Assessment	18.864	.548	17.760	19.967
Reflective	Peer-Assessment	18.200	.575	17.043	19.357
	Self-Assessment	19.235	.441	18.348	20.123

Table 8 shows the estimated marginal means of the groups. The estimated marginal mean of the peer-assessment-impulsive group was 17.76, while that of the self-assessment-impulsive group was 18.86. In addition, the estimated marginal mean of peer-assessment-reflective group was 18.20, while that of self-assessment-reflective group was 19.23.

5. Discussion

This study explored the comparative effect of self-assessment and peer assessment on reflective and impulsive EFL learners' speaking skill. The obtained results noted that the assessment type and cognitive type had no significant interaction in their effects on EFL learners' speaking skill. Moreover, there was no significant difference between the effect of peer assessment and self-assessment on reflective EFL learners' speaking skill, and there is no significant difference between the effect of peer assessment and self-assessment on impulsive EFL learners' speaking skill. As a result, it was concluded that peer assessment and self-assessment had the same significant positive effect on both impulsive and reflective EFL learners' speaking skill. Finally, the results indicated that reflective EFL learners outperformed the other group when exercising peer-assessment. In a similar vein, reflective EFL learners outperformed the other group when exercising self-assessment.

The above-mentioned findings generally bring about a systematic support and confirmation for the existing belief that the two employed types of alternative assessment, i.e., peer and self-assessment, can be regarded as legitimate techniques for developing productive language skills, in this case, speaking skill (Brown & Hudson, 2012). The finding is in line with the findings of other studies



such as [Ariafar and Fatemipour \(2013\)](#), [Heidarian \(2016\)](#) and [Mazloomi and Khabiri \(2018\)](#). However, it is important to take cognizance of one point regarding the results obtained, i.e., the advantage of reflective EFL learners over the impulsive learners in both of the treatment groups in terms of the development of the speaking skill.

Based on the obtained results in this study, employing peer and self-assessment similarly and equally result in higher speaking skill development for reflective learners (see Tables 1& 4). This is not to deny the advantages of alternative assessment in ELT programs; however, it is sensible to argue that encouraging reflection among EFL learners can function as a means for obtaining better results in boosting their speaking skill.

This advantage for reflective learners in both of the assessment groups brings about a sensible support for the belief that reflectivity results in obtaining higher levels of development in different aspects for learners ([Helyer, 2015](#)). This finding is also in line with the notion that reflectivity considerably assists learners in developing their communication skills, not irrelevant to the speaking skill ([Chang, 2019](#)). Reflection helps learners to obtain a deeper understanding of concepts and topics, and improve their performance in tasks and contexts ([Cavilla, 2017](#)). Therefore, providing planned psychological training on reflectivity is a practical pedagogical decision in ELT contexts and programs.

Ultimately, the observed advantage of reflectivity over impulsivity in developing EFL learners' speaking skill when exercising peer and self-assessment should be checked and verified in other ELT contexts.

6. Conclusion

Some pedagogical implications are proposed in this section: As the results of the present study provide practical support for the estimation that both self-assessment and peer-assessment were found beneficial in the same way on EFL learners' speaking skill, EFL teachers are thus recommended to use both types of assessment (i.e., self-assessment and peer assessment) by their students' language abilities and cognitive styles without abandoning one at the expense of the other.

There was a significant difference between impulsive and reflective EFL learners in terms of speaking skill, and reflective EFL learners were found to have higher levels of speaking skill than their impulsive counterparts in both self-assessment and peer assessment groups. Therefore, the findings of this study can help EFL teachers with the issues they may be faced with their learners in terms of different cognitive styles and the influence of these cognitive styles on EFL learners' speaking skill. Moreover, based on the results of this study, EFL teachers should detect impulsive EFL learners and support them to move toward

reflectivity by using proper techniques such as helping them not to respond to any questions on the spur of the moment and thoughtlessly.

Additionally, EFL teachers and instructors can also familiarize language learners with different cognitive styles, what every cognitive style means, and how cognitive techniques can support language learning in general and speaking skill in particular. Consequently, EFL learners can gradually develop a sense of what is required to become self-directed students. EFL teachers should be careful not get involved in preferring one cognitive style to the other that could simply end in the marginalization of some language students.

As for EFL learners, the results might suggest that being familiar with and applying different types of assessment in general and self-assessment and peer assessment in particular would help them improve their speaking skill in the same manner. The results might also recommend that EFL learners should identify their cognitive style and try to make use of different strategies appropriate for their cognitive features to improve their speaking.

Syllabus designers and material developers are also the beneficiaries of the present study. The findings can help syllabus designers to grasp a better picture of both impulsive and reflective EFL learners' speaking skill and how self-assessment and peer assessment influence their speaking skill. As both assessment types were found beneficial in the same way on EFL learners' speaking skill, syllabus designers are recommended to incorporate different assessment types in their syllabi. They therefore improve both impulsive and reflective EFL learners' speaking skill. The results of this study may also assist material developers in preparing different tasks and activities adequately appropriate to the EFL learners' cognitive styles to nurture their speaking skill. Functions and exercises should be based on EFL learners' cognitive styles to improve their speaking skill and successful participation in various communicative activities.

In conclusion, some suggestions for further investigations are presented. It is recommended to replicate this investigation over an extended period concerning the treatment phase. Moreover, the same research can be done in a larger sample of reflective, and impulsive EFL learners to provide the researcher(s) with more accurate and generalizable results. In this study, in self-assessment group, the assessment was based on the Speaking Self-Assessment Sheet by [Babaii, Taghaddomi and Pashmforoosh \(2015\)](#), while in the peer assessment group the assessment was based on the Peer Assessment Rating Sheet by [Yamashiro and Johnson \(1997\)](#). It is suggested that other studies employ other assessment models and rating sheets for self-and peer-assessments.



References

- Ako, W. W. (2009). *Assessment matters: Self-assessment and peer assessment*. Hamilton: Teaching Development Unit.
- Ariaifar, M., & Fatemipour, H. R. (2013). The effect of self-assessment on Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 2(4), 7-15.
- Ashraf, H., & Mahdinezhad, M. (2015). The role of peer-assessment versus self-assessment in promoting autonomy in language use: A case of EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 5(2), 110-120.
- Babaii, E., Taghaddomi, S., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2015). Speaking self-assessment: Mismatches between learners' and teachers' criteria. *Language Testing*, 33(3), 411-437.
- Birjandi, P., & Bolghari, M. S. (2015). The relationship between the accuracy of self-and peer-assessment of Iranian intermediate EFL learners and their learning styles. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 5(5), 1-18.
- Bora, F. D. (2012). The impact of emotional intelligence on developing speaking skills: From brain-based perspective. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 2094-2098.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th Ed.). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices* (Vol. 10). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, J. D., & Hudson, T. (2012). The alternatives in language assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 653-675.
- Bygate, M. (2002). Speaking. In: R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *the Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 27-38). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, C., & Collins, V. L. (2007). Identifying essential topics in general and special education introductory assessment textbooks. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 26(1), 9-18.
- Casson, A. (2009). *Assessment in outdoor education*. Unpublished MA thesis. Queen's University Kingston, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

-
- Cavilla, D. (2017). The effects of student reflection on academic performance and motivation. *SAGE Open*, 7(3), 1-13.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd Ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chang, B. (2019). Reflection in learning. *Online Learning*, 23(1), 95-110.
- Chen, Y. (2008). Learning to self-assess oral performance in English: A longitudinal case study. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(1), 235-262.
- Chuang, Y. Y. (2009). Foreign language speaking assessment: Taiwanese college English teachers' scoring performance in the holistic and analytic rating methods. *Asian EFL Journal*, 11(1), 150-173.
- Clare, A., & Wilson, J. J. (2015). *Speak out advanced student's book with DVD-ROM*; (2nd Ed.). Edinburgh Gate Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ellis, R. (2004). Tasks, production & lagunage acquisition. In: R. Ellis (Ed.), *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching* (pp.10-140). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Esfandiari, S., & Tavassoli, K. (2019). The comparative effect of self-assessment vs. peer-assessment on young EFL learners' performance on selective and productive reading tasks. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)*, 22(2), 1-35.
- Eysenck, S. B., & Eysenck, H. J. (1978). Impulsiveness and venturesomeness: Their position in a dimensional system of personality description. *Psychological reports*, 43(3), 1247-1255.
- Fahim, M., & Zaker, A. (2014). EFL learners' creativity and critical thinking: Are they associated? *Humanizing Language Teaching*, 16(3), 1-18.
- Fulcher, G., & Davidson, F. (2007). *Language testing and assessment: An advanced resource book*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Harris, L. R., & Brown, G. T. (2013). Opportunities and obstacles to consider when using peer-and self-assessment to improve student learning: Case studies into teachers' implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 36, 101-111.



- Harris, M., & McCann, P. (1994). *Assessment*. London: Heinemann.
- Heidarian, N. (2016). Investigating the effect of using self-assessment on Iranian EFL learners' writing. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(28), 80-89.
- Helyer, R. (2015). Learning through reflection: The critical role of reflection in work-based learning (WBL). *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, 7(1), 15-27.
- Ismaeel, D., & Al Mulhim, E. (2021). The influence of interactive and static infographics on the academic achievement of reflective and impulsive students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 37(1), 147-162.
- Kayi, H. (2006). Teaching speaking: Activities to promote speaking in a second language. *The Internet TESL Journal*, XII (11). Retrieved March, 24, 2021, from: http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kayi-Teaching_Speaking.html.
- Ma, W., & Winke, P. (2019). Self-assessment: How reliable is it in assessing oral proficiency over time? *Foreign Language Annals*, 52(1), 66-86.
- Mazloomi, S., & Khabiri, M. (2016). Diagnostic assessment of writing through dynamic self-assessment. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(6), 19-31.
- McKay, P. (2006). *Assessing young language learners*. New York: Cambridge university press.
- Miller, P. J. (2003). The effect of scoring criteria specificity on peer and self-assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(4), 383-394.
- Mitchell, R., Myles, F., & Marsden, E. (2013). *Second language learning theories*. New York: Routledge.
- Musfirah, Y. (2019). The use of peer assessment in speaking skill. *English Education Journal*, 10(1), 67-79.
- Nunan, D. (2001). *Meaningful English communication*. Expressions: Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

-
- Rashtchi, M., & Keyvanfar, A. (2010). *ELT: Quick 'n' easy*. Tehran: Rahnama Press.
- Redmond, B. F., & Willis, A. R. (2013). *Self-efficacy and social cognitive theories*. Retrieved May 6, 2020, from: [Https://Wiki Spaces.Psu.Edu](https://WikiSpaces.Psu.Edu).
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Saito, H., & Fujita, T. (2009). Peer-assessing peers' contribution to EFL group presentations. *RELC Journal*, 40(2), 149–171.
- Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29(7), 77-84.
- Slavin, R. E. (1997). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice*. MA: Allyn & Bacon: Needham Heights.
- Smith, C. R. (2003). *Learning disabilities: The interaction of students and their environments*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & Williams, M. (2008). *The tkt. Teaching knowledge test course*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge. ESOL examinations.
- Weisstein, E., & Jacobson, D. (2009). Many sizes fit all: Considering multiple pathways to higher education. *New England Journal of Higher Education*, 23(5), 15-17.
- Xu, W. (2011). Learning styles and their implications in learning and teaching. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(4), 413-416.
- Yamashiro, A. D., & Johnson, J. (1997). Public speaking in EFL: Elements for course design. *The Language Teacher*, 21(4), 13-17.