

A Case Study of a Competency Based Teacher Training Course

Elaheh Tavakoli¹

Received: 01/08/2022

Accepted: 11/03/2023

Abstract

The present case study reports on an innovative teacher training course with 14 Iranian senior undergraduate student teachers majoring in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). The course was developed after a Competency Based Teacher Education theory (CBTE) to assess student teachers' practicums via three sources (i.e. self, peer-group and teacher educator) and based on the Teacher Observation Instrument (TOI). The aim was primarily to see if there was congruence among the three sources in assessing student teachers' performance and secondly to know what the attitude of the course participants was towards the course and three modes of assessment. Pearson Correlation showed peer group assessment relatively congruent with both teacher educator assessment and self-assessment. The results from semi-structured interviews with student teachers showed that they favored peer group and teacher educator assessment more than self-assessment and that the course made them teach more reflectively.

Keywords: competency, peer group assessment, self-assessment, teacher educator's assessment

¹ Department of Language and Literature, Volda University College, Norway;
elaheh.tavakoli@hivolda.no

Introduction

Although teaching practicum is congruently viewed as a core element in teacher preparation courses, the issue of its assessment has always been a challenge. Teaching practicum is a multidimensional activity involving student teachers, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, administrators, and students (Gan, 2014). It plays a major role in bridging theory and practice and more importantly offers the context for student teachers to develop their personal teaching competence (Smith & Lev-Ari, 2005).

Measuring the performance of student teachers is a major concern in teacher training courses. Assessment may negatively influence their performance and make them anxious about the way they are assessed, which results in a poor teaching performance and negative evaluation by the teacher educator (Canh, 2014).

Although assessing teachers' practicums has always been a complicated process, using different sources of assessment based on explicit criteria can result in a more reliable judgment (Dochy et.al., 1999). Application of multiple sources for assessment can therefore contribute to a fairer evaluation which is what Somervell (1993, p.227) defines as "a more democratic approach"; the approach is also claimed to help the achievement of learning autonomy since self- and peer-assessment can be considered as complementary learning tools to teacher assessment (Dochy et al., 1999; Gale et al., 2002; Hanrahan & Isaacs, 2001; Segers & Dochy, 2001).

Given the need for more democratic teacher training courses, the researcher was intrigued to answer the question if employing different sources can lead to a more congruent assessment result. To respond to this question and know if an assessment-oriented teacher training course with a criterion-based practicum observation instrument can lead to congruent assessment results and consequently a more reliable evaluation, the researcher in the current case study took advantage of a course based on CBTE and three sources of assessment, self-, peer- and teacher educator assessment.

Review of the Literature

The literature on the congruence of assessment from several sources such as self, peer and teacher assessment has been well documented. Nonetheless, most of the research has centered on assessment of students particularly their productive

language skills, writing essays and oral presentations (e.g., Cheng & Warren, 2005; Langan, et al., 2008; Matsuno, 2009; Patri, 2002; Saito & Fujita, 2004).

Student teachers' performance, on the other hand, is an ill-defined area (Deering, 2011). Very few studies, to the best of the author's knowledge, have paid attention to assessing student teachers using various sources and criterion-based frameworks. Almutairi and Shraid's (2021) research, for instance, dealt with assessing high school teachers' performance through four sources: heads of the department, self, peer and student. Their study showed a significant difference between the internal sources considering instruction, assessment, management, student, interaction, and cooperation. For instance, students assessed their teachers' instruction higher than the teachers themselves and peer-teachers judged their colleagues harshly. Peer evaluation was found to be more accurate than teachers' self and head of department evaluation. Teachers' self-evaluation was more accurate than the head of department evaluation. In another study, Al-Mutawa and Al-Dabbous (1997) observed 36 competencies in five categories of components such as personal qualities, linguistic knowledge, inter-personal relations, planning, and implementation to assess 34 Kuwaitian student teachers. The assessment of teachers' practicum resulted in a significant correlation between all categories of competence.

The issue of student teachers' view and their satisfaction about being assessed was the focus in Merç's (2015) research. His qualitative results revealed that student teachers saw planning-preparation, general organization, and university supervisors as the best performance measures and peer teachers, writing observation and reflection reports, and evaluation by cooperating teachers as less effective. His quantitative findings showed a significant difference among the criterion measures for assessing teaching practicum. Assessment by the cooperating teachers was found as the weakest measure both on his survey items and during the interviews. The survey items in Merç's research failed to cover teaching competences and mainly targeted the sources for collecting information: reports from cooperating teachers and peer teachers, university supervisors and the organization. His results were not consequently easily transferable to other contexts as the evaluation of student teachers' practices were not based on the teaching competences in general.

Kiliç (2016) is one of the rare researchers who used various sources and

criterion-based assessment forms to know the level of agreement among teacher, self and peer. While there were no significant differences between teacher- and self-assessment ratings, peer assessment was found to be significantly higher than the other two modes. The researcher justified higher peer-ratings through the common summative assessment approach within the context of study. Contrary to Kiliç's (2016) case study which was on 15 teachers, Oren (2018) investigated the correlation between the three sources of assessment on 203 pre-service science teachers using a similar assessment-form with twenty-five teaching abilities. Self and peer assessment in her research showed a moderately high correlation and significantly higher than the teacher scores.

Overall, studies on the congruence of self, peer and teacher assessment are relatively few (Oren, 2018) and the existing studies have resulted in controversial findings. While there is consensus on promoted reliability and validity of assessment when various forms are utilized, there are very controversial findings in the literature about their congruence and attitudes towards them. While Teacher assessment correlates with self-assessment (e.g., Kiliç, 2016), it correlated higher with peer-assessment in some other studies (e.g., Oren, 2018). In general, the literature on teacher and self-assessment has shown more controversial results than on teacher and peer-assessment. Several reports, e.g., Patri (2002), Ross (2006) and Saito and Fujita (2004), have shown a low correlation while some other studies (e.g., Oldfield & Macalpine, 1995) revealed a significant relationship between teacher and self-assessment. Ross's (2006) review article indicated the students' highly consistent rating in self-evaluations, but much less reliable with other measures and sources (e.g., test scores, teacher ratings or peer ratings). These controversial results highlight the need for further research. This study, hence, aims at the congruity among three assessment modes in a CBTE course using an instrument designed based of the pre-defined competencies and teaching criterion.

Competency Based Teacher Education

Many teacher education programs have defining characteristics which lean toward one of several theories: behaviorist or competency-based, outcome-based, humanistic, and developmental theories. The heydays of the Competency Based Teacher Education (CBTE) programs were in the 60s and 70s. CBTE has its roots in

behavioral philosophy but persisted into the twenty-first century (Ducharme, Ducharme & Dunkin, 2017). While many of the Outcome-Based teacher education programs focus on learners and the program outcomes, the traditional teacher training programs aim at assessment based on entry requirements, hours of classwork and homework and written examinations. CBTE takes instructional processes into account and focuses on public observable performance. It heavily relies on assessment of performance against a clear set of criteria (Houston & Brown, 1975).

The literature uses the terms competency and performance indiscriminately (Gillie, 1974). Teaching activities comprise many individual competencies varying from very general activities like writing or verbalizing a philosophy of vocational education to more specific activities, such as demonstrating a manipulative skill (Field, 1979). Learning is strongly influenced by assessment; therefore, CBTE can be more successful when the assessment program is also based on competency (Birenbaum, 2003). The main goal of competency-based assessment is to assess students' ability to perform professional tasks according to specific criteria (Gulikers, et.al., 2010). Before the students tackle learning tasks, they should therefore be provided with clear assessment criteria which are often formulated as competencies and seek what the students are able to do (Crossley & Jolly, 2012). Lurie (2012) advised the language of these competencies to be prescriptive (e.g., "to be able to communicate properly") rather than descriptive since it integrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Hence, the present teacher training course was designed based on CBTE with multiple modes of assessment based on a set of pre-established prescriptive criteria. The researchers aimed to know if the course could reveal congruence amongst the assessors and consequently more effective teaching and learning how to teach.

Despite the existing models and the plethora of research on alternative forms of assessment of the students-teachers' practicum, not many researchers have paid attention to both the integration of several sources and implementing them into a CBTE. The current study, however, aimed to employ three modes of assessment, i.e., teacher, peer and self in a criteria-based assessment teacher training program. In other words, student- teachers were engaged in a program in which their practicums were assessed by teacher educator, peers and themselves based on a Teacher

Observation Instrument (TOI) comprising 41 competencies. The course instructor asked them to observe their peer's instruction, reflect on it, give interactive oral feedback and learn how to teach more efficiently through using alternative modes of assessments. Effective teaching competencies in the TOI for the current study were elicited from Harmer (2007). This paper also used the term peer-group assessment interchangeably with peer-assessment since the mean of all peers for every practicum was computed for more convenient analysis. The following research questions were consequently raised.

1. How do peer-group, self and teacher educator's assessment of student teachers' practicums relate to each other?
2. What is the attitude of student teachers towards peer-group, self and teacher educator's assessment in a competency-based teacher training course?

Method

Participants

The present case study recruited 14 English as Foreign Language (EFL) senior undergraduate student teachers (5 males and 9 females). For brevity, student teachers will be referred to by the acronyms ST1, ST2... ST14. They were selected based on convenience sampling and from an English Language Teaching Department at a state university in Iran. With no prior teaching experience, they had willingly enrolled in the teacher training course and consented to participate in this research which indicated their strong motivation. They participated in both quantitative data collection (questionnaires) and qualitative (semi-structured interviews) phases.

The researcher was designated by the university to be the course instructor. Aged 38, with 15 years of experience as EFL teacher and 5 years as teacher trainer, she led the course through both teacher training and the research process. Ethical issues were handled through the debriefing session which was held before the course. The participants were informed that pseudonyms were used to protect their privacy; the course was not a mandatory course in the students' curriculum, and they were free to resign from the course, the research or even both. The participants were initially 16 but two of them resigned from the research halfway through the study and their data were not employed. The participants were also assured that their data

would be strictly kept confidential and restricted to the study.

Procedure

The present case study encompassed five phases: teacher training, planning and preparation, practicum, multiple-assessment, and course evaluation. These phases are also illustrated in Appendix I.

The first phase of the study was educating student teachers in an overall 360 minutes (4 sessions of the course) with a focus on the main competencies for a successful teaching of language skills based on Harmer (2007) (See main themes in Appendix I). The educator posed *What*, *Why* and *How else* questions to elicit the responses from the participants and came up with a list of criteria for more effective teaching; for instance, “don’t teach too fast or too slow.”, “have clear instruction.”. In addition to teaching the main competences, in this phase, the researcher developed a list of dos and don’ts for effective teaching.

In the second phase, the participants were given a twenty-day preparation gap in which they were demanded to select, plan and practice a lesson to teach. The selection of the content to teach was opted by the participants but was checked and supervised by the teacher educator. They had access to the DVD of the actual class demonstrations (Harmer, 2007) and were required to watch them as models of good teaching practices prior to their own practice. In this phase, the researcher/course educator developed the TOI based on the list of criteria/competencies that had been taught in the first phase.

The third phase of this research gave an opportunity to each student-teacher to teach one or more activities (reading, writing, listening, speaking, discussion, conversation, vocabulary, pronunciation) from the international English books. They had access to the supplementary teachers’ guidebooks.

In the assessment stage (fourth phase), which occurred immediately after each practicum, student teacher, peers and the teacher educator simultaneously assessed the practicum via TOI. Self, peers and teacher educator assessment was conducted after every teaching from the fifth to thirteenth session of the course. None of the ratings (self, peer, or teacher) could influence the other modes since no one was aware of the feedback from other sources. This multiple-assessment phase was followed by ten-minute feedback exchanged orally on each practicum. The

teacher educator and student teachers shared their thoughts when the TOI ratings were collected.

If no feedback was voluntarily produced by the peer-group in the assessment phase, the teacher educator asked *what, why* and *how else* questions on the criterion in the TOI, for instance “*What do you think about her/ his pace of teaching? Why do you think she asked the question.....?*”, “*How else could she teach the vocabularies?*” To respond to the first research question, the ratings from the three sources were compared and correlated.

For responding to the second research question, all TOIs were assigned to each participant at the end of each session so that the student-teacher could compare the ratings from all sources and reflect on their teaching by comparing different modes of assessment. In the last phase of research (Evaluation in Appendix I), semi-structured interview and attitude questionnaire were used to collect data and discover the attitude of student teachers towards a CBTE course with multiple modes of assessment. All the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed for further analysis.

Instruments

Teacher Observation Instrument (TOI). TOI was developed by the researcher with 41 statements targeting different criteria/competencies such as appropriate teaching pace, classroom management, asking questions, assigning enough wait time, creating fun, implementing audio-visual sources, using body gesture, teachers’ movement, using eye contact and repetition. Appendix II shows the instrument with 41 statements which targeted 41 competencies. In this article, the words criteria and competencies are used interchangeably. The student teachers were required to read each statement with 5 possible ratings, strongly agree, agree, no idea, disagree and strongly disagree, and indicate their opinion about each. They assigned the highest rate of 5 by selecting strongly agree and the lowest by choosing *strongly disagree*.

The competencies for language teaching were adapted by the researcher from Harmer (2007). Since the book had been taught in the teacher training phase of this research, the researcher could ensure that the participants were familiar with the technical terms in TOI. The items were written in English since English was the

medium of instruction and interactions along the course and the student teachers had mastery on it. TOI only concentrated on student teachers' teaching practice inside class. Their outside- class competencies such as material development, teacher's relationships with the school, family and society were not taken into the researcher's account due to practicality issues and time limitation.

The instrument was checked for its validity through expert judgment and its reliability through Cronbach's alpha. Prior to its implementation, TOI items were piloted by two more experienced teacher trainers as the field experts and were modified by the researcher. Also, in line with Howell (2002), the researcher in this study estimated reliability of the TOI through Cronbach's alpha for inter-rater reliability of all the 15 measures (student teachers' and teacher educator's assessments of practicums). Cronbach alpha revealed the value of .87, which suggested a high inter-rater consistency for TOI.

Attitude Questionnaire. This study employed a researcher-developed attitude questionnaire with four-point rating scales for sixteen statements to explore the student teachers' attitudes toward the course in general and peer, self and teacher assessment in particular. The items targeted helpfulness of each assessment mode, learning opportunity each mode could provide, attitude to reliability and congruence of each mode as well as oral comments and interactive feedback. The questionnaire was validated by two expert judges in the field and improved in wording and content. It gained a relatively high reliability estimated by Cronbach's alpha ($r=.74$).

To the best of the researcher's knowledge, the literature did not document any questionnaires on student teachers' attitudes towards a teacher training course which incorporated all modes of assessment employed in this study; hence, the researcher had to develop an instrument for the purpose of this research. The development of this questionnaire, however, was informed by McMillan (2001), and Sadeghi and Abolfazli Khoni (2015).

Interview Questions. To answer the second research question more qualitatively and triangulate the data collected through attitude questionnaire, a semi-structured interview (Appendix III) was also conducted. It consisted of nine open questions to elicit the student teachers' opinions about the use of multiple assessors and the CBTE course. More specifically, questions 1, 2 and 3 were asked to collect data on the congruence of different modes of assessment in the course and

questions 4, 5, 6 and 7 to elicit the student teachers' attitude towards the CBTE course and its features. The whole interview was held in English and in the last two sessions of the course.

Data Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative data analyses were used to answer each research question. For the first research question, correlation analysis was conducted on the data obtained from TOI completed by student teachers, their peers and the teacher educator. For the second research question and to know the attitude of the course participants towards using multiple assessors and competency-based assessment, the researcher benefitted from frequency analysis of the data gained through administering attitude questionnaire. To respond to both research questions qualitatively and triangulate the data collected through TOI and attitude questionnaires, the content of the transcribed semi-structured interviews was analyzed based on Corbin and Strauss's (2008) theoretical comparative method. In other words, the data were collected through theoretical sampling or pre-established concepts (i.e., congruence, fairness, and attitude in this study, See Appendix II). Each incident of the concepts in the transcribed data was compared with other incidents to find similarities and differences.

Results

To address the first research question and to find the congruence between every two assessment modes and in order to do correlation analysis on the collected data from the TOI, the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), 19th version was utilized. Prior to that, however, descriptive statistics, such as mean and standard deviations were calculated for the assessment scores from the three sources. Table 1 shows the mean of the assessment scores based on TOI from each of the three sources. Teacher educator had the lowest assessment score for practicums while student teachers had the highest mean score when they assessed their own performance.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for self-, peer group- and teacher assessment

Assessor	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Teacher educator	143.4	24.94	14
Self-assessment	168.3	20.92	14
Mean of all peer-groups	165.9	12.89	14
Mean of all modes	159.2	14.94	14

The teacher educator’s mean score to all the student teachers’ practicums was 143.4. Student teachers’ mean score on peer-assessment and self-assessment were closer to each other (165.9 and 168.3 respectively) but higher than the assessment from the teacher educator.

Besides descriptive statistics, to fulfill the requirements of performing parametric correlations and respond to the first research question, Multiple Scatterplot (Appendix IV) was run for checking assumptions of linearity and normality. It showed that the linearity assumption was met for teacher educator and peer-group as well as peer-group and self-assessment correlations. The effect size, for both correlations, was large with a fairly wide CI ($R^2=.33$, CI=95%). The third relationship between self and teacher educator assessment, however, was not fairly linear and the associated effect size was found to be small too ($R^2=.009$, CI=95%). Consequently, to respond to the first research question, Bivariate Pearson Product correlation was run for the first two comparisons while for the third comparison (self and teacher educator), nonparametric Spearman Correlation was employed. Table 2 represents the results of the three correlations.

Table 2

Correlations between peer-group, self and teacher educator assessment

		Teacher educator	Peers’ mean	self
Teacher educator	Pearson Correlation	1	.57*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.03	
	N	14	14	
Peers’ mean	Pearson Correlation		1	.57*
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.03
	N		14	14
Self	Spearman's rho	-.037		1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.899		
	N	14		14

As is shown in the above table, peer-group shows a moderately significant correlation with teacher educator's assessment and with self-assessment (for both comparisons $r = .57$, $n = 14$, $P < .05$). There is no positive correlation, however, between self-assessment and teacher educator's ($r = -.037$, $n = 14$, $P < .05$), measured through Spearman's rho correlation coefficient due to the violation of normality assumption. Semi-structured interview revealed similar results on the congruence of teacher educator and peer-assessment but different results on self-assessment and teacher educator's. Except for ST11, all student teachers believed that assessment by their peers based on the checklist of competencies through TOI was similar to the teacher educator's assessment. Despite peer and teacher educator's congruence, the participants' opinions in the interview did not confirm the non-significant correlation between self and teacher assessment. Except for three (ST7, ST9 and ST13), all the student teachers believed that their self-assessment was similar to the teacher educator's. ST7 explained in the end of the course interview why his assessment did not match with the teacher educator's and why he had overrated himself, "Having regarded grammar as one of the most demanding components of language to teach, I overrated my teaching practice. I thought I deserved a high rating since I had selected a tough language skill to teach."

To find the answer to the second research question, the percentages of student teachers' responses to the four scales of the attitude questionnaire were calculated. Table 3 illustrates these results in the following.

Table 3

Percentage of student teachers' attitudes toward peer-group, self- and teacher assessment

Items	Very much Or Much %	very little or Not at all %
Attitude to peer-assessment		
1. My peers' assessment helped me to analyze and review my teaching.	100	
11. I liked it when I knew based on what criterion my peers assessed me.	92.1	
Attitude to assessing peers		
5. I liked it when I could assess my friend's teaching practice.	100	

6. By assessing my peers' practicums, I learned teaching skills better.	100
14. I liked it when I could express my opinion about my friends' teaching orally.	100
15. I liked it when I could express my opinion about my friends' teaching on paper.	71.4

Attitude to Self-assessment

3. I learned when I assessed my own teaching.	71.4
4. I liked assessing my own teaching practice and scoring myself.	64.3

Attitude to teacher educator's assessment

2. The teacher's assessment of my practicum and my peers' helped me.	92.9
--	------

Attitude to reliability of each mode

7. My peer student teachers' assessment of my practicum was reliable.	92.9
8. As an assessor, I was reliable when I assessed my peers' teaching practice.	100
9. The teacher educator assessment was reliable.	100

Attitude to multi-modal assessment congruence

10. I found the teacher's comments and assessment on my practicum similar to my friends'.	78.6
12. The teacher's comments and assessment about my teaching were similar to mine.	92.9
13. I liked it when I could see and compare my teacher' assessment with my friends' assessment.	78.6

16. Overall, I like the course.	100
---------------------------------	-----

As Table three reveals, the majority of the participants liked all the assessment modes in the course except for its self-assessment. In general, all of the student teachers liked the course very much or much (item 16). Six more items (1, 5,

6, 14, 8 and 9) showed a consensus of 100% of the participants. More specifically, all the participants in the course were interested in how peers assessed their practicums (item 1). They all liked to critically assess their peers through oral feedback and believed that they had learned better (items 5, 6 and 14). Only two participants didn't like filling in the TOI after every practicum and reported in the interview that they found the process trite and boring; however, they enjoyed assessing their peers through giving oral feedback and sharing it with the course instructor (item 14).

In contrast to peer and teacher educator's assessment, items on self-assessment showed participants' negative attitude; the majority of participants had learned very little from their self-assessment and liked assessing and scoring their own performance very little (71.4% and 64.3% respectively for items 3 and 4). Despite the participants' negative attitude to this mode, most student teachers found multiple modes of assessment congruent (items 10, 12, and 13); only one participant didn't find his self-assessment similar to the teacher educator's assessment (item 12).

The results on these items in the questionnaire were also supported qualitatively in semi-structured interview. Thirteen student teachers reported in the interview that peer assessment on their practicum was fair, although they did not accept it to have the lion's share in their final rating. They believed that they required more training on peer-assessment prior to the course and that it could not be impartial due to student teachers' subjective assessment. In a similar vein, two student teachers explained that they tended to avoid the lowest scale of TOI because they did not want to hurt their peers' feelings.

When the interviewer asked the participants about their attitude towards competency-based assessment and being assessed based on TOI, they expressed their interest because competencies made the goal clearer from scratch and could provide them with more convenient quantitative measurement scales, which they assumed resulted in fairer assessment of their peers' practicums. Nevertheless, the course attendees thought if they had delivered more teaching practices and had been assessed more than once; they would have improved their subsequent performances through their prior teaching experiences.

Seven of the participants thought some of the criterion in the TOI could not

be implemented in assessing their practicum. ST7, for instance, admitted that he didn't need to use whiteboard for teaching grammar as frequently as his peers who had taught reading skills or idioms. To be assessed more fairly, he believed he should have taught more than once during the course or should have been assessed through a different set of criterion or different observation scales.

In response to the fifth question of the interview (Appendix III), i.e., what they liked about the course, the student teachers referred to several features such as peers' and teacher educator's oral feedback, hands on learning in the course, assessment orientation based on a clear set of criteria, everyone's engagement in assessment and great learning opportunities every practicum provided. ST6, for example, told the researcher, *"I liked it when you asked our views on what the teacher (i.e., student-teacher) had or hadn't done and what he/she should or shouldn't have done."*

The participants in this case study did not show similar attitudes about implementing self-assessment in overall rating of their practicum. In response to question 7 (Appendix II), 12 of the participants did not view self-assessment to be fair or accurate due to being subjective. ST9 admitted, *"I am crazy about reading and enjoyed teaching it especially my selected text. With that passion, I overrated myself."* ST13 confirmed it saying, *"I assessed myself believing that as for the first experience, I had done a great job. My self-assessment was pretty higher since my peers didn't think of my teaching that way."*

Discussion

This case study was conducted based on a well-organized assessment-oriented teacher training course with the aim to improve student teachers' reflective learning through various assessment modes and feedback based on a set of clear pre-defined competences. It reported the assessment conducted by three sources and based on a criterion observation instrument.

The results were in line with many other studies (e.g., Longhurst & Norton, 1997; De Grez et al., 2012; Sedumedi & Mundalado, 2012; Kiliç, 2016; Oren, 2018), and could show a statistically significant correlation between teacher educator and peer-assessment. However, this study showed no relationship between self and teacher educator's assessment, a finding which could probably be due to

participants' lack of assessment experiences in general and self- assessment in particular.

Contrary to similarities in procedure and the congruence of various modes, this study was different from Kiliç (2016) in the assessment mode with the highest rating. Peer-assessment in Kiliç's study and self-assessment in this study were the highest ratings and in both different from the teacher's rating. This could probably be attributed to a distinct set of criteria utilized in assessing teachers' performance in the two studies. Competencies required for effective teaching such as comprehensible expression; effective application; being planned and controlled; management of time; using body language, gesture and facial expression efficiently were only a few of the items or competencies in TOI but all the criteria which Kiliç utilized. Unlike the student teachers in this research, the participants of his study had both theoretical and practical experience on self- and peer-assessment procedures. The finding that the self-assessment scores were higher than peer assessment contrasted with the results reported by other researchers in the literature (Magin & Helmore, 2001; Rudy et.al., 2001).

Langan et.al. (2008) attributed incongruent assessments to gender effect with females underscoring their performance. Brown and Harris (2013) associated it to age with younger participants' self-assessment being more optimistic, lenient or generous and less congruent with teacher's ratings than older participants'. Segers and Dochy (2001) justified overestimations in self-assessment of one's performance by the difficulty of critical analysis of one's own performance compared to assessing peer's performance. Borgmeier et al. (2016) related the cause of inconsistencies in teachers' self-assessed use of evidence-based classroom practices to the school levels (primary, intermediate, secondary).

In addition to the aforementioned justifications for incongruent teacher and self-assessment, Orsmond et al. (1996) attributed it to criterion for rating performances which was understood differently amongst students and teachers. Accuracy of self-assessment can be fostered through clear rubrics and criterion (Andrade, 2010; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007); however, there are still teachers who are reluctant to implement self-assessment, even in higher education (Tan, 2012). This reluctance was what the researcher in the current study could similarly observe when the course attendees were asked to assess their own teaching performance.

Inconsistencies of self-assessment and their incongruence with the teacher assessment were furthermore justified in Dochy et al's (1999) review article through more factors such as the time effect, methods for self-assessment and the content of the self-assessment. The participants in this study revealed some more contributing factors such as their different perspectives about the nature of language activity and the difficulty of its instruction, their insufficient teaching and assessment experience in comparison with the teacher educator. What they seemed to be unaware of was the opportunity that self-assessment provided them to reflect on their own learning, as Sadeghi and Abolfazli Khonbi (2015) and Kearney (2013) referred to. Through reflection and self-assessment, the students can promote autonomous learning as a valuable aspect of sustainable learning.

Regarding the result related to the participants' attitudes, while all the student teachers enjoyed the course and learned from assessment sources, particularly peers- and teacher educator's, they liked formative function of assessment more than evaluative function. They had particularly learned from peer-assessment and oral feedback in the course but did not like to be rated by their peers. This could probably be due to the participants' distrust in their peers as an impartial and experienced source of assessment.

The participants' traditional view that assessment should be the sole responsibility of the teacher educator is in line with the participants' views in Ballantyne et al. (2002) and Davies (2000). Despite this attitude, all of the student teachers in this course perceived that the peer and teacher educator's assessment had many benefits in facilitating their learning of a more effective teaching. In particular, they agreed that their peer feedback based on the clear set of competencies on TOI could help them in learning how to teach because it involved them in reflection on their own and their peers' performance.

The course made teacher-students reflect more on the criteria in the observation instrument and the way they themselves or their peers taught different language skills. The teacher educator in this study, by asking interactive questions orally in the assessment phase, required student teachers reflect before and after they delivered their own or their peers' teaching and consequently came up with alternative ways if they found shortcomings in teaching practicums. The questions encompassed not only questions of "what the student-teacher did" but also "what

else he/she could do and why"; they were, consequently, based on all descriptive, dialogic/analytic, and critical reflection introduced by Schön, D. A. (1983, p. 68) as reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action based on contextualization of multiple viewpoints. In line with Cosh's (1999) reflective approach, peer observation is not only to judge the teaching of others, but to encourage self-reflection and self-awareness. The general consensus is that dialogic and critical reflection are more conducive to development than descriptive reflection alone (see, e.g., Collier, 1999; Davis, 2006; Jay & Johnson, 2002; Stanley, 1998; Ward & McCotter, 2004; Watts & Lawson, 2009).

The variety of assessment modes, particularly the interactive oral assessment, enabled the student teachers to spend time exploring why they acted as they did and provide alternatives through reflection on their own or their peers' action. The course could also be in line with Greiman and Covington (2007) and Yost et al. (2000) who called for multiple, diverse opportunities/modalities for reflection in teacher-educational courses, including verbal reflection, self-reflection, and written reflection. In the current teacher-education course, the participants had the chance to reflect on their own and their peers' practices and share their thoughts in plenum and individually on the assessment instrument. Seifert and Feliks' (2019) research similarly showed a strong contribution of peer-assessment and assessment rubrics (known here as criterion-based assessment) to teacher training programs.

Although oral interactive assessment and peer assessment based on TOI were both reported by all the participants' to be interesting and helpful, self-assessment mode was not favored by student teachers as much because, as novices, they didn't view themselves capable of self-monitoring and self-assessing. This negative attitude towards self-assessment in this study was in line with Wolffensperger and Patkin (2013) but in contrast with Seifert and Feliks (2019) and Longhurst and Norton (1997). The former researchers found self-assessment experience of students far from faultless while the latter researchers stated that self-assessment could clearly help their participants to improve their own learning, as it focused their' attention on the metacognitive aspects of their learning and effective self-monitoring. The reason could probably be in the skill under assessment which in the current research was not only language skills but also teaching skills.

Overall, teacher training assessment courses with explicit criteria for

effective teaching can, in line with Leshem and Bar-Hama (2008), be used as a guideline for trainees to identify their own and their peers' strengths and weaknesses. The integration of multiple modes of assessment with CBTE in this course helped the student teachers have a central role in their own assessment and develop their teaching competencies through reflection and sharing feedback.

Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research

Despite the valuable insights that the present case study can provide for teacher education programs, there are several limitations which open new pathways for further research. Firstly, the small sample size did not allow the researcher to generalize findings and apply them to the wider population of EFL teachers. It could not allow the researcher to apply factor analysis and quantitative validation measures on the instruments that were developed for this research. Further research can, therefore, be conducted in the future to fulfill this. Another limitation of the present study relates to its cross-sectional nature and the time constraints; it was only possible for the participants to carry out one microteaching activity. Giving student teachers more opportunities to engage in microteaching activities help them to develop their teaching and reflective skills. It can also provide teacher educators/researchers with more insight into the prospective teachers' teaching and reflective processes. An assessment of long-term professional development would also give a fairer and less biased evaluation.

More research can be conducted to implement the same features of the program in this study but to trace the changes in teaching behavior of every student-teacher over a longer period and probe their long-term professional development. Last but not least, further studies can include other qualitative tools such as think-aloud protocols and diaries which might help provide further insight into the student teachers' development.

Conclusion

This study was conducted to explore the congruence of three modes of assessment in a competency-based teacher training course. While peer-group and the teacher educator's assessment were more similar, student teachers' self-assessment was overrated. Although the course helped the student teachers reflect on their own

and their peers' teaching based on a pre-determined set of competencies and a Teacher Observation Instrument (TOI), they did not seem to be confident about their own assessment skills.

The student teachers' overall positive attitude towards an assessment-oriented teacher training course in which assessment is formatively used for the purpose of learning rather than simply evaluating can be implemented in teacher training programs not only for educating EFL teachers but also teachers in many other fields. The researcher encourages teacher educators to utilize peer-assessment along with their own assessment of the training practices since their combination can be valuable as a formative assessment method and hence as a part of the learning process.

References

- Almutairi, T. S., & Shraid, N. S. (2021). Teacher evaluation by different internal evaluators: Head of departments, teachers themselves, peers and students. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 10(2), 588-596.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1299262>
- Al-Mutawa, N., & Al-Dabbous, J. (1997). Evaluation of student teachers' performance in TEFL practicum at Kuwait University. *Journal of the Educational Research Center*, 6(11), 27-48. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED435195>
- Andrade, H. L. (2010). Students as the definitive source of formative assessment. In *Handbook of formative assessment*, 90-105.
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/hivolda-ebooks/detail.action?pq-origsite=primo&docID=455487>
- Ballantyne, R., Hughes, K., & Mylonas, A. (2002). Developing procedures for implementing peer assessment in large classes using an action research process, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(5), 427-441.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293022000009302>
- Birenbaum, M. (2003). New insights into learning and teaching and their implications for assessment. In M. Segers, F. Dochy, & E. Cascallar (Eds.), *Optimising new modes of assessment: In search of qualities and standards* (pp. 13–36). Kluwer Academic Publishers. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/0-306-48125-1#page=25>
- Borgmeier, C., Loman, S. L. & Hara, M. (2016). Teacher self-assessment of evidence-based classroom practices: preliminary findings across primary, intermediate and secondary level teachers, *Teacher Development*, 20 (1), 40-56.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2015.1105863>
- Brown, G. T., & Harris, L. R. (2013). Student self-assessment. In *The SAGE handbook of research on classroom assessment*, 367-393.
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/hivolda-ebooks/detail.action?pq-origsite=primo&docID=1207749>
- Canh, L. V. (2014). Great expectations: The TESOL practicum as a professional learning experience. *TESOL Journal*, 5(2), 199-224. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.103>
- Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (2005). Peer assessment of language proficiency. *Language Testing*, 22(1), 93-121. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532205lt298oa>
- Collier, S.T. (1999). Characteristics of reflective thought during the student teaching experience. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 50(3), 173-181.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/002248719905000303>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures*

for developing grounded theory. Sage Publications.

- Cosh, J. (1999). Peer observation: a reflective model. *ELT Journal*, 53(1), 22-27.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/53.1.22>
- Crossley, J., & Jolly, B. (2012). Making sense of work-based assessment: Ask the right questions, in the right way, about the right things, of the right people. *Medical Education*, 46(1), 28–37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04166.x>
- Davies, P. (2000). Computerized peer assessment, *Innovations in Education and Training International*, 37(4), 346–355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135580000750052955>
- Davis, E. A. (2006). Characterising productive reflection among preservice elementary teachers: Seeing what matters. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(3), 281-301.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.11.005>
- Deering, T. (2011). How should we evaluate student teachers? *Critical Questions in Education*, 2(2), 66-73. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1047572.pdf>
- De Grez, L., Valcke, M., & Roozen, I. (2012). How effective are self- and peer assessment of oral presentation skills compared with teachers' assessments? *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 13(2), 129–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787412441284>
- Dochy, E., Segers, M., & Sluismans, D. (1999). The use of self-, peer and co-assessment in higher education: A review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 24(3), 331-350.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079912331379935>
- Ducharme, E., Ducharme, M., & Dunkin, M. J. (2017). Teacher education: Historical overview, international perspective.
<https://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2479/Teacher-Education.html>.
- Field, H. (1979). Competency-based teacher education (CBTE): A review of the literature. *British Journal of In-Service Education*, 6(1), 39-42.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0305763790060109>
- Gale, K., Martin, K., & Mcqueen, G. (2002). Triadic assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(6), 557–67.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293022000020318>
- Gan, Z. (2014). Learning from interpersonal interactions during the practicum: A case study of non-native ESL student teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 40(2), 128-139.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2013.869969>
- Gillie, A.C., (1974). Competency-based Teacher Education, *American Vocational Journal*, 49(4), 1-30. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ094266>
- Greiman, B., & Covington, H. (2007). Reflective thinking and journal writing: Examining student teachers' perceptions of preferred reflective modality, journal writing

- outcomes, and journal structure. *Career and Technical Education Research*, 32(2), 115-139. <https://doi.org/10.5328/CTER32.2.115>
- Gulikers, J. T. M., Baartman, L. K. J., & Biemans, H. J. A. (2010). Facilitating evaluations of innovative, competence-based assessments: Creating understanding and involving multiple stakeholders. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 33(2), 120–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2009.07.002>
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Longman ELT.
- Hanrahan, S. J., & Isaacs, G. (2001). Assessing self-and peer assessment: The students' views. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 20(1), 53–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360123776>
- Houston R.W., & Brown, K.W., (1975). Competency-based instructional systems: Past, present and future. *Journal of Industrial teacher Education*, 12(4).
- Howell, D. C. (2002). *Statistical methods for psychology*. Duxbury.
- Jay, J. K., & Johnson, K.L. (2002). Capturing complexity: A typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(1), 73-85. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00051-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00051-8)
- Jonsson, A., & Svingby, G. (2007). The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity, and educational consequences. *Educational Research Review*, 2(2), 130–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2007.05.002>
- Kearney, S. (2013). Improving engagement: The use of authentic self-and peer-assessment for learning to enhance the student learning experience. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(7), 875-891. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2012.751963>
- Kiliç, D. (2016). An Examination of using self-, peer-, and teacher-assessment in higher education: A case study in teacher education. *Higher Education Studies*, 6(1), 136-144. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1099387>
- Langan, A.M., Shuker, D.M., Cullen, W.R, Penney, D. Preziosi, R.F., & Wheeler, C.P. (2008). Relationships between student characteristics and self-, peer and tutor evaluations of oral presentations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(2), 179–190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930701292498>
- Leshem, S., & Bar-Hama, R. (2008). Evaluating teaching practice, *English Language Teaching Journal*, 62(3), 257-265. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm020>
- Longhurst, N. & Norton, L.S. (1997). Self-assessment in coursework essays. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 23(4), 319-330.
- Lurie, S. J. (2012). History and practice of competency-based assessment. *Medical education*, 46(1), 49-57. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04142.x>
- Magin, D., & Helmore, P. (2001). Peer and teacher assessments of oral presentation skills:

- How reliable are they? *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(3), 287-298.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070120076264>
- McMillan, J. H. (2001). Secondary teachers' classroom assessment and grading practices. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 20(1), 20-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.2001.tb00055.x>
- Matsuno, S. (2009). Self-, peer-, and teacher-assessments in Japanese university EFL writing classrooms. *Language Testing*, 29(1), 75-100.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/026553220809733>
- Merç, A. (2015). Assessing the performance in EFL teaching practicum: Student teachers' views. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(2), 44-56.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1060561>
- Oldfield, K. A. & Macalpine, J. M. K. (1995). Peer and self-assessment at the tertiary level - an experiential report, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 20(1), 125-132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293950200113>
- Oren, F. S. (2018). Self, peer and teacher assessments: What is the level of relationship between them? *European Journal of Education Studies*, 4(7), 1-16.
<https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/1661/4293>
- Orsmond, P., Merry, S. & Reiling, K. (1996). The importance of marking criteria in peer assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 21(3), 239-49.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293960210304>
- Patri, M. (2002). The influence of peer feedback on self and peer assessment of oral skills. *Language Testing*, 19(2), 109-131. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532202lt224oa>
- Ross, J. A. (2006). The reliability, validity, and utility of self-assessment. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.7275/9wph-vv65>
- Rudy, D. W., Fejfar, M. C., Griffith III, C. H., & Wilson, J. F. (2001). Self-and peer assessment in a first-year communication and interviewing course. *Evaluation & the Health Professions*, 24(4), 436-445.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/016327870102400405>
- Sadeghi, K., & Abolfazli Khonbi, Z. (2015). Iranian university students' experiences of and attitudes towards alternatives in assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(5), 641-665. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.941324>
- Saito, H., & Fujita, T. (2004) Characteristics and user acceptance of peer rating in EFL writing classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 31-54.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168804lr133oa>
- Sedumedi, T. D. T., & Mundalamo, F. J. (2012). Understanding field assessment of pre-service teachers on school practicum. *Africa Education Review*, 9(1), 73-90.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2012.755247>

- Segers, M. & Dochy, F. (2001). New assessment forms in problem-based learning: The value added of the students' perspective. *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(3), 327–43.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070120076291>
- Seifert, T., & Feliks, O. (2019). Online self-assessment and peer-assessment as a tool to enhance student teachers' assessment skills. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(2), 169-185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1487023>
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
- Smith, K., & Lev-Ari, L. (2005). The place of the practicum in pre-service teacher education: The voice of the students. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(3), 289–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598660500286333>
- Somervell, H. (1993). Issues in assessment, enterprise, and higher education: The case for self-, peer and collaborative assessment, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18(3), 221-233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293930180306>
- Stanley, C. (1998). A framework for teacher reflectivity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(3), 584-587. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588129>
- Tan, K. H. K. (2012). *Student self-assessment. Assessment, learning and empowerment*. Singapore: Research Publishing.
- Ward, J.R., & McCotter, S. (2004). Reflection as a visible outcome for preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(3), 243-257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.02.004>
- Watts, M., & Lawson, M. (2009). Using a meta-analysis activity to make critical reflection explicit in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 609-616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.11.019>
- Wolffensperger, Y., & Patkin, D. (2013). Self-assessment of self-assessment in a process of co-teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(1), 16-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.596925>
- Yost, D. S., Sentner, S. M., & Forlenza-Bailey, A. (2000). An examination of the construct of critical reflection: Implications for teacher education programming in the 21st century. *Journal of teacher education*, 51(1), 39-39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002248710005100105>



Appendix I

The phases of the research

Phase	Session	Course Content
		Main themes
1. Teacher Education	1	- Learner differences, traits of a successful teacher, teacher skills and knowledge, classroom management
	2	- Teaching grammar, teaching vocabulary, teaching pronunciation
	3	- Teaching reading, teaching writing
	4	- Teaching speaking, teaching listening
2. Preparation	(20 day gap)	Student teachers ... - selected a lesson - developed a lesson plan - consulted with the teacher educator - watched the model teaching practices - practiced the lesson and got prepared for the actual practicum
3. Practicum	5-13	Teaching practicums (30 minutes each)
4. Multiple- Assessment	5-13	Assessments through the TOI* (5 minutes each) student teachers' and teacher educator's interactive oral assessment (10 minutes for each teaching practice) Student-teacher's comparison of all assessments
5. Course Evaluation	14, 15	Semi-structured interview attitude questionnaire

* TOI (Teacher Observation Instrument) which was developed from the dos and don'ts in the first phase

Appendix II.

Teacher Observation Instrument (TOI)

	Items/ criteria	5 SA	4 A	3 NI	2 SD	1 D
1	She/he had a good first impression on the students.					
2	She/he talked clearly about the objective and purpose of the lesson .					
3	The teacher's warm up could involve the students and reveal the purpose of the lesson.					
4	She/he used the instructional strategies and activities that reflected attention to students' experience, preparedness, and prior knowledge .					
5	She/he encouraged a collaborative approach to learning among the students.					
6	She/he devoted adequate time for every activity (time management).					
7	The teacher appeared confident in his/her ability to teach.					
8	The teacher's classroom management style/strategies enhanced the quality of the lesson.					
9	The pace of the lesson was appropriate. The teacher had balanced speed in all the steps of instruction.					
10	The teacher was able to " read " the students' level of understanding and adjusted instruction accordingly.					
11	The teacher's questions could enhance students' understanding/problem solving					
12	The teacher used all sorts of questions including questions that made the students think on the answer (higher level of cognition)					
13	The teacher waited enough for the students to answer the questions. (enough wait time after questions)					
14	The teachers' questions were clear to understand.					
15	The teacher could engage all the students into the lesson.					
16	There was a climate of respect for students' ideas and questions.					
17	Teacher encouraged interactions (student/s with students/s & teacher with student/s) .					
18	The teacher used a good warm up, went on to the main lesson and concluded well. (lesson plan)					

	Items/ criteria	5 SA	4 A	3 NI	2 SD	1 D
19	The teacher used the audio visual resources (e.g. cassette player, computer,...) very well.					
20	Teacher could create fun in the class (a lively class) so that students learn better.					
21	The teacher had mastery on English (fluency and accuracy).					
22	The teacher had knowledge of the subject matter.					
23	She/he used body gestures (e.g. clapping, snapping fingers,...) to make students attend.					
24	She/he established a friendly rapport with students.					
25	She/he did not interrupt nor interfere the students' activities or responses.					
26	The teacher used variety in his/her tone of voice .					
27	The teacher was fair and even-handed in treating with students.					
28	The teacher was aware of what was happening in her/his class and what the students thought.					
29	She/he moved around the class in the right way and the right time.					
30	The teachers' voice was audible (easy to hear, loud and clear).					
31	The teacher was conservative in energy and breathing (did not spend too much energy).					
32	She/he could rough-tune his/her language at the level of the students.					
33	The teacher used repetition in the right time and appropriately.					
34	Classroom activities were meaningful .					
35	She/he could personalize students' learning .					
36	She/he used the whiteboard appropriately.					
37	She/he had a legible handwriting .					
38	The teacher's instructions were clear for the students to understand.					
39	The teacher provided enough examples and exercises for the lesson to contextualize the lesson content.					
40	She/he used pictures in the book in the best way.					
41	The teacher had eye contact with every student. She did not have a blind spot.					

Appendix III

Semi-structured Interview Questions

(Congruence)

After comparing your self-assessment with your peers' and your teacher educator's,

1. Did you see the congruence between your self- and peer assessment?
2. Did you see your own assessment in line with your teacher's?
3. Did you see your peers' assessment in line with your teacher's?
1. (Attitude)
4. To what extent do you think peers assessment has been fair to you? Explain.
5. What did you like or dislike about this course?
6. To what extent do you think your peers' assessment should be taken into your teacher's consideration? Explain your reasons.
7. To what extent do you think your self-assessment should be taken into your teacher's consideration? Explain.

Appendix IV

Figure 1 Multiple Scatterplot for Self, Peer-group and Teacher educator

