



Promoting Learning Performance and Learning Outcomes: The Case of an Indonesian School

¹Ujang Suparman, ²Ridwan Ridwan, ¹Hasan Hariri

¹Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Lampung

²SMP Negeri 3 Way Pengubuan

Corresponding author: ¹Ujang Suparman, email: ujang.suparman@fkip.unila.ac.id

Bio-profiles:

Ujang Suparman is a lecturer and researcher; his careers: since 1987 up to the present time as a lecturer at the English Study Program, University of Lampung; 2005–2016, as a lecturer on Psycholinguistics and Qualitative Research at the Masters Degree in English Education, Muhammadiyah University Prof. DR. Hamka, Jakarta; 2005 up to present, as a national book reviewer of English books for elementary school, junior and senior high schools, and vocational school (SMK) in PUSBUK DEPDIKNAS; 2005–2008. Besides, from 1989 through 2000, he once worked for Hawthorn Institute of Education, Melbourne Australia, as a lecturer of Interpreting and Translating; 1998–2000, working for Melbourne Institute of Asian Languages and Societies (MIALS), the University of Melbourne, as a lecturer on Indonesian studies. His research interests are in reading difficulties, reading strategies, reading assessment, curriculum design, translation, English for specific purposes, motivation, personality and learning styles, language acquisition, second and foreign language assessment. His email address: ujang.suparman@fkip.unila.ac.id

Ridwan Ridwan works as an English teacher for more than 25 years, active as a Central Lampung District curriculum development team, resource person at the District English Teacher Association, from 2007 to 2010 was involved in the Mainstreaming Good Practices in Basic Education project in collaboration with UNICEF and the European Union funded Ministry of Education and Culture. During the project, the writer became a Facilitator and Master Trainer to provide training assistance conducted by Regional Facilitators in Indonesia,

as an educational consultant in private schools from kindergarten, elementary, junior high and vocational/high school in Lampung Province. He can be reached at ridwanrosidimuawi@gmail.com

Hasan Hariri is a lecturer as a professor associate at Lampung University (1992), he began his career as an educator by teaching in high school. After graduating from S-1, he became a permanent lecturer at the Yunisla Foreign Language Academy and also taught at other institutions, including Lampung University and private universities. He was appointed as a Civil Servant (PNS) at Lampung University in 2002 with the task of providing English language training/courses especially TOEFL for the public, students, and lecturers. After completing S-3 in 2012, the writer was appointed the Chief of Staff of educator, and since 2014, he switched assignments to become a lecturer at the Master of Education Management FKIP Unila. In addition, since 2015 he has been active as a member of the Lampung University scientific work verification team and a team supporting the writing of FKIP Lampung University's scientific work. He can be reached at hasanhariri@unila.ac.id

Abstract

This classroom action research aims to find out: The significant relationship between the application of peer tutorial and the daily of learning performance assessment applied to 1) the average student academic achievement achievers, 2) students' language knowledge, 3) students' language skills, and 4) students' language skills in aggregate. The method used to answer research questions is by classroom action research (CAR) with a one-shot case study experimental approach. The data are collected through lists of the English test, and questionnaires. To measure the students' perceptions, questionnaires on 5 a Likert scale are used. All data in the form of numbers from learning outcomes were analyzed using SPSS version 23 to answer questions using correlations to determine the significance of the correlation, correlation coefficient, and relationship determination. The results showed that all correlations are significant.

Keywords: *learning outcomes and performance, assessment daily, and peer tutor.*

Introduction

The most important goal of learning a foreign language is that the learners can communicate it in different situations to express thoughts and information. Concentrating only

on oral English is not enough, writing competence also becomes indispensable for English Foreign Language students. The students must answer questions in the form of writing assignments and many other ways. So, there is a need for them to explore and express ideas if the teacher changes strategy or applies new techniques in learning English, it can improve the performance of students' speaking English.

Speaking skill is an important part of the curriculum in language learning and the ability to speak in foreign languages is at the core of what it means to be able to use a foreign language (Biggs, 2011; Liu, 2005; Tsou, 2005; Tsui, 1992). Being able to talk with friends, colleagues, guests, and even strangers, in their language or in a language that can be understood by both speakers, is certainly the goal of many students (Luoma, 2004). Besides, the relationship between students' oral participation in class and their academic achievement is undeniable. Research has shown that when students actively participate in class, their academic performance seems to be higher than those who are passive in class (Krupa-Kwiatkowski, 1998). The importance of the ability or perception of the ability to speak should not be underestimated by teachers or students (Turner, 2010).

By contrast, in the teaching experience, students remain silent all the time in class. They don't want to speak English. They hesitate to open their mouths. Even though they knew that they had to speak English well to make themselves eligible to be competitive today, they seemed indifferent about speaking in English.

Furthermore, Adamson (2004) argues that although there are various methods of language teaching, "no consensus arises, nor will they emerge, regarding the" best "or" right "way to teach language". If this view is taken, then we are interested in consolidating language learning in a very different way, which is slightly different from general practice in language teaching. This test is used for assessment; in our experiment, they were used to replace additional ingredients. The general practice is that students are presented with language input, then they are involved in language practice, and finally, they are evaluated by all means of formative assessment. For many foreign language teachers, it is common to divide language learning into three stages, whether real or hypothetical. These stages are presentation, practice, and production (PPP). For easy reference, it can be called, the 3-P teaching model (Çetinavcı & Yavuz, 2011; Hu, Cheng, Chiu, & Paller, 2020; Ur, 2014; Zghyer, 2014).

The significance of peer tutoring and daily of assessment have a positive impact on learning performance and learning outcomes, the results of this classroom action research are worthy of inspiring teachers to develop practical learning because of these: (1) Peer tutoring has been proven to be beneficial for tutors other than tutee, with the magnitude of these

benefits varying from study to study. In some cases, tutors may benefit more from the students they are tutoring, (2) The practice of consistent assessment carried out in learning can simplify the problem or break down the complexity, and can be used as information to plan further learning.

Globalization raises the urgent need of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), so teachers need to help students develop their skills, and beliefs need to take an active role in speaking learning (M. Liu & Jackson, 2009). In this way, the students must be encouraged to work cooperatively so that they can have the opportunity to progress in achieving their academic goals (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009; Ma, Zheng, Ye, & Tong, 2010). Only in this situation can they share ideas and structures that are interrelated with each other.

The research on the effectiveness of peer tutorials (Tudge & Rogoff, 1999; Vygotsky, 1980) and the impacts of assessment (Bernstein, Wasserman, Thompson, & Freeman, 2017; Randel et al., 2011; VanLehn, Siler, Murray, Yamauchi, & Baggett, 2003) have been done by many researchers in various regions. However, they are hardly found in some remote areas where students come from low-income family. Therefore, the authors propose the following research questions.

Following the explanation, the authors propose questions to investigate, as follows:

- 1) What is the significance of the application of peer tutors and the daily learning performance assessments to the average-student academic in aggregate?
- 2) What is the significance of the application of peer and daily assessment of learning performance to the score of knowledge and skills on the student's final semester score?
- 3) What is the significance of the application of peer and the daily learning performance assessments to the final semester assessment?
- 4) What is the significance of the application of peer and daily assessments based on the students' perceptions of the skill scores assessments?

Literature Review

Peer Tutor

Providing yourself to students with one-on-one interaction with teachers is a big challenge in large class learning. Peer tutor is a source of learning other than teachers, namely peers who are better at providing learning assistance to their classmates at school. Peers as a guide in learning can be used as an alternative to help students who have difficulty if guided by their teacher (Suherman, 2003). Sometimes a student is more receptive to teaching assistance from his friend than to receive help from his teacher because with friends they are,

do not have a sense of reluctance, low self-esteem and so on to ask questions or ask for help and give help (Hoa, 2008; Ischak & Warji, 1987).

The advantages of peer tutor learning are sometimes the results are better for some students who are reluctant to ask their teacher directly. Further, tutoring strengthen the concepts that have been mastered and it is an opportunity for the students to practice skills in guiding and holding responsibilities in carrying out a task and practicing the patience, as well as strengthening relationships between fellow students.

Assessment

Learning and assessment are closely related. Purpose, delivery, and assessment are the foundation of every educational effort. The purpose defines what needs to be learned; delivery, methods, and means to be determined to meet those needs; and assessment, the size of whether they have been fulfilled. Most class learning objectives can enter into one of the competencies of knowledge, skills, or attitude. The emphasis on each of these varies from class learning to other classroom learning. Meaningful assessments must be aligned with the stated objectives (Xinhua, 2008).

Assessment is a prescribed way to monitor student progress as they continue to meet classroom learning goals. A summative assessment has a strong social flavor. Here, teachers, institutions, and the community, in general, want to ensure that learning has taken place. These steps, which have a final impression of them, occur at the point specified during class learning, usually in the middle and at the end (Kibble, 2017). Other assessment categories are more tentative, where the aim is to provide feedback, encourage content mastery, sharpen skills, change attitudes, and improve student growth (S. Brown, 2005). Significantly, this is not intended to evaluate students' competencies or achievements. This assessment is often called formative, although the term does not capture full essence because both teachers and students often interpret this as only a temporary measure that leads to a real final test at the end. This might be better-called assessment for oriented learning or assessment (Carless, 2007). This series of assessments is the focus of this paper.

Kibble notes that there is a "continuum of summative assessment to formative, depending on the main purpose intended." For example, summative test results can give students instructions to improve their learning and students can see formative assessments only to do better on summative tests. All forms of assessment must enrich this learning process, and these factors are relevant to achieving assessment for learning (Kibble, 2017).

Meaningful learning can be improved significantly if students are allowed to

personalize their learning through assessment. So the quality of learning achieved by a student is significant. The means to achieve this is to have an assessment that allows students to explore important issues for them. Eisner categorizes educational objectives into two broad categories: learning and expressiveness. The former determines clearly what needs to be monitored, the later provides opportunities for students to explore problems that interest them. The quality of learning and, consequently, the assessment used to encourage learning can be enhanced by a wise balance between these two outcomes (Eisner, 1985).

Methodology

The method used to answer research questions was classroom action research (CAR) with a one-shot case study experimental approach. This means that a group given treatment is observed by applying a cycle comprising planning, implementing, observing, and reflecting activities and then evaluating as the dependent variable. It is carried out in three basic competencies (BC): 9, 10, and 11. Learning for BC 9 was carried out in 8 meetings, BC 10 in 11 meetings, and BC 11 in 9 meetings. The research: location was in the 3 Way Pengubuan Public Junior School in grade 8. The data were collected through English tests. Data in the form of numbers from learning outcomes were analyzed using SPSS version 23 to answer questions 1, 2, 3, and 4, using correlations to determine the significance of the correlation, correlation coefficient, and relationship determination.

Results

Question 1

What is the significance of the application of peer tutors and the daily learning performance assessments to the average-student academic achievers in aggregate?

Table 1 Correlation between Student Perceptions and the Average-Student Academic Achievers in the Aggregate

Correlations

		Student Perception	Academic achievement
Student Perception	Pearson Correlation	1	.186
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.082
	N	88	88
Academic	Pearson Correlation	.186	1

achievement	Sig. (2-tailed)	.082	
	N	88	88

Source: Research Data Process

Score $r = 0.186$, $p = 0.082$ (2-tailed), positive direction, and to know the strength of the relationship is to refer to the correlation value (r). Cohen suggested a guideline that the strength of a small relationship $r = 0.10$ to 0.29 , while $r = 0.30$ to 0.49 , and the magnitude $r = 0.50$ to 1.0 . $r = 0.186$, so the relationship strength is small (Pallant, 2011), and $r^2 = 3\%$.

Question 2

What is the significance of the application of peer tutorial and daily assessment of learning performance to the scores of knowledge and skills on the student's final semester scores?

Table 2 Correlation of Knowledge and Skills Scores for the Final Semester Assessment Score Correlations

	1	2
Final Semester Assessment	1	.760**
Average Knowledge and Skills	.760**	1

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

Source: Research Data Process

The direction of the relationship between the average scores of knowledge and skills with the end of semester assessment is positive (0.760), $r = 0.760$, and $r^2 = 5\%$, $p = 0.01$ level (2-tailed).

Question 3

What is the significance of the application of peer and the daily learning performance assessments to the Final Semester Assessment?

Table 3 Correlation of Final Assessments, Knowledge, and Skill scores Correlations

	1	2	3
Final Semester Assessment	-	.799**	.667**
Knowledge		-	.874**
Skill Score			-

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

Source: Research Data Process

The direction of the relationship between the average score of knowledge and skills with the end of semester assessment is positive (0.799, 0.667, and 0.874), the strength of the relationship for the three variables is large, $r^2 = 8\%$, and $p = 0.01$ level (2-tailed).

Question 4

What is the significance of the application of peer tutorial and daily assessments based on the students' perceptions of the skill scores assessments?

Table 4 Correlation between Student Perceptions and Skill Score

Correlations

		Student Perception	Skill Score
Student Perception	Pearson Correlation	1	.075
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.490
	N	88	88
Skill Score	Pearson Correlation	.075	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.490	
	N	88	91

Source: Research Data Process

The relationship between student perception scores and skills with the end of semester assessment is positive, the scorer = 0.075, $r^2 = 6\%$ and $p = 0.490$ (2-tailed).

Discussion

This research is to examine the significance, coefficient, and determination correlation of the use of peer tutorial and daily learning performance from 1) student perceptions and the average student academic achievement in the aggregate, 2) knowledge and skills scores for the final semester assessment score, 3) knowledge and skills scores for the final semester assessment score, final assessments, knowledge, and 4) skill score, and student perception and skill score. The result shows their significances.

The four results of this action research are in line with the results of previous research and theories that have been established. Various learning theories have predicted the success of peer guidance. They attract the difference between active, constructive, and interactive

activities. Interactive activities such as peer tutorial: (where a student talks with others about the subject matter) have been shown to produce learning outcomes that are greater than activities that are only constructive or active. From a social constructivist perspective (Chi, 2009), high-level interactions in which ideas, explanations, justifications, speculations, hypothesis, and exchanged conclusions can bring changes in the cognitive structure of tutors and tutees (Tudge & Rogoff, 1999; Vygotsky, 1980).

In particular, Vygotsky believes that students can observe cognitive skills from colleagues who are more capable and in time internalize and develop them personally. Thus, more advanced tutors will be needed to design tutees and help them progress cognitively in their "zone of proximal development" (Vygotsky, 1980). However, there is evidence that tutors do not need to be more advanced than tutees. In one study, student learning was equally effective when tutors were not advised to provide explanations and feedback to students (Chi, Siler, Jeong, Yamauchi, & Hausmann, 2001).

Besides, other studies show that students with similar abilities can successfully teach each other (Jensen & Lawson, 2011; King, Staffieri, & Adelgais, 1998; Menesses & Gresham, 2009). This observation is supported by equilibration theory, where learning is stimulated when students face unequal experiences in which prior knowledge can only accommodate new information if it is reorganized and contradictions are resolved (Piaget, 1985). In support of this, research shows that tutees must meet dead ends during the tutoring session for learning to take place (VanLehn et al., 2003), something that can happen with tutors at the same level of ability.

Peer tutorial has been proved to be useful for tutees and tutors, with the magnitude of this benefit varying from study to study (Benè & Bergus, 2014; Roscoe & Chi, 2007). Peer tutors can easily provide learning to students and summarize what they already known, called "telling knowledge" (Roscoe & Chi, 2007). Interestingly, tutee behavior can affect tutor learning. The more high-level questions asked the more tutors can monitor themselves, and the more conclusions they make. If tutees ask more superficial questions, tutors tend to be involved in more superficial knowledge disclosures (Nguyen & Baldauf Jr, 2010; Roscoe & Chi, 2004, 2007).

Tutors and tutees got a benefit from tutoring; reciprocal peer guidance must be an effective and efficient model to help students learn. Students take turns filling out the roles of tutors and tutees, allowing the student-to-instructor ratio of students to be possible in any size class. It allows each student to experience both roles, but it can also produce more collaboration and understanding together when roles are blurred (Duran & Monereo, 2005).

The benefits of peer tutors that have been proven through research (Assinder, 1991) there are at least eight, namely: (1) Increased motivation. Without exception, all students appear to be more motivated, and this motivation is maintained throughout the entire course. Students seem to enjoy themselves more, are more willing to contribute, have increased concentration ranges, and engage in more spontaneous conversations than ever before. (2) Participation is increasing. Even students who were previously quite passive in class became more involved. All talk is initiated by students and, as well as the students' talk time increases rapidly, the nature of discourse changes to include more questions, more checks, more clarity, and more negotiation than in previous lessons. Students also seem to listen to each other more closely. (3) Improvement of 'real' communication longer and more meaningful discussion. I was struck by the wealth and variety of exchanges that took place - the analysis of information and the political situation; discussion of learning and the values and objectives of various task components; group organization negotiations; and discussion of the relative merits of various dictionaries. (4) Enhance deep understanding. Group negotiation seems to result in a deeper understanding of all parties. There are several mixed abilities among students; stronger students often have linguistic resources that extend to the limit when called upon to explain something, be it content or grammar, to weaker students, who, in turn, have their own threshold raised to a new level. I was impressed with the persistence of the group to ensure that each group member had reached a thorough understanding of whatever was being discussed. (5) Increased responsibility for learning and their commitment to learning. In addition to being responsible to their own group (in terms of sharing work) and being accountable to other groups (in terms of teaching), each individual is fully responsible for what, and how much, is learned. Vocabulary development, for example, is very individual, with each student isolating a number of new items every day. The students themselves choose what, and how much, to learn. (6) Increase self-confidence and respect for each other. Every student is able to excel in something (not necessarily linguistic). Able to bring their own adult knowledge and skills, increase their confidence and respect for each other. This multiplicity of roles increases self-confidence and respect for peers. (7) Increasing the number of skills and strategies that are practiced and developed. It was surprised, in lesson after lesson, by the wealth of each session in terms of the number of skills and strategies practiced, and the amount of learning that seemed to occur. (8) Increased accuracy. Students take great pride in producing worksheets that are written accurately for other groups. As a result, there is often a long debate about the main points of grammar; negotiated final products always have a much greater degree of accuracy than the written work of each individual group member.

Peer tutors succeed as learning methods because they have social aspects that are directly proportional to language and humans as social creatures. Research findings on emotional and social aspects (Wette & Furneaux, 2018) provide insight into other types of challenges for students. Immediately after accepting them in teaching activities, most students put down great stress on "tutorial participation, and communication with peer tutors" (Zhang & Mi, 2010). This pressure is often fostered by personal factors such as the ability to feel comfortable with the tutor, readiness, the distance of good habits between home tutors and tutees, which creates better social and academic support (Zghyer, 2014).

Assessment is a set way to monitor student progress as they continue to meet classroom learning goals. There are two broad categories, called summative and formative. A summative assessment has a strong social flavor. Here, teachers, institutions, and, in general, the general public want to ensure that learning has taken place. These steps, which have a final impression about them, occur at the point determined during class learning, usually in the middle and at the end, and especially the assessment of learning (Kibble, 2017). Other assessment categories are more tentative, where the aim is to provide feedback, encourage mastery of content, hone skills, change attitudes, and enhance student growth (S. Brown, 2005). Significantly, this is not intended to evaluate the competencies or achievements of such students. This assessment is often called formative, although the term does not capture the full essence because both the teacher and students often interpret this only as a temporary measure that leads to a real final test at the end. This might be better called assessment for learning or learning-oriented assessment (Carless, 2007). This series of assessments is the focus of this paper.

The authors can synthesize that assessment for meaningful learning must prepare students not only to get good grades and meet certain class learning requirements but to give them training, skills, and enthusiasm for the long term. As postsecondary and professional education transitions to a competency-based model, it is increasingly clear that simply assessing students on their achievements within a limited time frame or classroom learning is not enough. Meaningful learning and assessment mean alignment with relevant results for the next stage of student growth, whether it is a provision for further learning or survival-based learning.

This strategy is a component of classroom practice, integrating them into unity will further enhance student achievement. There are several practices are conceptualized and operationalized (Arter, 2009; William & Thompson, 2017). In general, efforts to promote formative assessment often fail to achieve formative assessment practices that are developed substantially (Carless, 2005; Hume & Coll, 2009; James & McCormick, 2009; Jonsson,

Lundahl, & Holmgren, 2015; Marshall & Jane Drummond, 2006; Schneider & Randel, 2010; Wylie & Lyon, 2015), to the extent that student achievement improvement is obtained (Bell, Steinberg, Wiliam, & Wylie, 2008; Carless, 2005; Randel et al., 2011; Schneider & Randel, 2010).

Language Assessment also has its own characteristics included in the assessment. Components and language skills are presented through various methods and approaches in curriculum design, where various factors are integrated (Macalister & Nation, 2010). This is influenced by the philosophy of seeing language teaching or language learning (H. D. Brown, 2007; Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Typically, FL students are formally presented with language input in language classes. Materials are carefully assessed and designed, and are often based on specific organizational structures, such as grammar, functional, situational, skill-based, or task-based (Breen, 1985, 1987; Macalister & Nation, 2010; Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Richardson, 2011; White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta, 1991). As stated above, language input is followed by practice and ends with some type of class assessment (Hadley, Rispoli, & Hsu, 2016; Lin, Tsai, Hsu, & Chang, 2019; Mashad, 2008).

Conclusion

In line with the results of the calculation of this action research data, the authors can draw the conclusions, as follows: the application of peer tutors and the daily learning performance assessments to the average student academic achievers in aggregate, the application of peer tutorial and the daily learning performance assessments to the average-student academic in aggregate, the application of peer tutorial and the daily learning performance assessments to the final semester assessment, and the application of peer tutorial and daily assessments based on the students' perceptions of the skill scores assessments are significant. Those all tell that the efforts worked well in increasing student learning performance and learning outcomes of students' English lessons. Therefore, the traces of the practice of applying peer tutorial, the point is that peer tutorial is effective and efficient. It is effective because this can be done due to the fact that both those who act as teachers and students are the students themselves. This practice results in active patterns of interaction. It is efficient because at one time it runs a learning pattern that can involve all students in the class.

Pedagogical Implications

The fact is that majority of the students, especially in the remote area, tend to be passive

in learning English. However, as shown by this study the classroom atmosphere is different that the majority of the student were very active after the implementation of peer tutoring and assessment. Consequently, English teachers who want to help their students be more active in the classroom, the following pedagogical implication should be taken into consideration. First, involve the students to comment their peers' works so that they feel that they have been given responsibility to be active agents. Secondly, not only teachers but also students should be involved in assessing students' classroom activities.

Acknowledgment

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency.

References

- Adamson, B. (2004). *China's English: A history of English in Chinese education* (Vol. 1): Hong Kong University Press.
- Arter, J. (2009). *Classroom assessment for student learning (CASL) perspective on the JCSEE student evaluation standards*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, in the Division H symposium JCSEE National Conference on Benchmarking Student Evaluation Practices.
- Assinder, W. (1991). Peer teaching, peer learning: one model.
- Bell, C., Steinberg, J., William, D., & Wylie, C. (2008). *Formative assessment and teacher achievement: Two years of implementation of the Keeping Learning on Track Program*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New York.
- Benè, K. L., & Bergus, G. (2014). When learners become teachers. *Family medicine, 46*, 783-787.
- Bernstein, D. I., Wasserman, S. I., Thompson, W. P., & Freeman, T. M. (2017). ABAI's MOC assessment of knowledge program matures: adding value with continuous learning and assessment. *The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology: In Practice, 5*(1), 80-83.
- Biggs, J. B. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does*: McGraw-hill education (UK).
- Breen, M. P. (1985). The social context for language learning—a neglected situation? *Studies in second language acquisition, 7*(2), 135-158.
- Breen, M. P. (1987). Contemporary paradigms in syllabus design Part II. *Language Teaching, 20*(3), 157-174.

- Brown, H. D. (2007). Prinsip pembelajaran dan pengajaran bahasa, Edisi Kelima. *Jakarta: Kedutaan Besar Amerika Serikat di Jakarta.*
- Brown, S. (2005). Assessment for learning. *Learning and teaching in higher education*(1), 81-89.
- Carless, D. (2005). Prospects for the implementation of assessment for learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 12*(1), 39-54.
- Carless, D. (2007). Learning-oriented assessment: conceptual bases and practical implications. *Innovations in education and teaching international, 44*(1), 57-66.
- Çetinavcı, U. R., & Yavuz, A. (2011). Language proficiency level of English language teacher trainees in Turkey. *The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education, 1*(4), 26-54.
- Chi, M. T., Siler, S. A., Jeong, H., Yamauchi, T., & Hausmann, R. G. (2001). Learning from human tutoring. *Cognitive science, 25*(4), 471-533.
- Duran, D., & Monereo, C. (2005). Styles and sequences of cooperative interaction in fixed and reciprocal peer tutoring. *Learning and instruction, 15*(3), 179-199.
- Eisner, E. W. (1985). Eisner, Elliot W., *The Art of Educational Evaluation: A Personal View.* London: Falmer, 1985.
- Hadley, P. A., Rispoli, M., & Hsu, N. (2016). Toddlers' verb lexicon diversity and grammatical outcomes. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 47*(1), 44-58.
- Hoa, N. T. M. (2008). Mentoring beginning EFL teachers at tertiary level in Vietnam. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly March 2008 Volume 10, Issue, 10*(1), 111.
- Hu, X., Cheng, L. Y., Chiu, M. H., & Paller, K. A. (2020). Promoting memory consolidation during sleep: A meta-analysis of targeted memory reactivation. *Psychological bulletin, 146*(3), 218.
- Hume, A., & Coll, R. K. (2009). Assessment of learning, for learning, and as learning: New Zealand case studies. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 16*(3), 269-290.
- Ischak, S., & Warji, R. (1987). Program remedial dalam proses belajar mengajar. *Yogyakarta: Liberty.*
- James, M., & McCormick, R. (2009). Teachers learning how to learn. *Teaching and Teacher education, 25*(7), 973-982.
- Jensen, J. L., & Lawson, A. (2011). Effects of collaborative group composition and inquiry instruction on reasoning gains and achievement in undergraduate biology. *CBE—Life Sciences Education, 10*(1), 64-73.

- Jonsson, A., Lundahl, C., & Holmgren, A. (2015). Evaluating a large-scale implementation of Assessment for Learning in Sweden. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 22(1), 104-121.
- Kibble, J. D. (2017). Best practices in summative assessment: American Physiological Society Bethesda, MD.
- King, A., Staffieri, A., & Adelgais, A. (1998). Mutual peer tutoring: Effects of structuring tutorial interaction to scaffold peer learning. *Journal of educational psychology*, 90(1), 134.
- Krupa-Kwiatkowski, M. (1998). You Shouldn't Have Brought Me Here!: Interaction Strategies in the Silent Period of an Inner-Directed Second Language Learner. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 31(2), 133-175.
- Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2009). Language attitudes in interaction 1. *Journal of sociolinguistics*, 13(2), 195-222.
- Lin, J.-W., Tsai, C.-W., Hsu, C.-C., & Chang, L.-C. (2019). Peer assessment with group awareness tools and effects on project-based learning. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1-17.
- Liu, J. (2005). Chinese graduate teaching assistants teaching freshman composition to native English speaking students *Non-native language teachers* (pp. 155-177): Springer.
- Luoma, S. (2004). *Assessing speaking*: Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Ma, H., Zheng, Z., Ye, F., & Tong, S. (2010). *The applied research of cloud computing in the construction of collaborative learning platform under e-learning environment*. Paper presented at the 2010 International Conference on System Science, Engineering Design and Manufacturing Informatization.
- Macalister, J., & Nation, I. (2010). Language curriculum design. *London: ISP Nation*.
- Marshall, B., & Jane Drummond, M. (2006). How teachers engage with assessment for learning: Lessons from the classroom. *Research papers in education*, 21(02), 133-149.
- Mashad, I. (2008). Another look at the C-Test: A validation study with Iranian EFL learners. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly March 2008 Volume 10, Issue, 10(1)*, 154.
- Menesses, K. F., & Gresham, F. M. (2009). Relative efficacy of reciprocal and nonreciprocal peer tutoring for students at-risk for academic failure. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 24(4), 266.
- Nguyen, H. T. M., & Baldauf Jr, R. B. (2010). Effective peer mentoring for EFL pre-service teachers' instructional practicum practice. *Asian EFL Journal*, 12(3), 40-61.

- Randel, B., Beesley, A. D., Apthorp, H., Clark, T. F., Wang, X., Cicchinelli, L. F., & Williams, J. M. (2011). Classroom Assessment for Student Learning: Impact on Elementary School Mathematics in the Central Region. Final Report. NCEE 2011-4005. *National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance*.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). Communicative language teaching. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge UP.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*: Cambridge university press.
- Richardson, J. T. (2011). Eta squared and partial eta squared as measures of effect size in educational research. *Educational Research Review*, 6(2), 135-147.
- Roscoe, R. D., & Chi, M. T. (2004). *The influence of the tutee in learning by peer tutoring*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society.
- Roscoe, R. D., & Chi, M. T. (2007). Understanding tutor learning: Knowledge-building and knowledge-telling in peer tutors' explanations and questions. *Review of educational research*, 77(4), 534-574.
- Schneider, M. C., & Randel, B. (2010). Research on characteristics of effective professional development programs for enhancing educators' skills in formative assessment. *Handbook of formative assessment*, 251-276.
- Suherman, E. (2003). Strategi pembelajaran matematika kontemporer. *Bandung: Jica*.
- Tsou, W. (2005). Improving speaking skills through instruction in oral classroom participation. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(1), 46-55.
- Tsui, C.-J. (1992). English Business Communication Skills Training Needs of Non-Native English-Speaking Managers: A Case in Taiwan. *Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication*, 55(1), 40-41.
- Tudge, J., & Rogoff, B. (1999). Peer influences on cognitive development: Piagetian and Vygotskian perspectives. *Lev Vygotsky: critical assessments*, 3, 32-56.
- Turner, D. W. (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators. *The qualitative report*, 15(3), 754-760.
- Ur, P. (2014). Where do we go from here? Method and pedagogy in language teaching. *ExELL*, 2(1), 3-11.
- VanLehn, K., Siler, S., Murray, C., Yamauchi, T., & Baggett, W. B. (2003). Why do only some events cause learning during human tutoring? *Cognition and Instruction*, 21(3), 209-249.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*: Harvard university press.
- Wette, R., & Furneaux, C. (2018). The academic discourse socialisation challenges and coping strategies of international graduate students entering English-medium universities. *System*, 78, 186-200.
- White, L., Spada, N., Lightbown, P. M., & Ranta, L. (1991). Input enhancement and L2 question formation. *Applied linguistics*, 12(4), 416-432.
- William, D., & Thompson, M. (2017). Integrating assessment with learning: What will it take to make it work? *The future of assessment* (pp. 53-82): Routledge.
- Wylie, E. C., & Lyon, C. J. (2015). The fidelity of formative assessment implementation: Issues of breadth and quality. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 22(1), 140-160.
- Xinhua, Z. (2008). Is Syntactic Maturity a Reliable Measurement to Investigate the Relationship Between English Speaking and Writing? *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly March 2008 Volume 10, Issue, 10(1)*, 133.
- Zghyer, R. N. A. (2014). *Arab students' difficulties with English writing during their transition to the United States: An exploratory study*: Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
- Zhang, Y., & Mi, Y. (2010). Another look at the language difficulties of international students. *Journal of Studies in international Education*, 14(4), 371-388.