

## THE COMPARATIVE EFFECT OF PEER-ASSESSMENT AND SELF-ASSESSMENT ON IRANIAN EXTROVERT AND INTROVERT EFL LEARNERS' VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT

**Hoda Mosavi**

*Islamic Azad University Rudehen University, Tehran, Iran*

**Amir Reza Nemat Tabriz, PhD**

*Islamic Azad University Rudehen University, Tehran, Iran*

*Email: arnemati@yahoo.com*

### ABSTRACT

*This study was an attempt to investigate the comparative impact of self-assessment and peer-assessment on English as a foreign language (EFL) learners' vocabulary learning. For this purpose, 120 female EFL learners were selected from a group of 161 learners based on their performance on a sample NELSON in Pouyandegan Andisheh Saleh (GAP) Language Institute. Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) was administered to the participants to measure their degree of extroversion and introversion. They were randomly assigned into two experimental groups and a control group. Moreover, they were also given a Nelson vocabulary pretest to homogenize participants based on their vocabulary knowledge. The twelve sessions treatment which followed included teaching vocabulary using self-assessment in one experimental group and peer assessment in the other. The control group had their own traditional way of teaching without treatment. At the end of the treatment, a teacher-made vocabulary posttest was administered to three groups to see if there were any significance differences between three groups in terms of their achievement on the posttest. The analysis of the test scores using one way ANOVA and an independent samples t-test indicated self-assessment had significant positive effect on introvert learners' vocabulary development, and a significant positive effect on extrovert learners' vocabulary development. Moreover, peer-assessment had higher mean on the posttest of vocabulary than the control group and it can be concluded that peer-assessment had no significant effect on introvert learners' vocabulary development, but a significant positive effect on extrovert learners' vocabulary development.*

**KEYWORDS:** Extrovert, Introvert, Peer-Assessment, Self-Assessment, Vocabulary development

### INTRODUCTION

This was challenged by some researchers reporting that personality traits cause differences in what and how people learn (Mc Caulley & Natter, 1980). Similarly, Ackerman and Heggstad (1997) propose that personality dispositions are among the predictors of success in a particular

task. Among the studied personality types, the concepts of extroversion and introversion are perhaps the most popular ones (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996) both in theory and research. Recently, there have been some attempts to make a link between the two personality types and some skills and sub skills. Vocabulary learning is one of major concerns in language teaching and learning and occupies very important position in these areas. Richards and Rodgers (2001) state that “the building blocks of language learning and communication are not grammar, function, notions, or some other unit of planning and teaching but lexis, that is, word and word combination” (p. 132). Since 1980s, many eminent theorists and researchers have been the proponents of shifting from teaching to learning. In line with this reasoning, Huba and Freed (2000) defined assessment as the process of gathering and discussing information from multiple and different sources are used to improve following learning in order to improve a deep understanding of what students know, understand, and can do with their knowledge by means of their educational experiences; the process when assessment results are used to improve subsequent learning. There are various ways to empower students including peer assessment, teacher-assessment, and self-assessment. Peer assessment, in which learners assess the work of their classmates, is a kind of learning that lets learners provide feedback on each other’s work. Moreover, Falchikov (2001) states that peer assessment is an assessment in which member of a class give feedback and grade the work or performance of their peers using relevant criteria. In self-assessment, marks may be awarded by students themselves. These assessments bring a closer relationship among teachers and students as well as help students develop useful skills in academic and professional areas.

Learning vocabulary is considered as a key factor in achieving a high level of proficiency in the target language (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2008). Nowadays researchers and teachers are paying attention to foreign language vocabulary acquisition. Having a large number of vocabularies is the indicator of communicative competence and it is one of the important aspects of language learning (McCrostie, 2007). Within the last few decades in this regard, the adoption of different ways of assessment in foreign language education has become of crucial importance. In recent years, as Farhady (2006) claims “assessment has perceived a paradigm shift from a discrete-point component-based perspective to a task-based, performance-oriented approach” (P. 28). Peer and self-assessment along with dynamic assessment have proved themselves as useful and mediating tools for teaching and learning in different skills and sub-skills including writing (Seyed Erfani & Agha Ebrahimiyan, 2013), speaking (Hill & Sabet, 2009), reading (Guterman, 2002), grammar (Kovacic, Bubas, & Coric, 2012), and vocabulary (Saeidi & Hosseinpour, 2013). However, the previous studies have not provided conclusive results and techniques for the integration of dynamic assessment in vocabulary learning. Moreover, although self-assessment and peer-assessment have been widely researched in the fields of psychology and education, vocabulary learning was not considered in these studies and personality types such as the concepts of extroversion and introversion (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996) both in theory and research were ignored. Therefore, this study is an attempt to investigate the effect of peer, and self-assessment on English language vocabulary development among Iranian EFL learners with two different personality types within the body of dynamic assessment.

## REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

### *Vocabulary*

According to Manser (1995) “vocabulary is the total number of words in a language, all words known by a person or used in a particular book, subject, or a list of words with their meanings” (p. 461). In addition, Merriam-Webster Learner’s Dictionary (2003) illustrates that vocabulary means the words that make up a language. Moreover, the term vocabulary refers to “a list or set of words for a particular language or a list or set of words that individual speakers of a language might use” (Hatch & Brown, 1995). In importance of vocabulary, Wilkins (1972) argued that “without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed” (p. 111).

### *Introvert Learners versus Extrovert Learners*

Many second language teachers believe that an outgoing learner is more likely to be successful as a second language learner than his less gregarious counterpart. Language teachers condemn that the extroverts will create more situations for themselves to engage in conversation in the target language (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985). Therefore, these opportunities to speak a new language will positively affect the development of the student's proficiency in it. Wilson, Fornasier, and White (2010) regarding the difference between introvert and extrovert language learners notify that extroverts are those who are oriented primarily towards the outer world. They are also sociable and impulsive learners who wish to share information as well as interact with others. In contrast, introverts are those who are oriented towards the inner world. Given that they are less sociable but more reserved, and tend to withdraw into themselves (Goby, 2006). However, they used to focus their energy on concepts, ideas, as well as internal experiences (Weibel, Wissmath, & Groner, 2010).

### *Dynamic Assessment*

Dynamic assessment has been developed as an alternative to ‘static’ types of assessment, namely, standardized tests. According to Haywood (1992) dynamic assessment is a subset of the more generic concept of interactive assessment. He further suggested that “It might be useful to characterize as interactive any approach to psychological or psycho-educational assessment in which the examiner is inserted into an active relationship with a subject and does more than give instructions, pose questions, and record responses. ‘Dynamic’ should probably be reserved for those approaches in which the interaction is richer, in which there is actual teaching (not of answers but of cognitive tools), within the interaction and in which there is conscious, purposeful, and deliberate effort to produce change in the subject” (Haywood, 1992, p. 233). Haywood and Tzuriel (2002) defined dynamic assessment as a “subset of interactive assessment that includes deliberate and planned mediational teaching and the assessment of the effects of that teaching on subsequent performance. The term dynamic assessment refers to an assessment of thinking, perception, learning, and problem solving by an active teaching process aimed at modifying cognitive functioning. Dynamic assessment differs from conventional static tests in regard to its goals, processes, instruments, test situation, and interpretation of results” (p. 40).

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To fulfill the purpose of this study, the following research questions are formulated:

- Q1. Does self-assessment have any effect on vocabulary development of Iranian intermediate EFL learners?
- Q2. Does self-assessment have any effect on vocabulary development of Iranian intermediate EFL introvert learners?
- Q3. Does self-assessment have any effect on vocabulary development of Iranian intermediate EFL extrovert learners?
- Q4. In case of any effect of self-assessment, which of the introvert or extrovert learners benefit more?
- Q5. Does peer-assessment have any effect on vocabulary development of Iranian intermediate EFL learners?
- Q6. Does peer-assessment have any effect on vocabulary development of Iranian intermediate EFL introvert learners?
- Q7. Does peer-assessment have any effect on vocabulary development of Iranian intermediate EFL extrovert learners?
- Q8. In case of any effect of peer-assessment, which of the introvert or extrovert learners benefit more?
- Q9. If the answers to research questions one and five are yes, does peer-assessment have more effect than self-assessment on vocabulary development of Iranian intermediate EFL learners?

## METHODOLOGY

### *Participants*

The participants of the present study were 120 female intermediate English language learners, selected out of initial 161 participants as the result of homogenizing test, at Pouyandegan Andisheh Saleh (GAP) Language Institute. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 22. Following the administration of a Nelson test to 161 intermediate learners, 120 ones whose scores fell 1SD below and above the mean were selected. Eysenck's (1999) Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) was administered to the participants to measure their degree of extroversion and introversion.

### *Instruments*

The following instruments were used in this study:

#### *Test of Homogeneity (NELSON)*

In order to be assured of the homogeneity of the control and experimental groups in terms of English language proficiency, and being sure that they were at intermediate level, a test of NELSON, series 300B, was administered before the pretest. It consisted of four parts: cloze tests, structure, vocabulary, and pronunciation. All parts were in the form of Multiple-Choice questions. There were, in all, 50 items and the time allotted was 45 minutes.

### *The Nelson Vocabulary Pretest*

To measure the knowledge of the participants in vocabulary, and to prove that they are homogeneous in terms of vocabulary, the participants in all the groups were asked to have the 30 multiple choice Nelson vocabulary test prior to treatment as a pretest.

### *Eysenck's (1999) Personality Questionnaire (EPQ)*

EPQ is used to measure the extroversion and introversion degree of the subjects. This questionnaire contains 57 questions regarding the way someone behaves, feels, and acts. After each question is a space for answering YES or NO. Participants tried to decide whether YES or NO represents usual way of acting or feeling. Also, those who fill out the EPQ received three kinds of scores: E, N, and Lie. The scores show the degree of extroversion, neuroticism, and social desirability of a given person. E and N scores were computed out of 24 each because each consists of 24 items and the lie score is calculated out of 9. It took only few moments to fill out the questionnaire and researcher used the Persian version provided and validated by Noor institute of Behavioral Science Research in Tallish, Iran (as mentioned in Haradasht & Baradaran, 2012)

### *Posttest of Vocabulary*

The participants in all the groups were asked to have the same 50 multiple choice teacher- made vocabulary test as a posttest in order to assess their development after treatment. It is worth mentioning that this test was piloted before treatment.

### *Procedure*

161 participants out of 250 female intermediate students at Pouyandegan Andisheh Saleh whose scores fell between one standard deviation above and below the mean were identified and given the Eysenck's (1999) Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) in order to measure their degree of extroversion and introversion. From among the 161 students who attended the Eysenck Personality Inventory, 120 were chosen based on their scores which were calculated by the test key. Then in order to make sure that there was no significant difference between these groups regarding this variable at the outset before the treatment, their performance on the vocabulary Nelson test was compared. After making sure that there was no significant difference between the three groups' performance on vocabulary section of Nelson test, the treatment was started.

Before focusing on what was presented in the classroom, a brief review of the dynamic assessment model (Poehner & Lantolf, 2005) which was followed in the study seems necessary. The participants were given the required instructions to work with the checklist they received as the means of assessment. Most growth in vocabulary knowledge must necessarily come through reading. At the outset of the each session, the students were asked to pose question whenever they encounter any problem with vocabularies in reading texts. In the self-assessment group, while each participant was performing a reading task, the teacher used to take notes and write down that participant's errors in vocabulary learning. After finishing of the task, the teacher was giving her notes to the participant and asked her to find the correct meaning of the mentioned words and learn their correct form. In the following session each participant had to make a sentence, but with the correct meaning of words. To foster the self-assessment process, the



teacher started to act as a participant who was assigned to assess themselves. She showed how the required errors must be checked to provide feedback. However, in peer assessment group, the peer provided feedback if there were some mistakes and they acted as a mediator while in the self-assessment group, the students practiced self-assessment and were asked to assess themselves at the end of each session of the classroom. The peer assessment group worked in a team frame which included two participants and they corrected each other's error in word meanings. In this group, while one of the pairs was performing the reading task, the other pair had to take notes and find her friend's errors in word meanings. She was also responsible for finding of the correct meaning of the mentioned words and sharing them with her pair. At the end of the term, after giving treatment to the experimental groups, all learners in control and the two experimental groups took the post-test of vocabulary test to test the research hypotheses.

### **Research Design and Statistical Analysis**

This study is a quasi- experimental one, accordingly, the study involved two independent variables and one dependent variable. The independent variables were peer, and self-assessments and the dependent variable was vocabulary learning. Extrovert and introvert personality types were two moderator variables of this study. After collecting the data, some descriptive and inferential data analysis procedures was carried out in order to analyze the data including the descriptive statistical analysis of vocabulary tests and estimating reliability through Cronbach's Alpha method before and after removing the malfunctioning items. Finally, comprehensive comparison of the means of three groups through one way ANOVA was calculated to test the null hypotheses of the study. Moreover, an independent sample *t*-test was run to probe any significant difference between the effect of self-assessment and peer-assessment on EFL learners' vocabulary development.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The first step to reach a homogenous sample was to administer a proficiency test. The researcher used Nelson test to this end. The test contains 50 multiple-choice questions. On the whole, 250 students participated in the test administration. After the administration of the test, descriptive statistics were conducted just as was done in the piloting phase. Table 1 shows these statistics with the mean of 33.21 and the standard deviation of 4.74.

*Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of the Nelson Test Administration*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
Nelson	250	20.00	45.00	33.2160	4.74081	-.277	.154
Valid N (listwise)	250						

The next step was to identify extrovert and introvert participants from among the 161 homogenous participants. To do so, the participants were asked to fill in the Persian translation of Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI). In order to make sure that the participants were homogeneous in terms of their vocabulary knowledge at the outset a sample vocabulary test of Nelson was used. The results obtained from the Nelson vocabulary test were used to make sure that the students did not manifested significant difference in terms of their vocabulary

knowledge. Table 2 shows descriptive statistics of each group's performance on vocabulary knowledge test.

*Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of the Groups' Vocabulary Knowledge at the Outset*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Introverts	40	13.8250	1.98569	.31396	13.1899	14.4601	11.00	18.00
Extroverts	40	13.8500	1.92886	.30498	13.2331	14.4669	11.00	17.00
Control	40	13.7250	1.98698	.31417	13.0895	14.3605	10.00	17.00
Total	120	13.8000	1.95151	.17815	13.4472	14.1528	10.00	18.00

As it is evident from table 4.3, the mean of three groups were almost the same. In order to make sure that there was no significant difference between the means, a one-way ANOVA procedure was used. Before running ANOVA, assumption of homogeneity of variance needed to be checked. Table 3 Shows the results of Levene's test of homogeneity of variance.

*Table 3: Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance on the Scores of the Groups' Vocabulary Knowledge at the Outset*

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.098	2	117	.906

As evident from table 3, ( $F_{(2,117)} = .098$ ,  $p = .906 > .05$ ) the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met, running ANOVA was legitimized. Table 4 shows the results of ANOVA.

*Table 4: ANOVA; the Scores of the Groups' Vocabulary Knowledge at the Outset*  
*Vocabulary Knowledge Pretest*

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.350	2	.175	.045	.956
Within Groups	452.850	117	3.871		
Total	453.200	119			

As it is evident from Table 4 ( $F_{(2,117)} = .045$ ,  $p = .8956 > .05$ ), there was no significant difference between the three groups' performance on vocabulary knowledge test, indicating that the participants of groups had no significant difference in terms of their vocabulary knowledge at the outset. After the treatment was done, the pre-piloted vocabulary test was administered to the participants of the four experimental groups and the control group. Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics of the results obtained by each group in the posttest.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of Vocabulary Test Administration

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
Peer-Assessment Extroverts	20	28.00	47.00	37.3000	5.50693	.257	.512
Peer-Assessment Introverts	20	28.00	41.00	34.3500	3.70313	-.170	.512
Peer-Assessment posttest	40	28.00	47.00	35.8250	4.86688	.465	.374
Self-Assessment Extroverts	20	30.00	44.00	35.7500	4.17858	.378	.512
Self-Assessment Introverts	20	29.00	48.00	38.5500	6.23635	.026	.512
Self-Assessment posttest	40	29.00	48.00	37.1500	5.42808	.387	.374
Control Group Extroverts	20	27.00	37.00	32.1500	2.73909	-.021	.512
Control Group Introverts	20	29.00	39.00	33.1000	2.91818	.272	.512
Control Group Posttest	40	27.00	39.00	32.6250	2.83465	.161	.374
Valid N (listwise)	20						

The skewness ratio (skewness/std. error) of all the scores was fallen between plus minus 1.96; thus all data enjoyed normalcy of distribution.

For analyzing the first research question, an independent *t*-test was run to probe the significant effect of self-assessment on EFL learners' vocabulary development. Based on the results displayed in Table 6, it can be claimed that the self-assessment ( $M = 37.15$ ,  $SD = 5.42$ ) had a slightly higher mean on the posttest of vocabulary than the control group ( $M = 32.625$ ,  $SD = 2.83$ ).

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics; Posttest of Vocabulary by Self-Assessment

Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Vocabulary Posttest	self-assessment	40	37.1500	5.42808	.85826
	control	40	32.6250	2.83465	.44820

The results of the independent *t*-test ( $t(58.79) = 4.673$ ,  $p = .00$ ). Table 6 indicate that there was a significant difference between those who received self-assessment as their treatment and those who didn't. In other words, it was shown that self-assessment has significant effect on EFL learners' vocabulary development; thus the first null hypothesis was **rejected**.

Table 7: Independent Samples Test, Posttest of Vocabulary by Self-Assessment

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Vocabulary Posttest	Equal variances assumed	23.475	.000	4.673	78	.000	4.52500	.96824	2.59739	6.45261
	Equal variances not assumed			4.673	58.799	.000	4.52500	.96824	2.58742	6.46258



It should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not met (Levene's  $F = 23.475$ ,  $p = .00$ ). That is why the second row of Table 4.7, i.e. "Equal variances not assumed" was reported. For analyzing the second, third, and fourth research questions, a one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA) was run to compare the effect of self-assessment on EFL learners' means on the posttest of vocabulary. Before discussing the results it should be mentioned that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated (Levene's  $F (3, 76) = 12.621$ ,  $p = .00$ ) as reported in Table 8.

Table 8: Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances by Self-Assessment

Self-Assessment			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
12.621	3	76	.000

As the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated, robust tests of equality of means, namely Welch and Brown-Forsythe tests, were run to determine if there is any significant difference between the vocabulary knowledge of experimental and control groups (Table 9).

Table 9: Robust Tests of Equality of Means by Self-Assessment

	Statistic <sup>a</sup>	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	7.776	3	40.970	.000
Brown-Forsythe	9.155	3	51.130	.000

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

As it is displayed in Table 9, some differences were identifiable between the mean scores of the participants (Welch's  $F(3,40.97) = 7.776$ ,  $p = .000$ ). In order to see where the differences lies, a Dunnett T3 post hoc was run (Table 10).

Table 10: Multiple Comparisons; The effect of self-assessment

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
introvert experimental	extrovert experimental	2.80000	1.67858	.468	-1.8790	7.4790
	introvert control	5.45000*	1.53961	.009	1.0997	9.8003
	extrovert control	6.40000*	1.52307	.002	2.0861	10.7139
extrovert experimental	introvert experimental	-2.80000	1.67858	.468	-7.4790	1.8790
	introvert control	2.65000	1.13966	.142	-.5225	5.8225
	extrovert control	3.60000*	1.11721	.017	.4835	6.7165
introvert control	introvert experimental	-5.45000*	1.53961	.009	-9.8003	-1.0997
	extrovert experimental	-2.65000	1.13966	.142	-5.8225	.5225
	extrovert control	.95000	.89494	.866	-1.5268	3.4268
extrovert control	introvert experimental	-6.40000*	1.52307	.002	-10.7139	-2.0861
	extrovert experimental	-3.60000*	1.11721	.017	-6.7165	-.4835
	introvert control	-.95000	.89494	.866	-3.4268	1.5268

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Based on the results displayed in Table 4.13, it can be concluded that self-assessment had significant positive effect on introvert learners' vocabulary development ( $p = .009$ ); and a significant positive effect on extrovert learners vocabulary development ( $p = .017$ ). Thus, both second and third null hypotheses were **rejected**. It can also be concluded that there was no significant difference between extrovert and introvert learners' performance on vocabulary development posttest ( $p = .486$ ), indicating that the fourth null hypothesis **was supported**.

For analyzing the fifth research question, an independent  $t$ -test was run to probe any significant effect of peer-assessment on EFL learners' vocabulary development. Based on the results displayed in Table 11, it can be claimed that the peer-assessment ( $M = 35.825$ ,  $SD = 4.867$ ) had higher mean on the posttest of vocabulary than the control group ( $M = 32.625$ ,  $SD = 2.83$ ).

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics; Posttest of Vocabulary by Peer-Assessment

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Vocabulary Posttest peer-assessment	40	35.8250	4.86688	.76952
Control	40	32.6250	2.83465	.44820

The results of the independent  $t$ -test ( $t(62.729) = 3.593$ ,  $p = .001$ ) indicate that there was a significant difference between those who received peer-assessment as their treatment and those who didn't. In other words, it was shown that peer-assessment has significant effect on EFL learners' vocabulary development; thus the fifth null hypothesis was **rejected**.

Table 12: Independent Samples Test, Posttest of Vocabulary by Peer-Assessment

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
										95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Vocabulary Posttest	Equal variances assumed	9.966	.002	3.593	78	.001	3.20000	.89053	1.42709	4.97291
	Equal variances not assumed			3.593	62.729	.001	3.20000	.89053	1.42027	4.97973

For analyzing the sixth, seventh and eighth research questions, a one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA) was run to compare the effect of peer-assessment on EFL learners' means on the posttest of vocabulary. Before discussing the results it should be mentioned that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated (Levene's  $F(3, 76) = 4.928$ ,  $p = .004$ ) as reported in Table 13.

Table 13: Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances by Peer-Assessment

Peer-Assessment			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
4.928	3	76	.004

As the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated, robust tests of equality of means, namely Welch and Brown-Forsythe tests were run to determine if there is any significant difference between the vocabulary knowledge of experimental and control groups .

Table 14: Robust Tests of Equality of Means by Peer-Assessment

	Statistic <sup>a</sup>	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	5.077	3	41.331	.004
Brown-Forsythe	6.679	3	55.422	.001

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

As it is displayed in Table 14, some differences were identifiable between the mean scores of the participants (Welch's  $F(3,41.331) = 5.077$ ,  $p=.004$ ). In order to see where the differences lies, a Dunnett T3 post hoc was run.

Table 15: Multiple Comparisons; the Effect of Peer-Assessment

Dunnett T3

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
introvert experimental	extrovert experimental	-2.95000	1.48390	.278	-7.0858	1.1858
	introvert control	1.25000	1.05425	.798	-1.6753	4.1753
	extrovert control	2.20000	1.02995	.209	-.6623	5.0623
extrovert experimental	introvert experimental	2.95000	1.48390	.278	-1.1858	7.0858
	introvert control	4.20000*	1.39359	.031	.2814	8.1186
	extrovert control	5.15000*	1.37530	.005	1.2732	9.0268
introvert control	introvert experimental	-1.25000	1.05425	.798	-4.1753	1.6753
	extrovert experimental	-4.20000*	1.39359	.031	-8.1186	-.2814
	extrovert control	.95000	.89494	.866	-1.5268	3.4268
extrovert control	introvert experimental	-2.20000	1.02995	.209	-5.0623	.6623
	extrovert experimental	-5.15000*	1.37530	.005	-9.0268	-1.2732
	introvert control	-.95000	.89494	.866	-3.4268	1.5268

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Based on the results displayed in Table 15, it can be concluded that peer-assessment had no significant effect on introvert learners' vocabulary development ( $p = .798$ ); and a significant positive effect on extrovert learners vocabulary development ( $p = .005$ ). Thus, the sixth null hypothesis **supported** and the seventh null hypothesis was **rejected**. It can also be concluded that there was no significant difference between the performance of extrovert and introvert learners,

who received peer-assessment, on vocabulary development posttest ( $p = .278$ ), indicating that the eighth null hypothesis **was supported**.

For analyzing the ninth research question, an independent  $t$ -test was run to probe any significant difference between the effect of self-assessment and peer-assessment on EFL learners' vocabulary development. Based on the results displayed in Table 16, it can be claimed that the self-assessment group ( $M = 37.15$ ,  $SD = 5.428$ ) had a slightly higher mean on the posttest of vocabulary than the peer-assessment ( $M = 35.825$ ,  $SD = 4.867$ ).

Table 16: Descriptive Statistics; Posttest of Vocabulary by Types of Assessment

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Vocabulary Posttest self-assessment	40	37.1500	5.42808	.85826
peer-assessment	40	35.8250	4.86688	.76952

The results of the independent  $t$ -test ( $t(78) = 1.149$ ,  $p = .254$ ) indicates that there was no significant difference between the effect of self-assessment and peer-assessment on subjects' performance on the posttest of vocabulary. Thus, the ninth null-hypothesis **was supported**.

Table 17: Independent Samples Test, Posttest of Vocabulary by Types of Assessment

			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
Vocabulary Posttest	Equal variances assumed		1.532	.220	1.149	78	.254	1.32500	1.15272	-.96989 3.6198
	Equal variances not assumed				1.149	77.089	.254	1.32500	1.15272	-.97032 3.6203

It should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met (Levene's  $F = 1.532$ ,  $p = .22$ ).

## CONCLUSION

The result of the present study which concluded that self-assessment had significant effect on EFL learners' vocabulary development, is also consistent with the findings of Abbasszadeh (2012) who found that self-assessment significantly improves speaking and writing performance. Moreover, the findings of this study which proved that self-assessment had significant effect on EFL learners' vocabulary development, is in agreement with the results reported by Baniabdelrahman (2010) in which he concluded that student self-assessment had positive effect on students' reading comprehension and he concluded that the self-assessment method was more effective than the traditional method of assessment in improving students' reading

comprehension and it had positive effects on their performance. In addition, this result is in line with the findings of Shahrakipour (2014) who found that self-assessment had a significant effect on EFL learners' reading. Furthermore, the results of study are in line with the finding of the study of Birjandi, and Siyyari (2010) who came to conclusion in their study that it is the equal positive effect of self-assessment and peer-assessment on improving the rating accuracy of the participants on writing performance and rating accuracy. Moreover, the results of study are in line Sadeghi and Khanahmadi (2011) assessed the effect of dynamic assessment on the development of Iranian EFL learners' grammar and the results of their study proved that dynamic assessment-oriented instruction significantly improved the learning of L2 grammar.

The findings of the present study can also have implications for theorist, teachers, learners, and syllabus designers. According to the findings of this study, using peer assessment is as effective as using self-assessment on vocabulary learning, which simply means teachers should try to make use of both these kinds of assessments so as to help the learners improve their ability to learn vocabulary as well as learning English. One of the fundamental elements of language learning is the opportunity given to learners to assess their own progress and thus help them to focus their own learning (Harris, 1997). It is widely accepted that self-assessment is a key learning strategy for autonomous language learning, enabling students to monitor their progress and relate learning to individual needs (Harris, 1997). The procedure of self-assessment involves students in judging their own learning achievements and process, which would help students actively, assess their own learning performance. Students should receive explanations about the benefits of using peer assessment and self-assessment to be encouraged to become good learners. This can be done and supported by referring to the results of research. Giving more explanations to the learners would make them have a better understanding of the procedures involved in these kinds of assessment. In addition, curriculum developers, by designing and including peer and self-assessment in English textbooks, can accelerate the process of language learning in vocabulary learning. Similarly, in English textbooks, materials developers can include some sections on how peer assessment operates and what its benefits are. In addition, the implication of the findings of this study for teacher educators and teacher trainers is to familiarize teachers with the issue of personality types of the learners and the fact that different personality types have different needs and thus different instructions.

### ***Limitations of the Study***

Since the participants of the study are female, the finding of this study may not be generalizable to male learners. Moreover, not every student could catch up with the tone of the class, even their unbalanced level of insight is also a contributing factor to deteriorate the performance of mediation learning of vocabulary. The other limitation contributed to this procedure is the level of learners where the researcher was bound to work just with the intermediates and it deprives the researcher from having the test generalized.

## REFERENCES

- Abbasszadeh, S. (2012). *The impact of self- assessment on Iranian EFL learners' writing and speaking*. Unpublished Master thesis. Yasouj University, Yasouj, Iran.
- Baniabdelrahman, A. (2010). The Effect of the Use of Self-Assessment on EFL Students' Performance in Reading Comprehension in English. *TESL, The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 14(2), 5-31.
- Birjandi, P., & Siyyari, M. (2010). Self-assessment and Peer-assessment: A Comparative Study of Their Effect on Writing Performance and Rating Accuracy. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 23 - 45.
- Boers, F., & Lindstromberg, S. (2008). *How cognitive linguistics can foster effective vocabulary teaching*. In F. Boers & S. Lindstromberg (Eds.), *Applications of cognitive linguistics: Congitive Linguistic Approaches to Teaching Vocabulary and Phraseology*, 1-61. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Eysenck, H.J., & Eysenck, M.W. (1985). *Personality and Individual Differences: A Natural Science Approach*.
- Falchikov, N. (2001) *Learning together. Peer tutoring in higher education*. London, UK: Routledge
- Farhady, H. (2006). *Twenty-five years of living with applied linguistics*. Collections of articles. Iran: Rahnama Press
- Goby, V.P. (2006.) Personality and Online/Offline Choices: MBTI Profiles and Favored Communication Modes in a Singapore Study. *Cyber Psychology & Behavior*, 9(1), 5-13.
- Guterman, E. (2002). Toward dynamic assessment of reading: Applying metacognitive awareness guidance to reading assessment tasks. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 25(3), 283-298.
- Harris, M. (1997). Self-assessment of language learning in formal settings. *ELT journal*, 51(1), 12-20.
- Hatch, E., & Brown, C. (1995). *Vocabulary, semantics and language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haywood, H. C. (1992). Interactive assessment: a special issue. *Journal of Special Education*, 26 (2), 233-234.
- Haywood, H.C., & Tzuriel, D. (2002). Applications and challenges in dynamic assessment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 4(2).
- Hill, K., & Sabet, M. (2009). Dynamic speaking assessments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 5(2), 537-545.
- Huba, Mary E., & Freed, J. E. (2000). *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kovacic, A., Bubas, G. & Coric, A. (2012). Mobilizing students' grammar skills through collaborative activities with web 2.0 tools. *Procedia SBS*, 34(3), 132–136.
- Macintyre, P. D., & Charos, C. (1996). Personality, attitudes, and affect as predictors of second language communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 15(3), 3-26.
- Manser, M. (1995). *Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary New Edition*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- McCrostie, J. (2007). Examining learner vocabulary notebooks. *ELT Journal*, 61(3), 246-255.



- Sadeghi, K., & Khanahmadi, F. (2011). Dynamic assessment of 12 grammar of Iranian EFL learners: The role of mediated learning experience. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(2), 931-936.
- Saeidi, M., & Hosseinpour, A. (2013). The effect of dynamic assessment as an instructional tool on Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary learning. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 3(10), 421-429.
- Seyed Erfani, SH., & Agha Ebrahimiyan, A. (2013). Web 2.0 Incorporated Dynamic Assessment to Assess Writing Ability of Iranian EFL Learners. *Global Journal of human social science Linguistics & Education*. 13(1),
- Shahrakipour, H. (2014). On The Impact of Self-assessment on EFL Learners' Receptive Skills Performance. *AJTLHE*, 6(1), 1-13.
- Weibel, D., Wissmath, B., & Groner, R. (2010). Motives for Creating a Private Website and Personality of Personal Homepage Owners in Terms of Extraversion and Heuristic Orientation. *Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 4(1).
- Wilson, K., Fornasier, S., & White, K.M. (2010). *Cyber psychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 13(2), 173-177.