Collaborative Assessment in Reading Class: Skill Development and Students' Reliance Reduction

Amir Rakhshan[1], Sajjad Fathi[2*]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Foreign Languages, International College, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran
arakhshan@sina.tums.ac.ir
[2*]PhD Candidate, Department of Foreign Languages, International College, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran
Sajad.fathi@alumni.ut.ac.ir

Article Info	ABSTRACT
Article Type: **Research Article** **Received:** **01/07/2022** **Accepted:** **08/10/2022**	Competitive and individualistic approaches are the more predominant manners of classroom practice. The alternative approach for competition and individualism is the cooperative or collaborative teaching approach that has drawn significant attention in the TEFL field in recent years. This study intends to explore the fluctuation of students' reading skill and reliance on teacher who were received collaborative assessment practice. Forty intermediate EFL learners from a language center were recruited through administering Oxford Placement Test (OPT). A researcher-made reading comprehension test and a reliance-on-teacher questionnaire were utilized as other instruments of this study to collect required data. The experimental group was subjected to collaborative assessment practice during the instructional phase; meanwhile, the conventional teacher-led assessment was executed for the control group members. The educational phase consisted of eight sessions, each lasting thirty minutes and occurring twice per week for one month. The data analysis revealed that students reading skill and independency improved through implementation of the collaborative assessment practice. This study suggests that collaborative assessment has the potential to be a useful tool for improving learning outcomes and fostering learner autonomy. In addition, this study has some suggestions for researchers seeking further studies. ***Keywords:*** Collaborative Assessment, Reading Comprehension, Self-reliance, Skill Development, Students' Reliance

1. Introduction

Arguably, nowadays, competitive and individualistic approaches are the more dominant modes of classroom practice. The alternative approach for competition and individualism is the cooperative or collaborative teaching approach. Implementing the collaborative approach can lead to better learning achievements in three ways: 1) increased cooperative opportunities; 2) participants' co-constructing knowledge and interactive engagement; 3) development of cognitive apprenticeship (Gardner, 2012).

Collaborative assessment engages students in the process of assessment, encourages autonomy, and increases the significance of assessment for them. Moreover, it increases students' responsibility and self-reliance in learning while it brings them a firm grasp of the subject and makes them more involved in the learning experience. In addition, it helps them with reflection on their part in group learning as well as improving their decision-making ability (Rao et al., 2002). In addition, collaborative assessment enables teachers to obtain more information about students' performances and opportunities to enhance and facilitate students' learning (Weurlander et al., 2012).

Assessment implies measuring an individual's process and product of learning in specific areas like skills and components of language. One of those areas can be reading skill. Reading is a complex performance mental operation for acquiring information from the written text (Grabe, 2009). Reading skill is considered one of the most prominent and indispensable skills individuals depend on to acquire language use in lessons and life situations (Ruddell, 1992). Reading is a complicated process of extracting meaning from written texts, and comprehensible and interconnected information is needed to be able to read (Castles et al., 2018). Meaning-extracting processes grounded in an interactional and collaborative manner are conducive to students acquiring the reading skill by co-construction of meaning among themselves (Oakhill et al., 2019).

Moreover, nowadays, autonomy in learning has received exceptional attenton. Autonomy of self-reliance is a representation of responsibility. Shouldering the responsibility for learning involves resisting passiveness and imitation, the ability to make decisions, and assuming their consequences. On the other hand, students' reliance on teachers refers to students' dependence upon teachers in their learning process. Teacher-dependent students show a low level of self-reliance, and they prefer to be a receiver of knowledge and tend to perform their learning activities and assignments under the supervision and presence of their teacher and need the instruction on the part of their teacher step-by-step (Multon et al., 1991).

The collaborative classroom culture is the missing link in the Iranian EFL context, where most of the classroom's culture is based on competition

rather than cooperation or collaboration (Fahim et al., 2014). Under such circumstances, assessment is considered more of a tool for measuring the mastery of language and learners' level of performance than a tool for learning (Fathi et al., 2019). In addition, Iranian EFL learners show lots of problems in their reading comprehension skills, including limited previous knowledge of the reading text, concentration on accuracy and fluency of reading skill rather than meaning-extraction, lack of exposure to intensive or extensive reading tasks, and lack of self-confidence and motivation for self-directed and independent reading tasks (Abdolrezapour, 2017; Mardani & Tavakoli, 2011). Also, Iranian EFL learners show a high level of dependence on their teachers and a lack of self-reliance associated with conformity and seeking leadership from their teachers (Samanian & Roohani, 2018; Samar et al., 2015).

Regarding mentioned problems and the paucity of literature about the collaborative assessment's effectiveness on learners' reading skill development and reliance reduction, the current study seeks to bridge the gap through evaluating students' reading skill and independency fluctuation through provision of the collaborative assessment practice. To do so, the following research questions were formulated in this study:

RQ1: Does implementing collaborative assessment have any statistically significant effect on developing reading comprehension ability?

RQ2: Does implementing collaborative assessment have any statistically significant effect on reducing students' reliance on the teacher?

2. Literature Review

Human learning and education occur in the social context, so implementing the construction of knowledge and collaborative learning at different levels of education is recommended (Hargreaves, 2007). According to Sociocultural Theory, individual's cognitive and executive language competencies develop when he/she engaged in social interactions with others. According to Vygotsky, the provision of mediation from a more knowledgeable person can improve the individual's task performance and his/her independent problem-solving ability (Crawford, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978).

Compared with typical teacher-centered classrooms, a constructivist classroom stresses student-centered classroom discourse in which students lead discussions, and the educator acts as a guide or a facilitator. In this respect, the instructor's responsibility is to ask pertinent questions and then assist students through the learning process by inviting them to engage in in-depth discussion while analyzing their replies to the problems. Language assessment is one of the critical elements of the learning process, in which collaborative language assessment is regarded as a newly developed approach toward assessment to involve the learners in the process of

negotiation of knowledge and construction of meaning in their learning (Swain, 2001).

The collaborative assessment focuses on engaging the learners with the assessment complexity and reorienting them from passive objects to active participants in the assessment process. It emphasizes assessment literacy growth and enables students to know assessment grading standards and requirements by directly engaging them in assessing procedures and processes to gain a deeper understanding of language assessment (O'Donovan et al., 2008; Sambell et al., 2012).

In the light of teacher-learner and learner-learner collaborative work, the collaborative assessment allows learners to be fully involved in the process of the assessment, spend time thinking more profoundly, promote critical thinking, encourage good teamwork, improve decision-making abilities, self-monitoring and regulation, find the way how the other peers resolve issues, draw insight from their classmates' works, learn to collaborate and criticize cooperatively, reflect on the amount of hard work they put into their practice, and evaluate the appropriacy of their own performance standards (Hargreaves, 2007; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013; Sluijsmans et al., 1998; Somervell, 1993; Sung et al., 2005; Topping, 1998).

For Tinzmann et al. (1990), collaborative classrooms appear to possess four common features:

1. Knowledge shared between teachers and learners

In conventional classes, the teacher is regarded as a knowledge transmitter, and knowledge flow is only unidirectional from instructor to student. By contrast, in collaborative contexts, the teacher is considered the one who facilitates learning and tries to provide content knowledge, skills, and instruction for their student in a cooperative manner.

2. Divided authority between educators and learners

In collaborative educational settings, teachers and students share control and responsibility for their practice. Collaborative teachers encourage learners to set clear targets based on classroom instruction, respect diverse student interests and objectives, assess their own achievements, consider students' different learning styles, and motivate students toward democratic classroom culture.

3. Teachers as mediators

The teacher is seen as a mediator of the learning process through which she assists learners in relating new information to their previously gained knowledge and building their own language knowledge base. The collaborative teacher adjusts the level of information considering students

understanding level and maximizes their capacity to assume responsibility for learning tasks and activities.

4. Heterogeneous Groupings of Students

Students are heterogeneous regarding their learning styles, levels of ability, and knowledge. Students' groups are not formed according to their ability, achievement, interests, and learning styles. Heterogeneity enhances collaboration and allows students to learn from and with each other (Tinzmann et al., 1990).

Considering language skills' role in learning, reading comprehension skill is recognized as a crucial skill for lifetime learning for language learners since they will need it to comprehend material in future studies and utilize it for future job prospects. This crucial skill assists pupils in their academic and lifelong learning processes (Dechant, 2013). Reading comprehension is a mental process for extracting the meaning from the written texts and understanding the conveyed message of texts. Also, reading comprehension is characterized as the analysis and evaluation of a written language to ascertain the writer's message and extraction of associated meaning (O'Donovan et al., 2008). Reading comprehension, based on Sweet and Snow (2003), is considered the practice of concurrently eliciting and building meaning from written materials.

According to Nokes et al., (2007), reading skill is seen as an interactive process between the reader based on new perspectives and a written text based on her/his schematic knowledge about the content. Through this interactive process, students can construct their own meaning of the text (Birch, 2014; Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2011).

Self-reliance is associated with some factors such as responsibility, self-esteem, dedication, self-determination, and independence (Fukuda, 2018). However, autonomy can be defined as students' ability to achieve their learning objectives independently without the presence of external assistance (Huei-Ju, 2018).

Students' ability to rely on their own capabilities to meet their personal and educational needs is a typical definition of self-reliance (Little, 1991; Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986; Williams & Burden, 1997). A reliant EFL student is a person who requires the help of his teacher to meet his routine educational needs; otherwise, he cannot solve his learning problems by himself and cannot do the learning tasks independently. The EFL teachers are required to create the conditions for the manifestation of self-reliance in the classroom to prevent the high students' reliance on their language educators in the learning process.

Yon et al. (2022) conducted a study to investigate the effectiveness of collaborative reading strategies on student's reading skill development. Based on the findings of this study, it was revealed that students' reading

performance enhanced regarding factors such as literacy, interpretation ability, practical and analytical knowledge development.

Nosratinia and Hooshmand Fateh (2017) studied the effect of implementing collaborative reading practice in combination with content-sensitive instruction on development of Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension. The data analysis of this study showed that there was not meaningful and noticeable relationship between learners' reading comprehension development and experiencing collaborative reading practice when the focus was on content of the instruction.

Abbasnezhad and Zoghi (2016) investigated whether a specific reading teaching approach, Modified Collaborative Strategic Reading (MCSR), can minimize reading anxiety among intermediate English learners. The findings of this study revealed that implementation of MCSR reduced learners' reading anxiety significantly. Furthermore, instructors shifted focus from traditional methods of instructing the fundamental reading skill to trendy programs, namely MCSR, to eliminate their learners' stress and anxiety in reading.

3. Method

3.1. Participants

The target population of this study was an entire set of the Iranian EFL learners. In the current study, a convenience sampling method was utilized. 40 intermediate EFL learners (females = 24 and males = 16) were took part in this study. In this study, participants had at least spent two years learning English. They were assured about their data confidentiality.

3.2. Materials and Instruments

3.2.1. Oxford Placement Test (OPT)

This test designed by Oxford University Press was administered to homogenize the learners. It contains 60 items divided into two sections; the first focuses on vocabulary/grammar (40 items), and the second part concentrates on reading comprehension (20 items).

3.2.2. Reading Comprehension Test (RCT)

This test was designed by the researchers to evaluate learners' reading comprehension ability. The RCT had four passages and 20 items (12 multiple-choice and 8 true-false items) utilized as pre and post-tests. Regarding the test's reliability, the researchers piloted it and estimated its reliability through the Cronbach Alpha formula, about 0.87. To measure the test's content validity, two experts in the field of TEFL were approached to

comment on the items. The test revision was made based on these experts' comments.

3.2.3. Students' Reliance on the Teacher Questionnaire (SRTQ)

This test was developed and adapted by the researchers to measure students' reliance levels. The SRTQ was comprised of 39 items in five parts, including teacher dependency, self-confidence, self-regulating, self-commitment, and strategic ability. The items pool was gathered through a literature review about the subject of inquiry. The researchers administered a pilot version of this questionnaire to 150 EFL students and estimated its reliability using the Cronbach Alpha formula in SPSS. This questionnaire's reliability was determined to be 0.934. To measure the content validity of the questionnaire items, three experts in the field of TEFL were requested to provide their comments on the items used. Then the researchers refined and revised the items respectively.

3.3. Procedure

For the present study, the researchers first administered OPT to select a homogeneous sample of participants, whereby 40 participants were considered. The researchers then randomly assigned them to one of two groups: an experimental group (N = 20) and a control group (N = 20). Next, they administered RCT and SRTQ prior to the eight-week instructional phase to measure students' reading comprehension ability and reliance levels. During the instructional phase, participants in the experimental group were subjected to collaborative assessment practice through which they collaboratively assessed their reading tasks and activities. In collaborative assessment practice, pairs or small groups of students who work together benefit from their peers' knowledge and teacher feedback in the same activity. Before giving the collaborative assessment criteria, the participants were thoroughly briefed on assessment, evaluation, teacher assessment, self-assessment, and peer assessment. They were also given the opportunity to raise concerns about the process of collaborative assessment and have a complete understanding of the overall procedure. The control group participants were subjected to traditional assessment practice whereby the teacher assessed their reading tasks and activities. RCT and SRTQ were re-administered after the treatment ended to measure the changes in the two dependent variables.

3.4. Data Analysis

After collecting the necessary data, they were analyzed through the statistical software SPSS. The current study estimated descriptive statistics,

normality calculations (Shapiro-Wilk), and inferential statistics (Independent Sample T-Test) for each research question.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Results

4.1.1. Addressing the First Research Question

To answer the research question, first, the descriptive statistics for pre-test scores are presented. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for reading pre-test scores.

Table 1
The Descriptive Statistics for Reading Pre-Test Scores

Group	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Ctrl Pre	20	10	18	**14.05**	2.259
Exp Pre	20	10	17	**14.15**	1.785

As Table 1 shows, the control and experimental groups' reading pre-test means are 14.05 and 14.15, respectively. Next, the normality test (Shapiro-Wilk Test) of the control and experimental groups' reading pre-test scores is presented in Table 2.

Table 2
The Shapiro-Wilk Test for Reading Pre-Test Scores

Group	Statistics	df	Sig.
Ctrl Pre	0.967	20	**0.686**
Exp Pre	0.943	20	**0.278**

According to Table 2, the Sig values are 0.686 and 0.278, respectively and more than 0.05 (0.686 > 0.05 and 0.278 > 0.05). However, the researchers could use Independent Sample T-Test to present inferential statistics for comparison of means. Table 3 presents the inferential statistics for comparison of reading pre-test means.

Table 3
Independent t-test for Reading Pre-Test Means

		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig.
Ctrl Pre	EVA	1.486	0.230	0.077	38	**0.939**
Exp Pre	EVNA			0.077	36.471	0.939

As Table 3 shows, the obtained Sig value is 0.939 and more than 0.05 (0.939 > 0.05). Thus, the Sig value for the control and experimental groups' reading pre-test means is not statistically significant. To continue the analysis, post-test scores of reading should be taken into account. The following table presents the descriptive statistics for reading post-test scores.

Table 4
The Descriptive Statistics for Reading Post-Test Scores

Group	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Ctrl Post	20	11	18	**14.00**	1.654
Exp Post	20	11	20	**16.05**	2.164

As indicated in Table 4, reading post-test means are 14.00 and 16.05, respectively. Table 5 presents the normality test (Shapiro-Wilk) of reading post-test scores.

Table 5
The Shapiro-Wilk Test for Reading Post-Test Scores

Group	Statistics	df	Sig.
Ctrl Post	0.957	20	**0.492**
Exp Post	0.962	20	**0.575**

According to Table 5, the Sig values are 0.492 and 0.575 respectively and more than 0.05 ($0.492 > 0.05$ and $0.575 > 0.05$). Thus, the normalization of the post-test scores was confirmed, letting the researchers run a parametric inferential test, i.e., the Independent Sample T-test. Accordingly, table 6 below presents the inferential statistics for comparison of the control and experimental groups' reading post-test means.

Table 6
The Inferential Test for Reading Post-Test Means

		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	MD	SED
Ctrl Post	EVA	1.128	0.295	-3.734	38	**0.001**	-2.300	0.616
Exp Post	EVNA			-3.734	35.260	0.001	-2.300	0.616

Here in table 6, the obtained Sig value is 0.001 and it is less than 0.05 ($0.001 < 0.05$). It indicates that implementation of the collaborative assessment practice develops Iranian EFL students' reading skill.

4.1.2. Addressing the Second Research Question

To answer the second research question, first, the descriptive statistics of pre-test scores is required. Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics for the reliance pre-test scores.

Table 7
The Descriptive Statistics for Reliance Pre-Test Scores

Group	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Ctrl Pre	20	50	152	**87.65**	27.782
Exp Pre	20	42	141	**81.75**	27.849

As shown in Table 7, the control and experimental groups' reliance pre-test means are 87.65 and 81.75, respectively. Next, the normality test (Shapiro-Wilk) of the reliance pre-test scores is presented in the following table.

Table 8

The Shapiro-Wilk Test for Reliance Pre-Test Scores

Group	Statistics	df	Sig.
Ctrl Pre	0.940	20	**0.238**
Exp Pre	0.940	20	**0.242**

As Table 8 shows, the Sig values are 0.238 and 0.242, respectively and more than 0.05 (0.238 > 0.05 and 0.242 > 0.05). Here, the normalization of the scores was confirmed. Accordingly, the researchers could use Independent Sample T-Test to compare the pre-test means. Table 9 presents the inferential statistics for comparison of the reliance pre-test means.

Table 9

The Independent t-test for Reliance Pre-Test Means

		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	MD	SED
Ctrl Pre	EVA	0.001	0.973	0.671	38	0.506	5.900	8.796
Exp Pre	EVNA			0.671	38.000	0.506	5.900	8.796

As Table 9 shows, the obtained Sig value is 0.506 and more than 0.05 (0.506 > 0.05). Thus, the Sig value for the control and experimental groups' reliance pre-test means is not statistically significant.

Next, the descriptive statistics of the post-test scores are required. Table 10 reports the descriptive statistics for post-test scores.

Table 10

The Descriptive Statistics for Reliance Post-Test Scores

Group	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Ctrl Post	20	52	151	**87.40**	27.489
Exp Post	20	40	120	**70.40**	22.621

As indicated in Table 10, the reliance post-test means are 87.40 and 70.40, respectively. Next, the normality test (Shapiro-Wilk) of the reliance post-test scores is presented.

Table 11

The Shapiro-Wilk Test for Reliance Post-Test Scores

Group	Statistics	df	Sig.
Ctrl Post	0.929	20	**0.146**
Exp Post	0.948	20	**0.338**

Here in table 11, the Sig values are 0.146 and 0.338, respectively and more than 0.05 (0.146 > 0.05 and 0.338 > 0.05). The normalization of both sets of scores was confirmed, and the researchers could run a parametric inferential test, i.e., the Independent Sample T-test. The inferential statistics are presented in table 12 below.

Table 12

The Independent t-test for Reliance Post-Test Means

		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	MD	SED
Ctrl Post	EVA	0.468	0.498	2.136	38	**0.039**	17.000	7.960
Exp Post	EVNA			2.136	36.643	0.039	17.000	7.960

As Table 12 shows, the obtained Sig value is 0.039 and it is less than 0.05 (0.039 < 0.05). Thus, the Sig value for the reliance post-test means is statistically significant. Hence, it is indicated that the execution of collaborative assessment practice could significantly decline students' reliance on their teacher in the learning process.

4.2. Discussion

The research questions explored the effectiveness of the practicing collaborative assessment on development of the Iranian EFL learners' reading and the reduction of their reliance on their teacher during learning process. The data were analyzed, and different findings were reported. The first finding revealed that the provision of the collaborative assessment practice enhanced students' reading skill noticeably. The possible reason for this finding is that as learners are involved in the assessment process, their anxiety about assessment is reduced, making them more confident to try for better learning outcomes (Carless et al., 2006).

Estaji and Khosravi (2015), in their study about the effect of collaborative assessment, in comparison to static assessment, on the reading comprehension of EFL learners, found a result as this study did. According to their research, students viewed collaborative evaluation as a profitable and practical method for enhancing their reading skills. In addition, Marzban and Akbarnejad (2013) received the same finding, demonstrating cooperative learning improved the learners' reading skill.

Regarding the first finding of this study, Kolloffel et al. (2011) and Kozma and Anderson (2002) concluded in the same way. Based on their studies, collaborative learning assessment inspires students to view situations from various viewpoints, provides an opportunity to practice interpersonal and leadership abilities (social advantages), and offers a comforting educational experience that minimizes anxiety considerably (psychological advantages). In addition, as this study revealed, the nature of collaboration helps learners be highly motivated to do their learning tasks and activities (Conway et al., 1993). In addition, in the present study, it was noticed that the

atmosphere of the classroom becomes stress-free by implementing the collaborative assessment. Additionally, Dechant's (2013) study revealed the same finding in which she conceptualized collaborative assessment practice as an effective tool for emphasizing teamwork or group work among pupils through developing students' meaningful interactions in the classroom.

According to Tinzmann et al. (1990), the characteristic of heterogeneity in collaborative practice enhances collaboration, allows students to learn from and with each other, and increases student interactions, respectively. Therefore, through this enhanced interaction, the students are empowered to take steps further in their learning practice. As O'Donovan et al. (2008) and Sambell et al. (2012) showed, collaborative assessment can involve the student in the depth and intricacy of assessment and transform their role from a passive object of assessment to an active participant in the assessment process. It lays importance on assessment literacy development and enables students to know assessment marking standards and requirements by effectively involving them in assessing procedures and processes to develop a more profound understanding of language assessment.

The second finding was that implementing collaborative assessment has a statistically significant effect on reducing students' reliance on the instructor. This finding is consistent with McConnell's (2002) study, which examined how students discuss their perspectives and practices of collaborative assessment. In fact, a pleasant learning atmosphere is a side-product of collaborative assessment practice; therefore, this manner of assessment allows students to become less dependent on their educators. However, there is an agreement between these two studies regarding the matter of students' independency, which is accelerated by provision of collaborative assessment practice.

According to Rao et al. (2002), collaborative assessment involves students in the assessment process, encourages autonomy, and makes assessment more meaningful to them. Moreover, it increases students' responsibility and self-reliance in learning, brings them profound insight into the topic, makes them adopt an ever-increasing active part in their learning process, helps them consider their responsibility and role in group learning activities, and improves their decision-making ability. According to Chau (2005), collaborative assessment can shift the learners' roles from being passive entities to fully active participants and alter the application of learning skills. Here, these research studies confirm the findings of this study regarding the role of collaborative assessment on development of students' autonomy.

Furthermore, collaboration can be viewed as the practice of dependence on group judgment and decision-making for students, and it can help them avoid reliance on an individual in this respect, the teacher (Ushioda, 2001). According to Hargreaves (2007) and Panadero and Jonsson's (2013)

perspectives on collaborative assessment, the interactional nature of the collaborative assessment allows students to receive more feedback on their performance, motivates them toward deeper processing, and compares their ideas with those of other students. Furthermore, it gives teachers a deeper perspective and understanding of student involvement and learning and better decision-making processes.

5. Conclusion and Implications

The findings of the study indicated that collaborative assessment develops students' reading skill independency. When students practice collaboratively in their classroom, the level of interactions increases respectively. This interactional relationship among students facilitates the negotiation of meaning and thought in the classroom. Through the interactions, students enhance their strategic competence and show more efficacy in reading skills.

One of the critical factors of student reliance on the teacher is the student's lack of self-confidence. The collaborative assessment can give them self-confidence. Collaborative assessment is regarded as an assessment for learning, which leads teachers and students toward a better analysis of teaching and learning based on the information they gathered in this process and allows them to make effective decisions to help students learn more efficiently. As a result, acquiring these mentioned abilities can help students become more self-reliant in their language learning journey.

This study has many pedagogical implications for EFL teachers and students for making the learning situations more effective and successful. Moreover, these study findings can help English program developers, curriculum designers, and teacher educators provide better teaching and learning practices, conditions, and environments for language learners.

The researchers faced many potentialities throughout this research. It seems that many factors interact and create new situations leading to new questions. These questions are recommended as a guide to help formulate new research topics for future study. The current research evaluated the impact of collaborative assessment in reading class on students' skill development and reliance reduction. As this study was done in the Iranian EFL context, it could be a valuable option for researchers seeking future studies considering the ESL context.

Furthermore, as this study focused on reading skill practice in the classroom, investigating other skills and sub-skills is worth considering for further studies. Nowadays, the psychological factors of learning are gaining increasing attention from researchers in TEFL. Since this study concerned the reliance reduction factor, exploring the behaviors of other psychological factors such as students' autonomy, test anxiety, and willingness to communicate could be suggested for the execution of further studies. The

lack of sufficient participants leads the researchers to apply a convenience sampling methodology for selecting the participants in this research; thus, if possible, for other researchers, randomizing participants from a broader range of possibilities may enhance the validity and generalizability of the study.

References

Abbasnezhad, S., & Zoghi, M. (2016). The effect of modified collaborative strategic reading on EFL learner' reading anxiety. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics, 9*(18), 25-48.

Abdolrezapour, P. (2017). Improving L2 reading comprehension through emotionalized dynamic assessment procedures. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *46*(3), 747-770.

Birch, B. M. (2014). *English L2 reading: Getting to the bottom*. Routledge.

Carless, D., Joughin, G., & Liu, N.-F. (2006). *How assessment supports learning: Learning-oriented assessment in action*. Hong Kong University Press.

Castles, A., Rastle, K., & Nation, K. (2018). Ending the reading wars: Reading acquisition from novice to expert. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 19*(1), 5-51.

Chau, J. (2005). Effects of collaborative assessment on language development and learning. *The Language Learning Journal, 32*(1), 27-37.

Conway, R., Kember, D., Sivan, A., & Wu, M. (1993). Peer assessment of an individual's contribution to a group project. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 18*(1), 45-56.

Crawford, K. (1996). Vygotskian approaches in human development in the information era. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 31*(1-2), 43-62.

Dechant, E. (2013). *Understanding and teaching reading: An interactive model*. Routledge.

Estaji, M., & Khosravi, F. (2015). Investigating the impact of collaborative and static assessment on the Iranian EFL students' reading comprehension, critical thinking, and metacognitive strategies of reading. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies, 7*(1), 17-44.

Fahim, M., Miri, M., & Najafi, Y. (2014). Contributory role of collaborative assessment in improving critical thinking and writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *3*(1), 1-11.

Fathi, J., Mohebiniya, S., & Nourzadeh, S. (2019). Enhancing second language writing self-regulation through self-assessment and peer-assessment: a case of Iranian EFL Learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *8*(3), 110-117.

Fukuda, A. (2018). The Japanese EFL learners' self-regulated language learning and proficiency. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, 22*(1), 65-87.

Gardner, J. (2012). *Assessment and learning*. Sage.

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W. and Stoller, F.L. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Longman.

Hargreaves, E. (2007). The validity of collaborative assessment for learning. *Assessment in Education, 14*(2), 185-199.

Huei-Ju, S. (2018). Promoting language learners' awareness of autonomy through goal setting: An alternative approach of assessing goal setting effects. *English Language Teaching, 11*(10), 52-65.

Kolloffel, B., Eysink, T. H. S., & de Jong, T. (2011). Comparing the effects of representational tools in collaborative and individual inquiry learning. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 6*(2), 223-251.

Kozma, R. B., & Anderson, R. E. (2002). Qualitative case studies of innovative pedagogical practices using ICT. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 18*(4), 387-394.

Little, D. G. (1991). *Learner autonomy: Definitions, issues and problems*. Authentik Language Learning Resources.

Mardani, M., & Tavakoli, M. (2011). Beyond reading comprehension: The effect of adding a dynamic assessment component on EFL reading comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(3), 688-696.

Marzban, A., & Akbarnejad, A. A. (2013). The effect of cooperative reading strategies on improving reading comprehension of Iranian university students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70*, 936-942.

McConnell, D. (2002). The experience of collaborative assessment in e-learning. *Studies in Continuing Education, 24*(1), 73-92.

Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*(1), 30-38.

Nokes, J. D., Dole, J. A., & Hacker, D. J. (2007). Teaching high school students to use heuristics while reading historical texts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *99*(3), 492-504.

Nosratinia, M., & Hooshmand Fateh, N. (2017). The comparative effect of collaborative strategic reading and content-based instruction on EFL learners' reading comprehension. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 6*(6), 165-173.

Oakhill, J., Cain, K., & Carsten, E. (2019). Reading comprehension and reading comprehension difficulties. In D. A. Kilpatrick, R. M. Joshi & R. K. Wagner (Eds.), *Reading development and difficulties: Bridging the gap between research and practice* (pp. 83-115). Springer International Publishing.

O'Donovan, B., Price, M., & Rust, C. (2008). Developing student understanding of assessment standards: A nested hierarchy of approaches. *Teaching in Higher Education, 13*(2), 205-217.

Panadero, E., & Jonsson, A. (2013). The use of scoring rubrics for formative assessment purposes revisited: A review. *Educational Research Review, 9*(0), 129-144. doi:10.1080/0969594X.2013.877872

Rao, S. P., Collins, H. L., & DiCarlo, S. E. (2002). Collaborative testing enhances student learning. *Advances in Physiology Education*, *26*(1), 37-41.

Ruddell, R. B. (1992). A whole language and literature perspective: Creating a meaning-making instructional environment. *Language Arts, 69*(8), 612-620.

Samanian, S., & Roohani, A. (2018). Effects of self-regulatory strategy development on EFL learners' descriptive writing and reflective thinking. *Research in English Language Pedagogy, 6*(1), 95-116.

Samar, R. G., Kiany, G., & Chaleshtori, M. (2015). Promoting self-regulated learning in Iranian postgrads' English writing classes using an automated essay scoring software. *Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Science, 4*(2), 69-79.

Sambell, K., McDowell, L., & Montgomery, C. (2012). *Assessment for learning in higher education*. Routledge.

Sluijsmans, D., Dochy, F., & Moerkerke, G. (1998). Creating a learning environment by using self-, peer-and co-assessment. *Learning Environments Research, 1*(3), 293-319.

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.

Steinberg, L., & Silverberg, S. B. (1986). The vicissitudes of autonomy in early adolescence. *Child Development*, *57*(4), 841-851.

Sung, Y.-T., Chang, K.-E., Chiou, S.-K., & Hou, H.-T. (2005). The design and application of a web-based self-and peer-assessment system. *Computers & Education, 45*(2), 187-202.

Swain, M. (2001). Integrating language and content teaching through collaborative tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 58*(1), 44-63.

Sweet, A. P., & Snow, C. E. (2003). *Rethinking reading comprehension. solving problems in the teaching of literacy*. ERIC.

Tinzmann, M., Jones, B. F., Fennimore, T., Bakker, J., Fine, C., & Pierce, J. (1990). *The collaborative classroom: Reconnecting teachers and learners.* NCREL.

Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(3), 249-276.

Ushioda, E. (2001) Language learning at university: Exploring the role of motivational thinking. In Z. Dornyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 93-125). University of Hawai'I, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Readings on the Development of Children, 23*(3), 34-41.

Weurlander, M., Söderberg, M., Scheja, M., Hult, H., & Wernerson, A. (2012). Exploring formative assessment as a tool for learning: students' experiences of different methods of formative assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 37*(6), 747-760.

Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Yon, A. E., Rafli, Z., & Nuruddin, A. (2022). Teaching reading by collaborative strategic reading: an action research. *English Review: Journal of English Education, 10*(2), 465-474.