

**A Comparison of English Reading Comprehension Self-Assessment with Teacher Assessment of the Students of Kish Institute of Science and Technology of Ilam**

Ali Jamali\*, Mohsen Bahramvand  
Department of English Language, Ilam Branch,  
Islamic Azad University, Ilam, Iran  
jamalinesari@yahoo.com (\*corresponding author)  
mohsenbahramvand2021@gmail.com



**Keywords:** Reading comprehension, Teacher assessment, Self – assessment, OQPT Test, Likert scale questionnaire

**Abstract**

*Learner-centered classes involve students in their process of learning as well as their evaluation, while, the classical way to teach and assess students was teacher based. Accordingly, the current study investigates the impact of teacher assessment and self - assessment of reading comprehension on Iranian EFL learners, in a comparative manner. The current research was carried out in Kish Institute of Science and Technology of Ilam. To this end, out of a population of 79,30 EFL learners were selected, based on Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) with an intermediate level. Prior to the experiment, the Likert scale questionnaire was applied by the teacher to assess the participants' ability to figure out and answer reading*



*questions. To set out the study, the participants were divided into two different groups, namely base group (teacher assessment); experimental group (self - assessment) each of which included 15 participants. In the next stage, these two groups received a pre-test. Furthermore, after performing the treatment course, which included 10 sessions (two sessions a week with each session lasting about 45 minutes) the students of two groups were given the post-test. Accordingly, the follow-up test was given to the participants after a week from finishing the given post-test. To analyze the data, SPSS was performed. The instruments used in this study were Likert scale questionnaire, OQPT Test and Quiz Sheets. All in all, with regard to the outcome of this research, students play an important role in their learning and evaluation process.*

## **1 Introduction**

Reading is one of the important skills of a second language learning which plays a pivotal role in the progress of other linguistic skills such as, grammar, vocabulary, and writing. According to Grabe & Stoller (2002, p. 17), “reading is the ability to understand information in a text and interpret it appropriately”. With reference to (Brown, 2004, p. 185), reading is the most highlighted skill of learning a language; it is definitely the most effective skill to reach the aims in all educational processes. Reading is a multifaceted process including the recognition of words, comprehension fluency and motivation.

Reading comprehension is another main pivotal aspect of reading that shows the skill to process the text, figure out its meaning, and cumulate with what the reader knows. Based on the findings of (Snow, 2002, p. 11), “reading comprehension is the process of extracting and constructing meaning as well as interaction and involvement with written language, which should be taken into account while learning a new language is the purpose of the study. Moreover, the most

important criterion of reading that should be considered is comprehension resulted in the enhancement of the understanding of the passage that students read. In this respect, Madani Habib (2016) notes, “reading comprehension needs to decode words and related background to receive the meaning of the reading passage”.

Concerning the definition of assessment, it is the systematic basis that serves two functions namely, the evaluation of students’ understanding without reference to any language learning programs, and measuring the goals which they have gained during a course. Black & William (1998) defines the term assessment as “the process of defining, selecting, designing, collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and using information to increase students’ learning and development”. In other words, the notion of assessment refers to the wide diversity of methods or tools used by instructors to assess skill level, measure learning development, and students’ needs during education. As Black & William, (1998) mentioned, “assessment is considered as a task which consists of a set of activities that teachers and learners carry out to get information that can be used diagnostically to correct both teaching and learning”. Besides, various kinds of assessments are especially planned to calculate specific parts of learning such as the competence of a student about a concept without participating in any courses or the ability that a student achieves after a learning course.

On the other hand, assessments are highly related to the recognition of the weaknesses and strengths that students individually have, so the instructor should plan pertinent educational programs to identify and support them. Likewise, a large number of people collaborate to develop assessable programs such as, educators, universities, institutions, state departments of education or groups included individuals and companies. Having utilized an effective

assessment, teachers and learners benefited significantly. There are some main advantages listed:

- Improved learners' self-confidence
- Improved methods and programs of teaching planned to be used in the next steps
- Improved process of students' placement
- Improved recognizing the needs of learners in their process of learning and evaluation

The present study investigated two various kinds of assessment, exceptionally used in the evaluation of reading comprehension. There are self-assessment and teacher assessment. Simply put, self-assessment is the ability to examine yourself to find out how much progress you have made. It requires students to monitor their own abilities and evaluate strengths and weaknesses. It puts students largely in charge of their own development. To consider the importance of self-assessment during learning a language based on Crooks' findings (2001), giving impressive feedback on students' assessment directly depends on the students' acceptance to improve their result. Also, they should know about the level that they wish to achieve.

Accordingly, self-assessment is a "qualitative assessment." As Andrade & Valtcheva, (2009) point that, "self- assessment is not a strict quantitative assessment". Considering related researches of Alonso-Tapia & Baker, 2010; Baker, Alonso- Tapia, & Huertas, 2012, "It is not a good teaching strategy, as it does not warrant reflection on the work done". Through self-assessment, students can feel more engaged in their process of learning, be more confident about their abilities, gain greater insights, set future goals for improvement, feel more valued, and be more motivated to learn new skills. To sum up, self- assessment is not on the basis of the scores of the students, but

it is instead based on figuring out their mistakes via evaluating themselves. When students are trained carefully and supported by their teacher to assess themselves, they can evaluate their own work.

It is crystal clear that a large number of students assess their work individually and give themselves feedback. It plays a crucial role in their process of learning as well as evaluation that brings them the sense of confidence to consider their acquired knowledge, along with the aim they try to achieve. As a matter of fact, not only self-assessment cannot be intentionally taught in the classrooms, but also it is needed to enable students in assessing their knowledge. Also, instructors should take the responsibility to urge learners to evaluate themselves based on the end product and the consequences of their learning process, e.g. their weaknesses, strengths, their knowledge of course content, and the aspects of their learning procedure to be improved. On the other hand, with paying close attention to the increasing number of students, the burden of teachers should be lightened through training students to collaborate in their processes of learning, along with evaluation.

Furthermore, in terms of assessing students' reading comprehension, the teacher's assessment is performed. It includes students' placement based on their level of English and plan standardized approaches to achieve their aims. As a subject of assessment, teachers identify students' weaknesses and strengths to be analyzed based on teaching instructions. Moreover, teacher assessment is the classic way to figure out students' understanding about reading comprehension skill. Therefore, the responsibility of teacher is identifying who is a successful reader or not through assessment. With regards to the view of Gersten(1999),the aim of assessment is "accumulating related information of reading and planning to have better classes for improving reading skill". Similarly,

in another study, Aweiss (1993) expresses that assessment enables the teacher to collect information about students' reading abilities and help to plan relevant instruction and give essential feedback to them. Concerning the benefits of teacher assessment, we can count some factors such as helping students to recognize their strengths and where they need to make more effort as well as identifying not only what they gained, but also what they have still to achieve.

Indeed, teacher assessment becomes an essential part for instructors to determine educational aims and to utilize them in the next steps of students' learning process. Consequently, assessment should be considered as important as learning and teaching that increases students' capabilities of self-evaluation and the understanding of their weaknesses and strengths. With regard to this view, the interaction of students directly with subjects, together with the evaluation of their understanding bring them the chance of connecting to the main topics and internalizing them easily.

## **2 Literature Review**

With paying close attention to the research done by Ira Permata Sari Selutan and Gatot Sutapa, Eni Rosnija in the academic year 2014/2015, we can figure out that self-assessment plays an important role in enabling students to participate in the process of learning and evaluation. See above the Earl's theory (2003:11), students' learning is positively correlated with engaging them in their learning process. In addition to the teacher's judgment about quality and accuracy, the students should be given feedbacks continuously which causes learning becomes more appropriate and simply internalized during their education.

With due attention to the findings of Takarroucht Kenza (2021), accentuating self-assessment expands the ability of learning reading skills especially reading comprehension. Results revealed that self-assessment plays a significant role in enabling students to trust

themselves in order to participate in the processes of making decisions, together with assessing themselves. The use of self-assessment can be effective to give the students a proper opportunity of being familiar with the reading strategies, and also, their performance may be enhanced through it. Likewise, self-assessment grows the rate of reading instruction criteria and the process of their assessment.

Moreover, the outcomes of another study performed by Parviz Ajideh et al. (2021) show an affirmative and strong relationship existed between two groups of teacher assessment and self-assessment. Accordingly, the findings of other researchers namely, Lee (2011), Han and Riazi (2018), Leach (2012), Thawabieh (2017), and Mozaffarzadeh (2019) elicit weak to medium, but positive correlation between two types of assessments namely teacher-assessment and self-assessment. Comparing the results, it is found that the mean scores obtained through teacher assessment were higher than students' self-assessment. As found and discussed by Thawabieh (2017), this may be due to the students' estimation. In this study, this issue was not taken into consideration in particular, while the result achieved by Thawabieh (2017) presented the familiarity of the students with the process of self- evaluation bridging the gap between the consequences of teacher- and student- assessment.

Similarly, another study carried out by Vangah (2013) investigates the impact of self-assessment on reading comprehension and vocabulary knowledge. As according to this study, the participants were 192 intermediate EFL learners. To collect data, the researcher used Oxford Placement Test (OQPT), Self-Assessment questionnaire, TOEFL reading comprehension and vocabulary tests. Results show that self-assessment was not effective on the increase and

improvement of vocabularies, whereas it was integrally effective on reading skill.

In terms of searching for more related studies, Shahrakipour (2014) examined the results achieved through performing self –assessment on EFL students' receptive skill performance. It was carried out through a sample which included 120 Iranian language learners. The reading self-assessment sheets were piloted in the treatment session. The result of this study showed the consequence of self-assessment on improving learners' reading skills.

Another research done by Baniabdelrahman (2010) presented an affirmative impression of self-assessment on reading skills. The researcher carried out this study with a number of 136 students. The underlying stage focused on considering whether reading skill is affected with self- information about students' reading abilities and helping to plan relevant instruction and give essential feedback to them. Concerning the benefits of teacher assessment, helping students to recognize their strengths and where they need to make more effort as well as identifying not only what they gained, but also what they have still to achieve should be taken into account.

All in all, the consequences of this research displayed a core contrast gained regarding to the mean scores of the experimental and the control group on the post-test.

These reviews reveal this main point that although some studies analyzed the effects of distinctive types of assessment on the various skills of learning English, there are a restricted number of studies comparing the effects of teacher assessment and self-assessment on reading comprehension. These point along with utilizing more instruments were exclusively devoted to the examination of the main topic. The research in this area gets more attention in the EFL context of Iran, based on the lack of relevant and comprehensive research about the differences between the effects of these two types of



assessment on reading comprehension. In conclusion, there is no appropriate study to consider the effects of the assessments performed by the instructor or by the learners themselves on reading comprehension. Hence, the present study investigates the comparison of the effect of these two assessments of reading comprehension on the learners of Kish institute of Science and Technology of Ilam. To this end, the following three questions were presented:

- A. What is the difference between the mean scores of teacher assessment and self - assessment in reading comprehension?
- B. What is the relationship between self - assessment and the teacher's assessment in reading comprehension?
- C. What is the students' feedback on their own assessment? Could they trust their own assessment?

On the subject of the questions of this study, the following research hypotheses were proposed:

1. There is no significant difference between the mean scores of self-assessment and teacher assessment in reading comprehension.
2. There is a correlational relationship between self-assessment and the assessment of their teacher in reading comprehension.
3. The students are effected with their own assessment positively, but not in all parts.

### **3 Methodology**

#### **3.1 Participants**

There were 30 participants chosen in this research, out of a population of 79 English language students, in Kish Institute of Science and Technology of Ilam. They were selected in both genders based on whole classes. Considering the importance of homogeneity, Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) was utilized to select students in the intermediate level. Their proficiency level was determined according to their scores achieved in the test. All participants took part in learning English courses over a period of 4 years. Also, there were no differences among participants based on their nationality and their vernacular language, which was Kurdish. Furthermore, they had no experience of living in any English speaking countries. Finally, the learners' reading comprehension results were assessed and the feedback, which is about the comparability of the impacts of teacher assessment and self – assessment on reading comprehension, were given by an English teacher who was expert in teaching reading to EFL students.

### **3.2 Instrumentation**

#### **OQPT (Oxford Quick Placement Test)**

Concerning the importance of homogeneity of the students' level, Oxford Quick Placement Test was performed. It was a two part test, including 64 multiple-choice items, supposed to be completed within 60 minutes. So, based on the students' scores, the students on the intermediate level were selected.

#### **Reading comprehension texts**

A reading comprehension test was devised by the instructor, according to the course objectives. The test included 34 questions taken from Inside New Headway Intermediate (Fourth Edition). The participants in intermediate level received different types of reading questions such as, True or False, Matching Items, Cloze Tests, and

Completing with Short Sentence Questions , used by the teacher in both pre-test and post-test stages.

### Likert scale questionnaire

In the current study, Likert scale questionnaire was used in order to check the self-efficacy of a large number of students. In this questionnaire, some sentences were used in English to check the abilities of the students and consequently to answer reading questions such as, "I know how to answer True-False questions". Also, the students were given the feedback in the end of the post-test of the self-assessment.

Concerning the importance of validity, there are some proper methods used in this study. First and foremost, it is necessary to check the items utilized for considering learners' reading comprehension skill. Moreover, the validity of this research was checked by 6 experts of TEFL. Besides, the reliability of the present study was checked through SPSS that the result of Cronbach's Alpha showed the high reliability between the tests of this research.

In this study, there were three variables. Reading comprehension was taken into account as the dependent variable, while the teacher assessment as well as the students' self-assessment were considered as the independent variables, which measured their impression on the dependent variable.

### **3.3 Data Collection Procedure**

In the present study, after informing the participants about the research project and checking their knowledge about the items of the quizzes through Likert scale questionnaire before the administration,

the appropriate 30 participants, out of 79 English language learners were chosen via OQPT (Oxford Quick Placement Test). It was contained in 64 Multiple-Choice question tests, together with a listening test to identify the learners in the level of intermediate. It was given to the participants for recognizing, how well learners figure out the meaning of what they are exposed, which is a magnificent indicator of general language ability. Also, it is used to choose a homogeneous group for reading ability and their factual level in English.

The procedure was carried out by dividing them into two different groups of base group (teacher assessment), and experimental group (self - assessment), so as to stir motivation and interest. Therefore, the first group was assessed by a teacher and the second group by the students themselves in various sessions through the prepared pre-test which included, various authentic reading questions. The study was run in one semester consisted in 10 sessions (two sessions a week), and the amount of time was allocated per each session was 45 minutes. After performing the course, the students of two groups were given the post-test to check the differences between reading comprehension results assessed in two groups ,together with the changing rate between the pre-test and the post-test in each group during the period. It was followed by giving the follow-up (delayed post-test) to the students of two groups (teacher assessment and self-assessment) after a week to check the reliability of the results. Finally, after finishing the experiment course, the students were given the results of assessing reading comprehension skills by teacher and students themselves through their instructor.

## **4 Results**

As discussed earlier, this research was performed to achieve the answers of these three following questions below:

1. What is the difference between the mean scores of teacher assessment and self - assessment in reading comprehension?
2. What is the relationship between self - assessment and the assessment of their teacher in reading comprehension?
3. What is the students' feedback on their own assessment? Could they trust their own assessment?

As expressed in advance, the current research aimed to examine the differences of mean scores achieved between the self-assessment and the teacher assessment groups. To answer these questions, Independent Samples T- Test, the Normality Test, and Descriptive Statistics Test were implemented on pre-test, post-test, and follow-up scores of the learners.

In this step, the researcher evaluated the data which was gathered after performing the first test, to analyze the distribution of the scores of the pre-test between two groups, to show whether the data distributed normally or no. In the Table 1, the details of the first Test of Normality listed.

### **Table 1**

*The Test of Normality of self-assessment and teacher assessment in the pre-test*

**Tests of Normality**

READING COMPREHENSION		Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
PRE-TEST	SELF-ASSESSMENT	.119	15	.200	.927	15	.244
	TEACHER- ASSESSMENT	.221	15	.047	.898	15	.089

\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

According to Table 1, the students in two groups namely, self-assessment and teacher assessment participated in this test and answered the specific questions designed for two groups. The hypotheses for this test are:

$H_0 < 0.05$  data is not normal

But if,

$H_1 > 0.05$  the data distributed normally

With reference to the Sig received of Shapiro-Wilk, and the hypothesis of  $H_0$ , the distribution of pre-test scores was normal between two groups respectively (.244, .089). Regarding to the result of Normality Test presented, the mean scores of two groups were taken into consideration via Descriptive Statistics Test and Independent Sample T- Test in the Tables 2 and 3.

## **Table 2**

*Descriptive Statistics Scores of self-assessment and teacher assessment in the pre-test*

### Group Statistics

READING COMPREHENSION		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PRE-TEST	SELF-ASSESSMENT	15	62.13	5.222	1.348
	TEACHER - ASSESSMENT	15	55.87	4.291	1.108

As pointed in Table 1, the number of the students in two groups was  $N_{\text{Self}}=15, N_{\text{Teacher}}=15$ . As the mean scores shown in the Descriptive Statistic Table, there was an important contrast between the mean scores of two groups in the pre-test, 62.13 and 55.87 respectively. The SD for two groups in the pre-test was 5.222 and 4.291. The Table 3 showed the comparability of mean scores between two groups in the pre-test.

**Table 3**

*The comparability of the mean scores of self-assessment and teacher assessment in the pre-test*

### Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
PRE-TEST	Equal variances assumed	1.387	.249	3.591	28	.001
	Equal variances not assumed			3.591	26.985	.001

On the basis of the number of sig of Levene's Test that was .249, the hypothesis of equal variances accepted. Additionally, if Sig (2-

tailed) $\geq 0.05$ , the mean scores of pre-test between two groups were equal. It should be pointed that the score was not gained here based on the Sig (2-tailed)  $< 0.05$  with .001. Therefore, the mean scores of the pre-test in two groups were not equal.

After carrying out the first test, the researcher performed post-test in five weeks of experiment to evaluate students' performance between two groups. Table 4 showed the normality of the post-test scores achieved between two groups.

**Table 4**

*The Test of Normality of self-assessment and teacher assessment in the post-test*

Tests of Normality							
READING COMPREHENSION		Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
POST-TEST	SELF-ASSESSMENT	.165	15	.200 <sup>*</sup>	.922	15	.209
	TEACHER - ASSESSMENT	.173	15	.200 <sup>*</sup>	.929	15	.265

\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

According to the Sig received by Shapiro-Wilk in Table 4, the distribution of post-test scores was normal between two groups respectively (.209, .265). After analyzing the Test of Normality, the researcher started comparing the mean scores of two groups through Descriptive Statistics and Independent Sample T- Test in the Tables 5 and 6.

**Table 5**

*The Descriptive Statistics Scores of self-assessment and teacher assessment in the post-test*



### Group Statistics

	READING COMPREHENSION	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
POST-TEST	SELF-ASSESSMENT	15	66.67	7.068	1.825
	TEACHER - ASSESSMENT	15	62.20	5.281	1.363

As demonstrated in Table 5, the number of the students in two groups was  $N_{\text{Self}}=15, N_{\text{Teacher}}=15$ . As the mean scores show in the Descriptive Statistic Table, there was no serious disparity between the mean scores of two groups in the post-test, 66.67 and 62.20 respectively. The SD per each group in the post-test was 7.068 and 5.281. Table 5 showed the comparability of mean scores between two groups in the post-test.

**Table 6**

*The comparability of the mean scores of self-assessment and teacher assessment in the post-test*

### Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
POST-TEST	Equal variances assumed	1.682	.205	1.961	28	.060	4.467	2.278	-.200	9.133
	Equal variances not assumed			1.961	25.917	.061	4.467	2.278	-.217	9.150

See above the number of sig of Levene's Test that was .205, the hypothesis of equal variances accepted. Additionally, if Sig (2-tailed)  $\geq 0.05$ , the mean scores of post-test between two groups were

equal, and that was achieved based on the Sig (2-tailed) >0.05 with .060.

According to the importance of the concept of reliability, the test of follow-up (delayed post-test) performed one week after the post-test. It was followed by the Test of Normality, along with Descriptive Statistics Test and Independent Sample T-Test in the Tables 7, 8, and 9.

**Table 7**

*The Test of Normality of self-assessment and teacher assessment in the follow-up test*

Tests of Normality							
READING COMPREHENSION		Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
FOLLOW-UP	SELF-ASSESSMENT	.138	15	.200 <sup>*</sup>	.920	15	.192
	TEACHER - ASSESSMENT	.176	15	.200 <sup>*</sup>	.917	15	.171

\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

As regards the Sig received by Shapiro-Wilk, the distribution of follow-up scores was normal between the two groups (.192, .171). After analyzing the Test of Normality, the researcher started comparing the mean scores of both groups in the Follow-up test through Descriptive Statistics and Independent Sample T-Test in the Tables 8 and 9.

**Table 8**

*The Descriptive Statistics Scores of self-assessment and teacher assessment in the follow-up test*

**Group Statistics**

	READING COMPREHENSION	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FOLLOW-UP	SELF-ASSESSMENT	15	67.00	7.141	1.844
	TEACHER- ASSESSMENT	15	62.13	5.592	1.444

As elicited in the Table 8, the number of the students in two groups was  $N_{\text{Self}}=15, N_{\text{Teacher}}=15$ . As the mean scores show in the Descriptive Statistic Table, there was a notable difference between the mean scores of two groups in the follow-up, 67.00 and 62.13 respectively. The SD per each group in the follow-up was 7.141 and 5.592. Table 9 showed the comparability of mean scores between two groups in the follow-up.

**Table 9**

*The comparability of the mean scores of self-assessment and teacher assessment in the follow-up test*

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
FOLLOW-UP	Equal variances assumed	1.013	.323	2.078	28	.047	4.867	2.342	.070	9.664
	Equal variances not assumed			2.078	26.477	.048	4.867	2.342	.057	9.678

As regards the number of sig of Levene's Test that was .323, the hypothesis of equal variances accepted. Additionally, if Sig (2-tailed) $\geq 0.05$ , the mean scores of the follow-up between two groups

were equal, while it was not achieved here based on the Sig (2-tailed) <0.05 with .047.

Based on the results achieved, it seems obvious that there was a sizeable difference among the mean scores obtained in both groups of teacher assessment and self-assessment that rejected the first hypothesis of this research that was, there is no critical contrast between the mean scores of these two groups.

To look for the answer of the second question of this research, the examination of the relationship between teacher assessment, together with self-assessment, the data acquired from pre-test, post-test ,and follow-up tests were analyzed via the Pearson rank-order correlation. The result was indicated in Table 10.

**Table 10**

*Pearson's Correlation between the scores of Self-assessment and Teacher assessment*

Correlations		PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	FOLLOW-UP
PRE-TEST	Pearson Correlation	1	.727**	.721**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	30	30	30
POST-TEST	Pearson Correlation	.727**	1	.988**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	30	30	30
FOLLOW-UP	Pearson Correlation	.721**	.988**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	30	30	30

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

With regard to the outcome gained in the Table 10, teacher assessment and self-assessment were closely and positively

correlated each other. In the other words, Pearson correlation's scores of pre-test, post-test and follow-up tests indicate that the increase of the self-assessment scores causes teacher-assessed scores risen up and vice versa.

Considering the results presented in the Table 10, there was a critical and affirmative correlation between two groups caused accepting the second hypothesis of this research that was, there is a serious correlational relationship among two groups of self-assessment and teacher-assessment.

To search the opinion of the students about their self-assessment and to consider how much they were affected by their assessment, as well as how much they trust themselves in different examination, some questions were prepared to ask them. In continue, the students' answers resulted deeper understanding of how they think about self-assessment based on their reactions to answer the questions. The students' answers elicited that; they could identify their problems and the way to deal with them. As a subject of trusting themselves; they could trust their evaluation in their processes of learning such as, the examinations taken during semesters, but final examination.

*L: before the main instruction, I did not know what I should concentrate on and how to read it.*

**Also, after the main instruction, they found that, what they knew or they did not know for being considered in the next classes:**

*O: regarding to the different questionnaires given, I could learn what I should do.*

**Another key point was unfamiliarity of the students to the method that they were assessed with.**

**M:** *taking an examination is the most difficult thing for me, I do not know what I should study before participating in the exam, but after taking part in this exam and taught by my teacher I knew what I must do.*

**C:** *I was in doubt about how I was scored by my teacher, and then I complained a lot, but know.*

**Another integral point was the responsibility of the students in the case of assessing themselves.**

**B:** *I did not imagine that I could correct my exam paper in order to i did not trust myself. It was highly likely because of; I did not have enough information about how to correct my paper of examination without being helped by the teacher. While, I trust myself now to correct the papers and correct my mistakes that I made.*

**The majority of the students are content with assessing themselves during the term, but their final examination.**

**J:** *I do not trust myself to assess my final examination, because I do not know what answer is right or wrong and what should be as the appropriate consequence of the final examination and how to be used in plan next educational steps. The opinion of mine is I do not know everything that can help me to correct the mistakes. Consequently, teachers should be responsible for the evaluation of students' final examination.*

The consequences presented that the students were affected positively through assessing themselves during their semester, but not definitely in their final examination, so the third hypothesis of this research that was, the students are affected positively through their evaluation in different examination during their semester, but not the final examination, accepted totally.

## **5 Discussion**

This research aimed to investigate a comparison among teacher assessment and self-assessment on reading comprehension that showed underlying differences. Comparing the results, the evaluation of the students by themselves was more impressive than teacher assessment, whereas, the finding is not constant with the findings of the research performed by Parviz Ajideh et al., (2021). The result of their research gained the high efficacy of teacher assessment on reading comprehension .As found and discussed by Thawabieh (2017), it is because of the students were affected by their estimation. In continue, this research showed the core reason caused this difference, which was unfamiliarity of the students to evaluate themselves, which in the next stages was decreased and bridged the gap between the results achieved through these mentioned types of assessment.

To sum up, the result of this research about the existence of correlation between teacher assessment and self-assessment showed that an affirmative and effective correlation existed, while, the findings of some researchers namely, Lee (2011), Han and Riazi (2018), Leach (2012), Thawabieh (2017), Mozaffarzadeh (2019), and Parviz Ajideh et al., (2021), showed,” there is a weak to medium, but statistically strong correlational relationship between both teacher and self-assessment groups”.

As a subject of the students’ opinion, self-assessment enhances their understanding about the criteria that they are assessed with. Regarding the findings of Mousavi (1999), student familiarity with their process of evaluation, considered as one of the aims of self-assessment and motivates them to participate in their process of assessment. This is what Han and Riazi (2018) took into consideration as “the core values of self-assessment as a formative assessment tool (p. 10)”. Therefore, giving students feedback through

their own assessment causes better understanding of the evaluative process than they are scored by their teacher.

Respecting the results of this research, the students take the responsibility of their evaluation during their semester, but final examination. It may be because of, the students are in the opinion that, teacher plays the main role to evaluate students in the final examination and they do not trust themselves. Also, the findings of Parviz Ajideh et al., (2021), showed that the students are positively affected by their assessment but not in their final examinations, especially in higher educational level.

## **6 Conclusion and Implications**

Regarding to the boldfaced aim of teachers, an appropriate and well –performed type of assessment needed to increase the chance of students to learn efficiently, and to have better understanding of the students' capabilities as well as their level of knowledge. It is an essential part to plan appropriate instructions, together with proper types of assessment. Although, teachers are known as liable people to plan instructions to teach their students, together with the process of their assessment, published studies such as, (Lorente & Kirk, 2014; Sadler, 2010; Parviz Ajideh et al., (2021); Lo´pez-Pastor, 2008 and Carless, Joughin and Mok, 2006) indicated that, based on the significance of students' responsibility, they should be involved in their process of learning and evaluation, that results in having more learner-centered classes.

Training learners to join in their process of learning plays a pivotal role in their education and can help the learners to positively value their performances, try to find the best way to do their work in their real life, foster a curious mind for problem solving, take on more responsibility, have a gorgeous sense of self-assurance in their abilities and finally feel more appreciated.



This research performed to compare the effect of students' self-assessment on reading comprehension with teacher assessment and also, the effect of self-assessment on students' opinion. The results showed that after having trained appropriately, the students are able to participate in their process of learning and evaluation. Besides, having trained the criteria of assessment, the students trust their teachers to evaluate them.

To look for the logical reason related to the lack of self-assessment, it is found that, they do not trust themselves to participate in their process of leaning and assessment. As well as, lee (2011) notes some similar reasons that included ,a) students trust their teachers more than themselves to assess their learning especially in the higher level of education and it increases the responsibility of the teacher to plan and evaluate students at least in the summative test. b) Because of the increasing number of the students in the higher level of education, teachers are not able to consider the feedback of the students efficiently.

Having proposed and used more and more in different educational processes, especially in English classes, self-assessment should be highly considered in detail. The current research was run on a limited sample in a short period of time and exclusively for reading comprehension skill. It is an excellent opportunity for next studies performed in the future to be more in detail and large samples can be used to gain more valid and trustworthy results. Due to the limitations of time, population, and the epidemic of Covid-19, together with inequality of the number of genders participated in this study (more males than females), we faced some struggling challenges that in the next studies can be solved. In conclusion, further studies can be carried out based on various types of assessment and their effects on the other skills of learning English such as, writing.

## 7 References

Parviz Ajideh; Lynn Batler-Kisber; Ali Akbar Ansarin; sorayya

Mozaffarzadeh. "A New Dilemma for Language Teachers and Students: Self-assessment or Teacher Assessment (Research Article)". *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning University of Tabriz*, 13, 27, 2021, 35-57. doi: 10.22034/elt.2021.43932.2334

Andrade, Heidi. "Promoting Learning and Achievement through Self-Assessment". *Proven Programs in Education: Classroom Management & Assessment*, Corwin Press, 2014, pp. 20–24, <https://doi.org10.4135/9781483365633.n5>.

Aweiss, Salem. "Meaning Construction in Foreign Language Reading". *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics*, 1993.

Baker, Credence. "The Impact of Instructor Immediacy and Presence for Online Student Affective Learning, Cognition, and Motivation". *The Journal of Educators Online*, vol. 7, no. 1, Grand Canyon University, Jan. 2010, <https://doi.org10.9743/jeo.2010.1.2>.

Baniabdelrahman, A. Ahmad. "The Effect of the Use of Self-

- Assessment on EFL Students' Performance in Reading Comprehension in English". *Tesl-Ej*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2010.
- Black, Paul, and Dylan Wiliam. "Assessment for Learning in the Classroom". *Assessment and Learning*, SAGE Publications Ltd, 2012, pp. 11–32, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446250808.n2>.
- Brown, H. Douglas. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. 3rd ed., Pearson Education, 2018.
- Carless, David., Joughin, Gordon. & Mok, Magdalena. "Learning-Oriented Assessment: Principles and Practice". *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 31, no. 4, 2006, pp. 395–398.
- Crooks, Terry. *The Validity of Formative Assessments*. *British Educational Research Association Annual Conference*. 2001.
- Earl, Lorna. *Assessment as Learning: Using Classroom Assessment to Maximize Student Learning*. 2003.
- Gersten, Russell. "Lost Opportunities: Challenges Confronting Four Teachers of English-Language Learners". *The Elementary School Journal*, vol. 100, no. 1, University of Chicago Press,

Sept. 1999, pp. 37–56, <https://doi.org10.1086/461942>.

Grabe, William, and Fredricka L. Stoller. *Teaching and Researching Reading*. 3rd ed., Routledge, 2019. Applied Linguistics in Action.

Han, Chao, and Mehdi Riazi. “The Accuracy of Student Self-Assessments of English-Chinese Bidirectional Interpretation: A Longitudinal Quantitative Study”. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 43, no. 3, Informa UK Limited, Apr. 2018, pp. 386–398, <https://doi.org10.1080/02602938.2017.1353062>.

Leach, Linda. “Optional Self-Assessment: Some Tensions and Dilemmas”. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 37, no. 2, Informa UK Limited, Mar. 2012, pp. 137–147, <https://doi.org10.1080/02602938.2010.515013>.

Lee, Yun-hyang. “Comparing Self-Assessment and Teacher’s Assessment in Interpreter Training”. *T&I Review*, vol. 1, 2011, pp. 87–111.

Lopez-Pastor, Victor. M. “Implementing a Formative and Shared Assessment System in Higher Education Teaching”. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 31, no. 3, 2008, pp. 289–307.

Lorente-Catalán, Eloísa, and David Kirk. “Making the Case for

- Democratic Assessment Practices within a Critical Pedagogy of Physical Education Teacher Education”. *European Physical Education Review*, vol. 20, no. 1, SAGE Publications, Feb. 2014, pp. 104–119, <https://doi.org10.1177/1356336x13496004>.
- Madani, Habib. “Assessment of Reading Comprehension”. *Revista Românească Pentru Educație Multidimensională*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2016, pp. 125–147.
- Mousavi, Seyyed. Abbas. *A Dictionary of Language Testing*. Rahnama Publications, 1999.
- Mozaffarzadeh, Sorayya. *Investigating the Effectiveness of Cloze Procedure as a Means of Activating ZPD through Self-Assessment of Reading Comprehension*. 2019.
- Sadler, D. Royce. “Beyond Feedback: Developing Student Capability in Complex Appraisal”. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 35, no. 5, Informa UK Limited, Aug. 2010, pp. 535–550, <https://doi.org10.1080/02602930903541015>.
- Selutan, Ira. Permata. Sari., Gatot. Sutapa. and Eni, Rosnija. “The Implementation of Self- Assessment in Teaching Reading

Comprehension on Narrative Text”. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, vol. 4, no. 11, 2014.

Snow, Catherine. *Reading for Understanding: Toward an R&D Program in Reading Comprehension*. 2002.

Takarroucht, Kenza. “The Effect of Self-Assessment on the Development of EFL Reading Comprehension Skills”. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, vol. 5, no. 2, UNIB Press, June 2021, pp. 231–247, <https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.5.2.231-247>.

Thawabieh, Ahmad Mahmoud. “A Comparison between Students’ Self-Assessment and Teachers’ Assessment”. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, vol. 6, no. 1, Sciedu Press, Feb. 2017, p. 14, <https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v6n1p14>.

Vangah, F. Pourvandi. “Effect of Self-Assessment on Iranian EFL Learners’ Reading Skill and Vocabulary Knowledge”. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2013, pp. 676–680.

## **Biodata**

**Dr. Ali Jamali** received his Ph.D. from Tehran Science and Research Branch. He is an Assistant Professor of English Literature and faculty member of Islamic Azad University, Ilam Branch. His research interests include, Cognitive Linguistics, Discursive Semi-Semantics,

Narratology, Children's Literature, 18th-century, Shakespeare studies, and applied literary theory.

**Mohsen Bahramvand** is currently studying for Ph.D. in TEFL in Tehran Science and Research Branch. He is an English instructor. He has been teaching English for about 7years in some private language institutions in different cities. His current research interests are Language Learning Strategies, Critical Thinking, Language Assessment, Corrective Feedback, Applied Linguistics, Practical Teaching, and Language Skill Development.